

ANACORTES PLANNING COMMISSION



June 14, 2017

Municipal Building Council Chambers

6th Street and "Q" Avenue

AGENDA

6 P.M.

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Minutes of May 24, 2017**
3. **Correspondence**
Update on Development Regulations & Design Standards Code
4. **Old Business**
5. **New Business**

If reasonable accommodation of a disability is needed please contact Cherri Kahns at 299-1950 at least 48 hours prior to this meeting.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for – May 24, 2017

Chair Laumbattus called the meeting of May 24, 2017 to order at approximately 6 p.m.

Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners Laumbattus, Moffit, Cleland-McGrath, Mount and Doll

Members Absent: Commissioners Oppel and McNett

Minutes

Minutes of February 8, February 22, & March 8, 2017 were approved as written.

Correspondence

None

Old Business

Public Hearing – Jacob's Meadow PUD Final Plat Approval; PUD-2011-0001

Libby Grage, Planning Manager, presented a summary of infrastructure constructed to date and the proposed conditions.

Commissioner Doll requested clarification of the use of the tracts on site. Ms. Grage provided that there may be playground type amenities or vegetation which would be for public use.

Commissioner Mount questioned the timeline for conditions to be applied. Ms. Grage clarified conditions must be completed prior to the city signing final plat maps.

Commissioner Doll made a motion to move the project to City Council with the staff recommended conditions. Commissioner Mount seconded. Commissioner Cleland McGrath abstained due to late arrival. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

Public Hearing – Cap Sante High School Portable, Conditional Use Permit; CUP-2017-0001

Kevin Cricchio, Associate Planner, AICP, presented a CUP for a temporary placement of a 2,700 sq. ft. portable building on the field located at the intersection of 22nd Street and J Avenue. This unit would be in place until the fall of 2019 during the high school reconstruction. The applicant also proposes an option of two additional 1,100 sq. ft. portables, which may be placed in the summer of 2018 through the fall of 2019.

Commissioner Doll expressed concern with traffic surrounding the portable. Marc Estvold, Project Manager, clarified plans for possible portable relocation and improvements to intersections surrounding the high school, and also addressed lighting. Mr. Estvold provided that the City has applied for a Safe Routes to School Grant that could contribute if awarded.

Commissioner Doll questioned the demand for bicycle racks and Commissioner Cleland McGrath questioned student parking. Mr. Estvold clarified the School District would address either if needed.

With no public comments, Chair Laumbattus closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Cleland McGrath made a motion to recommend approval with staff recommended conditions of approval. Commissioner Moffit seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Laumbattus called the meeting to a close at approximately 6:30 p.m.



Planning Commission Agenda Bill

Meeting Date: 6/14/2017 **Agenda Item:** 2

Subject: Development regulations & design standards – Code Update Project Status

Staff Contact: Don Measamer, Libby Grage

Approved for Submittal to Council by	
	Laurie Gere, Mayor
x	Don Measamer, PCED Director
	Darcy Swetnam, City Attorney

Action Type	
	Public Hearing
	Staff Report
x	Discussion

Summary Statement: At the June 14, 2017 PC meeting, staff would like to update the Planning Commission on the development regulation update project status, including a briefing on the residential and commercial open house survey results.

Background: The development regulations are one of the primary tools for implementing the 2016 Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies, which guide the City's future growth. Recommended concepts for updates to the development regulations have been generated for public review and feedback and specific draft code language is being developed for further public review based on that feedback. Additional information, including the preliminary concepts, and other project documents can be found on the project [website](http://www.cityofanacortes.org/devregupdate.php) (<http://www.cityofanacortes.org/devregupdate.php>).

Previous Council/Committee/Commission Action: None.

Competing Viewpoints Considered: Opportunities for public comment on the initial development regulation and design concepts was provided at the March 16 and May 25, 2017 public workshops, and additional opportunities (both informal and at a public hearing(s)) will be provided throughout the code update process.

Recommended Motion: N/A

Alternative Actions: N/A

Attachments:

Workshop Survey Results: Preliminary Residential Code Update Concepts



WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS: PRELIMINARY RESIDENTIAL CODE UPDATE CONCEPTS

April 2016

The survey results below are based on 139 completed surveys, both from participants who attended the March 16 public workshop and a follow-up online version. MAKERS led a presentation describing these concepts. The workshop also included an open house with presentation boards and information about the concepts. Within the four middle columns (from “Great Idea” to “Bad Idea”), we’ve indicated the total number of survey respondents who’ve responded to the survey question accordingly. Within the Comment Themes column, we’ve attempted to summarize the specific comments we’ve received into generally “positive”, “Unsure/Neutral”, and “Negative” categories for better legibility. The complete listing of comments are provided in the Appendix.

Concept/Option					
1. Adjust Maximum Density Limits in key areas per the Adopted Comprehensive Plan					
The recently adopted Comprehensive Plan directed a number of zoning changes aimed at meeting community housing goals. (A link to a video recording of the 3/16/2017 open house presentation and a PDF of the Comprehensive Plan’s proposed zoning changes was provided.) Add any specific comments/suggestions regarding proposed changes to specific zones. If you like or dislike proposed changes, please elaborate on WHY they are a good or bad idea. SEE APPENDIX FOR LISTING OF SPECIFIC COMMENTS.					
Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
2. Consider adding Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards					
FAR standards would limit the size of homes relative to the size of their lots for the purpose of maintain neighborhood compatibility					
- R-1 & R-2 zones: A maximum somewhere between 0.40 and 0.50. - R-3 zone: A maximum somewhere between 0.55 and 0.70 FAR.	38	52	25	21	<u>Positive:</u> 0.5 would be good. Like that this supports affordability; I like it because the biggest problem is tearing old houses down and building giant houses next to older smaller; 0.5 should be the standard not including daylight basement; R-1 and R2 should be 0.3. R-3 should be 0.4. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Not sure how this is better than hard size/height limits; Retraining absorption surface is critical for environment. What matters is footprint. Keep to .35 or less; 0.70 FAR in R-3 zone is too much. No more than 0.50 FAR; In R-1 and R-2 zones,

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
					0.5 to 0.7 and min allowed small slots. In R-3, 0.7 or none – want density; Not sure I fully understand how this works; Unsure how this will work with smaller lot sizes. Out to exclude daylight basements; Need to provide some flexibility for existing homes to do moderate projects without tripping into a big FAR outrage (i.e. existing big house doing a remodel but not getting any bigger – does that trigger the limit on the whole property); What about lot minimums? Why not consider footprint (lot coverage) or is floor area a better indicator of “mass”? Does DADU count in addition to “main house”? Options for 3,000sf lots in R-4? <u>Negative:</u> Don’t want street after street of (boring) one-story houses.
3. Consider building height and setback adjustments					
a. Change the way building height is measured from the top of buildings to the mid-point of pitched roofs (so it doesn’t discourage pitched roofs) AND reduce the maximum height by 5’ in all residential zones.	30	47	24	29	<u>Positive:</u> Allows for great attractiveness; could encourage creative use of dormers; requires clear guidelines; maintain a maximum height. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Add an overall height; if using midpoint, lower height limit by 10 feet; consider impacts on views; unclear this will discourage flat roofs; usefulness depends on the slope of the roof; consider larger side yard setbacks instead. <u>Negative:</u> Encourages houses that are taller overall; ensure CCRs can override this; modern homes can make good use of flat roofs if yard space is limited and should not be punished; concern about blocking views; this is too detailed and should be left to the architects and builders.
b. Front setback – allow porches and covered entries to project up to 6’ into setback.	35	57	21	15	<u>Positive:</u> Allow this but don’t require it; no perceived impact; better connection to street and neighbors; helpful in rainy climate; can help reduce impact of front-facing garages. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Depends on the depth of the front yard setback; if mixing new and existing homes this may result in an uneven appearance; need to be careful this doesn’t result in porches becoming enclosed, resulting in larger homes; do not allow a second floor to extend over the porch; introduce a width limit, such as 15 feet or 50% of the front wall length; more information needed on how close such porches would be to the street.

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
					<i>Negative:</i> Results in more impermeable surface; setbacks exist to keep yard spaces open; enclosed sun porch or entry room could become a loophole; concern about a creep in footprint.
c. Retain existing side yard setbacks, but add a daylight plane standard that limits the massing of upper floors along side yard edges.	40	41	25	26	<i>Positive:</i> Beneficial for separation and daylight; could allow for individual creativity; benefits for privacy. <i>Unsure/Neutral:</i> Concept looks complicated; wider side yard setbacks would help achieve the same goal and provide more space for exterior maintenance. <i>Negative:</i> This restricts usable floor area, especially for ADUs; overly complex with marginal benefit; it's unfair to restrict design on neighborhood newcomers; setbacks and height restrictions can be better utilized to address these issues; privacy impacts are a fact of life in urban neighborhoods; creates too much restriction on the few remaining lots.
4. Consider adding Design Standards for Small Lot Single Family (< 5,000sf lots) and Duplexes					
• Provide a covered entry facing the street. • Minimize the impact of garages on the street. • Provide a minimum amount of usable open space. • Limit the width of driveways along the street. • Provide a minimum amount of windows on facades.	29	52	29	21	<i>Positive:</i> Good ideas to reduce boxy appearance; preserving yard area is good; brings positive features to high density scenarios; helps for people with modest incomes and small households; some uniformity would be beneficial. <i>Unsure/Neutral:</i> Flexibility for different situations would be good; window requirements should be based on area, not quantity, of windows; each site is unique and design standards could make some lots unbuildable; design review is an alternative solution; multiple lots should be able to share open space; garage access should be from the back or alley. <i>Negative:</i> Many lots do not have alleys, so build smaller homes to accommodate parking on site; porches seem like a waste of space for high density dwellings; this is overregulating; allows no architectural flexibility; need more details on how garage impacts will be reduced; location of entry should be flexible, sometimes it makes more sense on the side; unclear why windows facing the street are important; don't penalize smaller lots; forcing covered entries and minimum windows could end up looking bad;

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
5. Update Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) provisions					
a. Retain key existing standards: ○ Allow in all residential zones. ○ Retain 900sf size limit. ○ Retain owner occupancy of home or ADU. ○ Allow ADUs to be attached/detached.	51	43	26	8	<u>Positive:</u> Good way to allow older residents to stay in their homes; promotes affordable housing; generally good provisions already. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Ensure CCRs cannot be overridden; unclear why this is allowed in R4, as ADUs would not be attached to an apartment building; owner occupancy only makes sense in lower density zones; most landlords are responsible and owner occupancy is not necessary; do not encourage proliferation of AirBNBs; size of the lot should determine suitability, versus allowing in all zones; only a good idea if ADUs maintain neighborhood character; unclear if ADUs have actually provided affordable housing so far; 900sf seems overly large, 750sf or the size of a 1-bedroom apartment makes more sense; other suggestions to reduce to 450sf or increase to 1150sf; maximum footprint should be based on lot coverage limits. <u>Negative:</u> Turns all residential areas into duplex areas; minimum lot size is necessary, such as 9,000sf; owner occupancy requirement is bad if a person moves, rents out their former home, and is forced to tear down the ADU.
b. Add flexibility on 16' ADU height limit – provided standards are included to protect privacy. c. Allow available on-street parking in front of home to count as the extra parking space needed for ADU. c. Add standards to maintain some usable open space in the rear yard.	38	50	18	18	<u>Positive:</u> Parking allowance is important for enhancing density; adding extra height to allow living above garage is acceptable <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Needs additional design standards, such as sloped roof with dormers; 20 feet height limit may suffice; unclear if allowed to be visible from street; unclear if AirB&B allowed; respect CCRs; do not require additional parking for ADUs; unclear how street parking provision could be enforced; rear yard open space requirement may not be necessary, as not everyone needs it; any provisions for tiny homes. <u>Negative:</u> Turns all residential areas into duplex areas; off-street parking should continue to be on the site; concern about street parking and congestion; extra height could block neighbors' views; height should be limited to height of primary residence; minimum lot size should be 9000sf; usable open space in front yard is more important than the rear yard.

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
6. Allow for Cottage Housing and add design standards					
a. Limit individual cottages to 800sf footprint and no more than 1,200sf each – but allow 2 cottages to count as one dwelling unit for the purpose of density calculations (since they are less than half the size of typical new homes – and they wouldn't otherwise be economically viable to build). b. Provide for minimum common and private open space standards. c. Locate parking areas to the side or rear of cottages to minimize the impact on streetscape.	47	48	15	18	<i>Positive:</i> Parking location is important; limiting footprint and density bonus is agreeable; great idea for seniors; much needed housing option. <i>Unsure/Neutral:</i> Clusters should have shared greywater systems for irrigation; limit the number of vehicles permitted, as small homes doesn't mean fewer vehicles; recommendation for 2 parking spaces per unit; location of parking is site-dependent; parking in the front can reduce paving; requiring parking is discriminatory compared to ADU proposal to allow on-street parking to count; common space needs to be higher, such as 1000sf per unit; suggest 12 feet between units; 1200sf may be too big, multiple suggestions for lower minimums such as 800, 900, or 1000sf; additional shared amenities, such as gathering room, storage, etc. could incentivize smaller cottages; the existing cottages on J Avenue are a poor example; minimum private open space is not needed, as people buying these homes expect to share common space; unclear why clusters are 4-12; unclear how impact fees would be split. <i>Negative:</i> Affordability requirements may be necessary; unclear on economic argument; not acceptable in R1 and R2 zones; this is a "sleeper" density increase; density impacts argument does not fit with more people, more cars, more noise; 1200sf is the size of some normal homes.
7. Create Design Standards for Townhouses					
a. R-3 zone, limit townhomes to 4-attached units (subject to lot size minimums). b. Orient buildings to the street and feature a covered entry and parking/garages off of alleys or internal auto-courts.	40	50	23	12	<i>Positive:</i> Façade articulation standards is a good idea; fee simple subdivision is key; great way to increase population density with limited space; flexibility is needed, don't limit to four attached units; good idea for urban parts of town but not elsewhere. <i>Unsure/Neutral:</i> 4-unit limit is highly dependent on lot size; homeowners associations operate effectively with at least a dozen units; alley should be a requirement; parking location is site-

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
c. Provide façade articulation standards and minimum façade materials and detailing standards. d. Require a minimum amount of semi-private open space.					dependent; require two parking spaces per unit; guest parking should be considered; want to avoid cookie cutter effect; enforcement needed to maintain affordability; allow decks to count as open space; consider impact of height on neighboring properties; allow builders to have more discretion; avoid design standards that describe details and materials that may become outdated; don't make designs too uniform. <u>Negative:</u> If it's too hard to park in auto-courts, they will backfire and people will park on the street; limit to urban areas; 3 stories is too high; would have too many impacts in Old Town; requiring a covered entry is arbitrary, allow for deviations; people living in townhomes are expecting to give up a yard, so don't require private open space; limit townhomes to urban areas; don't be too specific on site orientation.
8. Update Zoning & Design Standards for Apartment Buildings					
a. Orient buildings to the street and feature a covered entry and parking/garages off of alleys or internal auto-courts. b. Provide façade articulation standards and minimum façade materials and detailing standards. c. Require a minimum amount of open space.	35	64	15	9	<u>Positive:</u> Covered entries are good for the building, not individual units; enhances attractiveness of buildings from the street; good to move parking away from the street. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> 22nd and J apartments are example of not oriented to the street but look good; ensure articulation standards have flexibility; avoid micromanagement that delays permit review; amount of needed open space is dependent on what the public park situation is nearby; not all infill sites may allow for design standard compliance; there are many small parcels in the R4 zone; design standards should be conscious of the economics; avoid blank walls; central open space/courtyard is acceptable; need good landscaping. <u>Negative:</u> No more apartment buildings; these ideas are more about how the building looks from the street and don't address how the building works for people who live in it; unclear how minimum open space is calculated; these rules could prevent implementation of solar energy collection; leave the details to the architects, builders, and developers.

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
9. Update Residential Zoning provisions for the C, CBD, and planned MMU zone					
a. Allow ground floor residential on side streets in the Commercial and CBD zones.	36	43	21	24	<u>Positive:</u> Space for live/work units would be a great addition; good use of downtown infrastructure; great idea if parking issues can be handled; ground floor would already likely be used for parking and pedestrian entry. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Only if off-street parking is provided; half-block of side streets closest to Commercial should not have ground floor commercial, so commercial uses wrap around the corner; use side streets between Commercial and O, Commercial and Q (not residential side of O and Q); except corner lots; businesses on ground floors is important for community spirit and walkability; second level and above units are more attractive the buyers; Amazon has made retail viability difficult. <u>Negative:</u> Don't want to push out retail; residential units should be above the noise and traffic; commercial zones are supposed to be commercial; leave the ground floor for businesses as the population grows.
b. Allow bonus heights in exchange for special uses or design features. • Affordable housing • Additional publicly accessible open space • Special streetscape design improvements • Integration of vertical mixed-use with ground floor commercial space • Other?	32	42	20	28	<u>Positive:</u> Additional open space is especially needed; affordable housing is a good idea; taller buildings is appropriate in urban areas; these features should be required across the board without height bonuses. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Unclear that vertical mixed-use is a public benefit; unclear where the affordable housing would be located; 65 feet on Commercial Avenue is fine; dedicated parking for residents is needed to keep vehicles off the street; instead of height bonus, consider density bonuses such as reduced setbacks or increased lot coverage; need to be much more specific on the proposals, hard to comment; only in CBD; water views need to be preserved; avoid canyon effect on streets; affordable housing should be overseen by a nonprofit, City should not be in business of rent control; sounds like too much of a gift to developers; do not impact views. <u>Negative:</u> 65 feet is too high; do not allow bonus heights; increased heights will destroy the city skyline; this deal would not provide community benefits; ground floor retail is not viable with Amazon competition; features would only benefit the developer, not the public.

ANACORTES DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS UPDATE – RESIDENTIAL WORKSHOP SURVEY

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
c. Allow flexibility for residential uses on the Central Fidalgo Bay waterfront property provided a mix of uses is integrated and special internal circulation, site, and building design standards are met.	43	28	28	18	<u>Positive:</u> Mixed-use or live-work spaces could revitalize this area; marine uses are good, but avoid boat storage and marketing; on the condition that the shoreline is reserved for public use; residential marina is needed; restaurants and shops with residential above would be good; tourism potential. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Only if waterfront access is preserved for the public; keep strong concept for commercial marine access; no regional scale big box stores; design standards needed for all types of buildings; commercial, convention center, and hotel uses would be better; needs a detailed proposal for this prime waterfront property; needs an affordable housing component (on site or in-lieu); it is time to move on from this failed urban renewal project. <u>Negative:</u> Land was set aside for industrial use; not 65 feet, maybe 4-stories; don't misuse this limited type of waterfront land; don't allow condo walls to block views between 22nd and 17th; keep it as is for marine uses; should be limited to water-dependent businesses.
10. Large Lot Subdivision Standards					
a. Allow variable lot sizes provided the overall density and design standards are met. b. Consider allowing modest density bonuses in exchange for public amenity features.	36	39	26	19	<u>Positive:</u> Allow mixed use; variable housing types for different family types and incomes would be nice; promote co-housing options for mixed density; especially needed in the R-I zone; be more specific on lot sizes and design standards; public-private cooperation on trails and green spaces is good. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Unclear if this is already allowed or required; bonus must have more specificity; affordable housing should be integrated among market rate units; avoid a net gain in density; variable lot size needs limits; unclear what defines a public amenity; trail or open space should be of value.

Concept/Option	Great Idea	Good Idea	Unsure/ Neutral	Bad Idea	Comment Themes (see Appendix for listing of complete comments)
<i>Large lot subdivision standards, cont.</i> a. Allow variable lot sizes provided the overall density and design standards are met. b. Consider allowing modest density bonuses in exchange for public amenity features.					<u>Negative:</u> Variable lot sizes can be manipulated by developers with rare public benefits; don't increase density; sounds like a PUD; Anacortes already has a code for this; open space that includes wetlands or forest land is a bad idea; builders will benefit from trails and open space, make it a requirement not an option; don't allow in R-1, as there is not much of it left; open space should be required, not negotiable; most homeowners don't like have public trails adjacent to their back yards; City already struggles to maintain existing parks.
II. Street Design Standards					
a. Provide for optional local street cross sections emphasizing modest street widths, planting strips, street trees, and sidewalks. b. Allow strategic flexibility for infill situations (auto courts, private lanes, and fee-in-lieu of improvements)	26	53	32	9	<u>Positive:</u> Like the idea of different standards; bike lanes and walkability should be encouraged; the city is in dire need to safe ways to walk around; keep the 30' limit in residential areas. <u>Unsure/Neutral:</u> Prioritize bike and pedestrian routes for construction and maintenance; bikes and pedestrians should be able to cut through blocked or unbuilt right of way; traffic circles on residential streets; important that standards are flexible for infill; unclear what auto-courts are; parking on one side is preferred with narrower streets; or with parking on both sides ensure there is room for two cars to pass; more planting strips and street trees; arterials need to remain viable for commercial use; minimize hard surfaces and use stormwater friendly designs; hard to visualize what these options mean; plan for guest parking and loading zones; builders shouldn't be able to buy their way out; maintain good visibility for safety and appearance. <u>Negative:</u> Fee-in-lieu improvements will not get built soon enough by the city; too much flexibility conflicts with existing street and sidewalk standards; needs to incorporate more focus on bike and pedestrian pathways; street should be wide enough to drive safely



WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS: APPENDIX A - WRITTEN RESPONSES

April 2016

Below is a listing of the complete comments received for each of the survey questions (from workshop and online versions). We've attempted to categorize each of the comments into generally "positive", Unsure/Neutral", and "Negative" categories for better legibility. The numbers listed below are for reference purposes only.

Question #1 (Paper Question #1)

The recently adopted Comprehensive Plan directed a number of zoning changes aimed at meeting community housing goals. (A link to a video recording of the 3/16/2017 open house presentation and a PDF of the Comprehensive Plan's proposed zoning changes was provided.) Please provide any specific comments/suggestions you have for the proposed changes to specific zones. If you like or dislike proposed changes, please elaborate on why they are a good or bad idea.

Positive

1. Good idea – as long as the projected population is sustainable for the carbon footprint for an island of this size.
2. R-3 change seems like a good idea.
3. I like the direction Anacortes is going. Keeping the priorities of environment, livability, and community is so important is apparent in the plan!
4. Zone N and Q, changing to residential from commercial is good.
5. Agree with increasing density close in – with improvements in local public transit, improved public open spaces, including protecting water access and views. Incentives and public support for integrating affordability housing. Dense tall forms blocking all water views from Oaks Avenue development shouldn't be allowed.
6. I agree with changing to R2 near San Juan Passage.
7. I am glad to see some options for single purpose residential in sections E and D on the map. I hope thought could be given to some percentage of that being designated low income. I am also in support of the smaller lot size proposal and the exploration of tiny houses or cottages in section B. I am in support of regional retail at section I. If multi-story development is built right on Commercial, I hope it has either green setbacks to make welcoming walking spaces, or some commercial space for small shops and cafes to make it more human in scale (which would make it mixed-use residential, I know).

8. Availability of smaller lot size and greater density will allow us to construct smaller affordable homes and still keep the much needed character of our town. 700 - 1100 sq ft can be very comfortable and much more affordable.
9. I like proposed changes. They integrate affordable housing, aesthetic design, and in-town increases in density very well. I am impressed!
10. Glad to see rezoning of Ship Harbor Residential area to R2 as more in keeping with the guidelines supporting the environmentally conscious development of San Juan Passage & Channel Landing
11. looks OK

Neutral

12. Uniformity, consistency, clarify, and specific with conformity to zone use is necessary. Eliminate variance and conditional use, averaging of lot sizes and PUDs. If not stated as a permitted use, use should be permitted by code.
13. Consider tree ordinance to avoid removal of trees from residential areas. Limited on-street parking to temporary visitors. Grandfather conditional use permits already in-place.
14. Old Town needs a transition zone from west edge of CBD to M Ave. Very different area, with lots of public uses in this area, then the rest of Old Town west of M Ave.
15. Commercial on both sides of O Avenue.
16. Better streetscapes
17. Look at implementing transition height allowances between R3/R4 and Commercial/CBD, so no structure towers above smaller residences.
18. Just an overall note. We live in Old Town and picked the area because it was unique to Anacortes (and to towns in general on the west coast) All the houses are different designs, shapes, colors and sizes. We are against the typical cookie cutter residential designed neighborhoods. We also prefer not to be strictly controlled by anything that would resemble CC&R's. here or in other areas of the city. Bigger is better and strict controls dont fit well with us. We are old New England Yankees. So I hope we are not headed in that direction here in Anacortes.
19. Link takes me to a blank page, so I can't comment.
20. Little or no R4 zoning of undeveloped property
21. All R1 in the city should be zoned R2

22. Light manufacturing along Anacopper road needs careful attention with airport use and wildlife impact between the ponds (south) and wooded areas (north).
23. I am wondering about the word "cottage housing" as there is a newer contemporary form being built. I also am not in favor of condos down in the Seafarer's area. Lots of good work and I thank you for all the care as this is tricky!
24. As an Anacortes citizen my main concern is the island environment. The Industrial area along the waterfront must remain as clean-industry and not developed otherwise. Developers need to protect sensitive areas, steep slopes, drainages and creeks, drainage properly designed and mature trees protected.
25. Look at areas C, D, and E and explore mixed use or increased density housing such as attached Townhomes on side streets to promote affordable living. Consider raising height restrictions for mixed use specifically to promote construction of affordable housing (not trying to add apartments to any of these areas). Consider adding a touristy waterfront area (something I hear from a lot of people who regularly visit Anacortes).

Negative

26. ADU is a bad idea. There is no difference between attached ADU and duplex. This permits all residential areas becoming duplex areas. Lower level commercial and upper level residential is excellent idea.
27. Please consider parking and vehicles. Some of the proposals will not have sufficient space for RVs, boats, etc. Nor will there be sufficient off street parking to support 3-4 vehicles per unit (and yes many people have this many vehicles: 2 cars, 1 motorcycle, and a jet ski/boat). There will have to be restrictions and enforced.
28. do not like the smaller lot sizes. R3 should not be reduced any smaller than 5500. All of R2 should stay at 7500 (not a special rule for Anacopper area. There should be no Industrial on Fidalgo Bay by Sharpe Corner. Height restrictions should stay at 50' except for right on Commercial. The Downtown area should go up to 12th Street. The Marine MU should not have 65' height. I like increased density and mixed use, work/live options especially near Commercial and R where there is access to the bus.
29. I would like more transparent wording, or detailed wording in some instances. For example what does in the "B" section, what does "allow for 3000 ft lots when consistent with underlying plats" really mean? I'm not keen on the raise to 65' height limit anywhere. Community space needs to be preserved. The meeting room at the library is beyond capacity frequently. Plans for a larger community center area should be part of any long range planning as we continue to grow.
30. Traffic on Oakes is getting difficult. Also, cutting every tree down in order to cram more house into what's currently zoned low density is very objectionable.

31. Any zoning changes west of D Avenue between 12th and 32nd should not be allowed. This entire area is near wetlands, which are fragile, and drainage should not be disturbed.
32. I disagree strongly with changing R2 lot size minimums from 7500 sq ft to 6000 sq ft. This change dramatically changes the traditional feel to the average Anacortes neighborhood. The larger lot offers more buffer between neighbors, creating more open space for greenery and trees. It provides a more natural setting, which Anacortes is known for. We are not a high density community. Anacortes is defined by its wonderful charm of "getting away from the city". Keep the R2 regulations consistent. 7500 sq ft lots has proved itself to provide a great mix of residential and natural space.
33. Do not like the idea of reducing the residential lot sizes in Anacortes
34. Day in and day out this city is pushing green energy. Presumably to combat global warming. Day in and day out this city cuts down more and more and more and more and more and more trees. Stop cutting down the trees. The two don't jive. As it is I need to disclose I.E. due to avigation easement, I.I. due to incompatible land uses surrounding the airport (see ordinance no. 2411 and Aviation section of letter from DOT dated March 27, 1997 - my neighborhood was built AFTER that ordinance took effect), and 2.A.4 due to fiber optic water. And before you go telling me I don't have to, if we aren't supposed to follow the rules why do you all keep making so many?
35. I don't agree with reducing lot size in the annacopper area. A. Zone r-2
36. Increasing density is appropriate in the areas that are annotated as such. However, increasing height limits is not good for our city. This would negatively impact many of our skylines and aesthetic factors that are an extremely important draw to the city. The return on investment for height increases would be negative.
37. Please do not allow the idea of cottage style housing to be implemented in R-1 zoning. It appears that this is an idea that is happening, and it looks like somebody wants it to be applied at the south side of the city. It is a bad argument to propose that two 1200 sq ft homes are less impacting than one large home. It actually makes me frustrated that it is being proposed at all. It is a fact that the densities in this area were put into place to provide a buffer to protect our forest lands and to provide for movement of wildlife. The cottage housing makes some sense in more dense areas, but it only serves the desires of developers and a small handful of property owners in the R-1 areas. Two households of people are far more than impacting than one...at least twice as impacting. It doesn't matter if their bedrooms and kitchens are smaller. They have cars, dogs, stereos, etc. Please don't pursue this option!
38. I dislike the proposal to include cottage style housing into the R-1 designation. It makes no sense to argue that two households are less impactful than one, even if the one house is larger. Two houses means twice as much traffic, twice as many pets, twice as much noise, twice as much light pollution, etc. Although it is trendy to advocate for cottages and tiny houses, it is ridiculous to want to sneak cottage housing into this. This

is especially true on the south side of the city limits where the zoning was specifically made in part to provide a buffer for our forestlands and for animal movements. Please do not make these changes simply to benefit developers, or a handful of landowners who want to maximize profits on land they own, but are not planning to live on.

39. An increase in building height canyons our main streets, hiding the scenery that permanent residents and visitors long to see. So who's paying the price? Let's also address the ability of our fire department to handle a fire at 65 feet. Isn't the mandate supposed to be to limit the amount of run-off into the sound? Reducing lot sizes with along with the increased lot coverage as is the standard operating procedure for builders going property line to property line will eventually begin to tax the current drainage system as well as do more damage to the ecosystem. Smaller lots should equal smaller homes with more permeable land. At some point the treatment plant will not be able to handle the amount of waste produced by high density. How much will that cost?
40. I think that there is a big problem with the proposed changes to the R1 density. It seems like the City is trying to insert a "sleeper" into the zoning by increasing the density from 2 units per acre to 4 units per acre with the cottage housing idea. The argument is that two 1200 foot units will have the same impact as one large home, but that immediately flags my "BS detector". It is a terrible argument that makes very little sense no matter how you slice it. On the south side of the city the 2 dwellings per acre zoning was specifically designed to buffer our forest lands from high density development in order to protect habitat and to provide for local wildlife movement. Changing it to cottage housing style development may be a trendy idea, but it runs in direct conflict with what we need to maintain the character of our city. I strongly urge that the City resist the temptation to appease a few landowners who are simply trying to maximize their profits through high density development. The cottage housing idea looks good "on paper", but the long term effects will be undesirable.
41. Cottage housing is inappropriate in the R1 zone as this low density zone was set up to provide a buffer for the adjacent forest lands habitat and foster wildlife movement. Concentrated cottage development is inconsistent with this objective
42. Housing density increases are overpopulating the city. The BIG City density is not what Anacortes residents are desiring in our lives. We moved here to enjoy a lifetime of spaciousness, not getting closed in from our neighbors. More density in housing thereby creates heavier traffic and the accident dangers associated with impatient, frustrated, aggressive drivers.
43. The Guemes channel is one of few natural deep-water access areas that can be used for shipping. It is a mistake to change LM or CM to transitional or residential. If a buffer is needed, as has been proposed in Y, make it in the existing residential zone and keep what little LM and CM we have left for future industry growth.
44. What happened to making section "Y" a part of Old Town? It seemed to be approved, but has disappeared and is now a "transitional zone". Would like to see the city follow through on approved decisions.

45. Well, I see you dropped the minimum R-3 lot size to 4500sf. Really dumb idea but then you promised uncle county to accept some part of the residential growth over the next 10 years. So, remember my unanswered question: What are you going to do next time to accommodate more? I won't be here but you might be.
46. I do not like the change in CM by the airport to R-2 why would we put the Port in this position? Mistake! Also A changing the size of lots by 1500SF smaller to accommodate even more population around the airport. Seems wrong very wrong!
47. I dislike the proposed changes to the zoning on the south end of the city. Current residents purchased homes there on the assumption of limited density due to the current zoning. South of 41st Street the proposed changes appear to be benefiting a handful of property owners who want to maximize development. However, each of these property owners purchased that property knowing the zoning of the time and it seems unreasonable to force all the current residents to deal with increased traffic, water runoff, noise, and light, simply to enrich landowners who will not be living there. All residents adjacent to the proposed changes should be given a voice in the process. I don't believe that this has been a priority of the City because the "stakeholder interviews" have already happened and few (if any) residents were invited to participate. It seems that they should be thought of as having a major stake in this decision.
48. Ship Harbor should definitely be changed to R2. What are the proposed options for additional trailhead parking?

Question #2 (Paper Question #2)

We are considering adding maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards to maintain neighborhood compatibility. This would limit the size of homes relative to the size of their lots. What do you think of this idea?)

Positive

1. 0.5 would be good. Like that this supports affordability.
2. In R-1 and R-2 zones, 0.5 to 0.7 and min allowed small slots. In R-3, 0.7 or none – want density
3. I like it because the biggest problem is tearing old houses down and building giant houses next to older smaller
4. We are becoming a retirement community thus there is not the need for the exceeding large floor plans.
5. Limiting FARs great idea however, I think the FAR limit needs to NOT go any higher than the existing .31 FAR
6. This helps provide a consistency to Anacortes neighborhoods. Good planning is based on consistency.
7. I feel it is important that new houses be compatible in scale, and not completely overshadow neighbors. Nothing worse than someone tearing down a small house and completely filling the lot with a troll.
8. It would be good for long term health to minimize home size for ecological reasons and so that the housing supply is more in tune for people with less money rather than always for the maximum profit for developers.
9. I would like to see the size of homes limited, design is a key element along with energy efficiency.
10. This seems like a good way to encourage customized floorplans, without encouraging crowding.

Neutral

11. Not sure how this is better than hard size/height limits.
12. It depends on existing homes. If most of homes are 1 story a 2 story might be out of character. If most of homes are 2 story, it would fit in.
13. 0.5 should be the standard not including daylight basement

14. Not sure I fully understand how this works
15. Unsure how this will work with smaller lot sizes. Out to exclude daylight basements
16. Need to provide some flexibility for existing homes to do moderate projects without tripping into a big FAR outrage (i.e. existing big house doing a remodel but not getting any bigger – does that trigger the limit on the whole property)
17. What about lot minimums?
18. Such a standard might not make sense if uniformly applied to all areas, to new construction and to existing houses. Some grandfathering would seem to be necessary. Also, some areas may be more suitable for more dense development on smaller lots, even if that is not multi-family development. I like the idea of standards, but the standards may have to be different in different neighborhoods.
19. Though should be controlled by setbacks and height restrictions.
20. As long as they are realistic - meaning those buying or developing in areas with tiny homes on large lots were not limited forever to 900 to 1200 square foot homes.
21. Depends on the zoning of the neighborhood. We would consider it a bad idea on already small lots (R-3&4 areas) However on larger zoned lots may be okay. But not more than .45-.50
22. If FAR is to be used, all above ground areas including garages, covered decks, and detached buildings such as ADU's etc should be used in the calculation. As presented, the FAR ratios for R1 are meaningless, they could result in a 7500 sq ft house. FAR ratios would need to be used in concert with defined setback standards.
23. Keep new or remodeled housing within the scale of the neighborhood
24. The maximum square footage covered in any lot size should less than 0.3.
25. For new construction only. Existing homes should not be penalized when consider additions/remodels
26. If you adopt any FAR standards, they should be based on the volume of the home under roof so that multi-level homes don't gain a space advantage while inflicting light penetration and loss of "openness" on neighboring buildings.
27. We have enough mega-houses. The feel of Old Town has bee wrecked by the new buildings.
28. Need tiny houses in Anacortes
29. This does not mean that neighborhoods cannot be designated to evolve over time to accommodate larger homes or denser housing,

30. This gets a bit complicated because the surrounding homes and neighborhood need to be taken into account, and views should be considered sacred and not blocked.

Negative

31. Retraining absorption surface is critical for environment. What matters is footprint. Keep to .35 or less.
32. 0.70 FAR in R-3 zone is too much. No more than 0.50 FAR.
33. Don't want street after street of (boring) one-story houses
34. Why not consider footprint (lot coverage) or is floor area a better indicator of "mass"? Does DADU count in addition to "main house"? Options for 3,000sf lots in R-4?
35. R-1 and R2 should be 0.3. R-3 should be 0.4
36. We already have something like this (different term used?). Keep it the same, footprint limited to 35-40% of property.
37. The graphic is misleading, as most new lots in town are 7500 sqft or less. Not that many 9,000 sqft lots in Anacortes. Would garages and basements be counted in the FAR. Due to sloped lots in community many homes have lower level basements could really throw off your ratio, as could your garage, particularly a 3 car. Current lot coverage is problematic for single level homes, but works well otherwise.
38. I cannot think of a single instance of an appropriate to neighborhood looking development with exceedingly large FAR. 32nd street comes to mind. Not heard one good thing from long time residents about that development.
39. Market forces typically determine the size of homes that are appropriate for a neighborhood. Any artificial manipulation can cause a neighborhood to become undesirable, and die a gruesome death.
40. This not not consider odd lot size or adjacent green space, that can not be built on, to be added to total area to aid in house size.
41. Adding more restrictions reduces options. Options are necessary.
42. If the city is attempting to meet LID standards and still encourage growth, limiting the size based on Floor Area Ratio is a very bad idea. Plus, it limits what can be built and therefore limits who would be willing to move to the city and perhaps increase the business base. The ratio should be considered solely on footprint of the building. If a home is built on a hillside in Anacortes, this would limit the possibility of having a daylight basement as well. In most cases, the new home would be put in a neighborhood and enhance it instead of detract from it's character. There are few cases where

someone will overbuild in a neighborhood because the ROI is not there. This is not needed in any way and should only be determined by footprint versus the size of the lot for LID standards if the city is leaning that direction.

43. R-1 & R-2 should remain as .33-.4 FAR. R-3 zone at .4-.5 makes sense. The idea of .55-.7 is too much FAR for this community. Need green space!
44. Depends on how it is worded. Devil is in the details. How does FAR relate to lot coverage and bulk? Current zoning allows 3,150 sf lot coverage for 9000 sf lot in R2 or 4,500 in R3 so both of these examples would be much less usable floor area than a 2-story house under current zoning. I understand the goal of encouraging smaller homes, but REQUIRING small homes may be counter-productive if it forces wealthy folks who want large homes to build outside the city, thus taking their tax base with them. Also, allowing some larger homes that incorporate ADU's could actually increase the number of small units. Why is it intrinsically bad to build a large home? If the issue is neighborhood scale, then the rules should be neighborhood-specific. As seen in Old Town, a mixture of sizes can be interesting and attractive. If the issue is overwhelming a small neighboring home, increasing side setbacks as the house gets larger would offer "breathing room" to mitigate the scale.
45. Limits value of homes and lots. There are no "pure" neighborhoods in Anacortes, except when controlled by HOA's, so all you're doing is limiting people's ability to sell their homes in the future.

Question #3 (Paper Question #3a)

We are considering changing the way building height is measured in residential zones. Currently height is measured from the top of buildings, and the concept would measure height at the mid-point of sloped roofs and reduce the maximum height by 5 feet. This would discourage flat roofs for new single family homes and increase usable floor area for homes with sloped roofs. What do you think of this idea?

Positive

1. Allows for greater attractiveness and variability
2. This could work as long as there are daylight limits as proposed in concept 4. Also since overall height is a function of roof pitch, there should be an overall height limit. Creative use of dormers could lead to a small fourth story.
3. Very good idea, would need some limitation and clear guidelines. Maintain a maximum height to prevent someone from exploiting loop holes (like a church-like tower in the middle of an expansive flattish roof).
4. I agree that flat roofs should be discouraged and sloped roofs encouraged. The instance where this raising the overall roof height would not work is when views from surrounding homes or areas are at stake. Since this is not always an issue, perhaps adopting this policy with a caveat that if a view will be impacted that the top of the roof not be allowed to increase.

Neutral

5. Maybe add an overall height
6. Height is our friend, allows more flexibility more flexibility and density, use of land
7. Seems good but how does this fit with desire for density? This change doesn't give us much gain.
8. 3-story, flat roofed "big box" houses show more "mass" than 3-story pitched roof. Also "local character" issue.
9. Lower 10 feet and use mid-point.
10. Use midpoint but don't raise heights
11. AS long as the rules were clear and not modified or mitigated.
12. Water views are prized thus the height should take into account of blocking existing view, even if there are not convents for the area.

13. Does the midpoint include the eave overhang? It should.
14. I'm not sure what the difference is. Gabled roof homes can be ugly, just like flat roofs.
15. let's keep our roof heights as low as possible and yet with a good pitch.
16. While this looks like a great idea on paper, we are not sure this will actually meet the desired outcome of discouraging flat roofs. A flat roof will enable a person to have more usable space regardless of the height of the building. We do agree that measuring at the midpoint of the sloped roof would be optimal, it still isn't going to change what is allowed except that it would overall increase the height allowance for new construction in the city utilizing sloped roofs.
17. This allows the peak to be a little higher than with a "box" but requiring the slope forces the eaves to be lower, which mitigates scale and allows views in some cases. Minimum 6/12 slope should be required to use this option, otherwise those benefits are lost. Could consider measuring to the 35' peak if the roof is flat or less than 6/12, and measuring to the mid-point if steeper.
18. Might be better to impose a requirement for larger side yard setbacks to compensate for daylight effects. We took a step toward this years ago when I proposed letting setbacks be whatever the builder wanted to do as long as a minimum of 5 ft on one side and a total minimum of 15 ft was met. We did this in the hope that it would create a bit more space between structures on average.

Negative

19. Permits even higher houses. Make it 25 feet.
20. Our CCRs limit roof height to 30 feet. Please allow CCRs to be the limiting factor – not zoning or code
21. I have not seen our building heights be a big issue in town. Not a bunch of new homes coming in with flat roofs. Keep it as is.
22. While I understand that flat roofs create certain problems, modern residential architecture makes extensive use of flat, or almost flat roofs. I am not in favor of penalizing them.
23. It seems cleaner to have an absolute building height and not worry about the shape of the roof per se or where it is measured from -- A house with a flat roof is not inherently less worry than a house with a pitched roof. There are lovely modern homes with flat or curved roofs.
24. keep the 35 feet limit

25. This concept could be fraught with other variables beside overall height. Where do you measure heights from. Contractors tend to be very creative when prepping a lot, placing the house. Your conceptual drawing are a little confusing. Figure 3 shows a 30' height limit, but you still have a pitched roof above that's higher than the old 35' limit? You have also changed the building dynamics of the house by lowering the 2nd floor to incorporate more space. The house now uses a "Balloon" framing technique that requires extra engineering and materials adding to the cost of the house. Overall a little confusing. Overall will probably generate a lot of unique ways to still build as high as possible. So needs to be either explained or examined further.
26. Many would lose valuable views, that they paid money for. This would change the rules and hurt those who have invested in Anacortes
27. overall height should be more limited than 30 feet There are too many houses that are too tall and ugly
28. This does not prevent the building of 3-story, flat roofed houses
29. I've only seen people break this rule and then get their construction approved after the fact
30. too high, blocks views
31. Looks like building orientation relative to views, might mean this actually results in more potential view blockage.
32. What is wrong with flat roofs? Is this somebody's personal crusade for their aesthetic preferences?
33. Height is height, and no amount of messing with it is going to change the realities. There is nothing wrong with flat-roofed structures, if they are designed to be aesthetically appealing.
34. Nope. Houses should be smaller. Get creative with attic space don't build taller houses with wasted space.
35. Height is a concern for view issues and the impact on neighbors. That is a maximum height concern. Keep measuring what is important- maximum height.
36. Get out of the home design business. Leave it to builders and owners to set their own designs.
37. With flat top roofs you can have rooftop patios which is an appealing concept
38. I believe that 35' height is too much anywhere residential. We have not taken care to protect views especially in old town. The tallest houses along the waterfront block everyone else's view. I feel there are too many ways for the developers to adjust the restrictions to favor their investment.

39. Most complaints would be about height blocking view. Flat roof ridiculous in the climate.
40. I have a PNW contemporary home and would have been discouraged if the had city limited me on the slope of my roof. Height, absolutely, roof line based on architectural design would have been frustrating.

Question #4 (Paper Question #3c)

Concept: Retain existing side yard setbacks, but add a daylight plane standard that limits the massing of upper floors along side yard edges. This would require the 2nd and 3rd floors of homes to be pushed back from the property edge, reducing shadows and privacy impacts on neighboring yards. What do you think of this idea?

Positive

1. I like the idea but wonder if this fits everywhere. Probably a good idea.
2. I like this idea, it preserves some separation and light in neighborhoods where home size increases and lot size could decrease.
3. Very beneficial. Highly approve.
4. We experienced a neighbor building 2+ stories 4 feet from the property line and completely shadowing all of our Western sunlight from noon on. This is a Great Idea!
5. I would support to allow more sunlight to reach the adjacent property, but the privacy issue is too subject to personal interpretation
6. There's a national-wide law in the UK regarding what they call "ancient light laws". The idea being that you have the right to the light your property would have gotten without any human build up. It gets pretty complex with people having to pay for light "stolen" from the neighbor, this seems like a much easier way of trying to accomplish the same thing.
7. Overall this concept is strong. I think a bit of individual creativity should be instilled into this process also, such as not allowing windows to line up with neighboring properties. No one should have windows of a house next door lined up to look right into their windows.

Neutral

8. Like the concept but looks complicated
9. Only on sides, assuming alley in back
10. I think the setback should be (side) be 7 or 8 feet, with daylight plane standards
11. Larger side yard setbacks to allow for building maintenance
12. Let's build smaller homes under 40 feet high – take in consideration what's in the neighborhood

13. Water front view should be a driver on the home design to maintain as much as possible view for neighbors.
14. As stated this limits the bulk of the upper stories
15. Idea would be better if the daylight slope and structure took into account passive solar techniques at the same time.
16. Wish this had happened before my vegetable garden and fruit trees got blocked from the sun. I think setbacks should be increased.
17. Privacy is important! Not sure how this concept would work.
18. See comments on previous question.
19. It would be really nice to prevent giant box houses being built in our town.
20. This would seem to negate at least some of what you are trying to accomplish with the previous issue of changing the building height measurement. It seems this change would reduce usable floorspace on the upper floors.

Negative

21. starts to get pretty restrictive on how much usable area you can have on a second floor and forces limited use space on second floor
22. Why? What is the genesis of this issue?
23. Radically reduces the ADU floor area in the example.
24. Again depends on the lot size and currant setbacks. It does limit the size and scope of the upper floors.
25. Overly complex; marginal benefit.
26. It is never a good idea to let the first people in a neighborhood to do what they want, and then change the rules for all who come after. That is just plain selfish on the part of those with existing homes.
27. Get out of this meddling.
28. Again - more restrictions. We have set backs and height restrictions. You live in town, expect to be able to see, hear ,feel your neighbors.
29. The information we got from the video is this is intended for ADUs. If this is the case, an ADU over a garage is already limited in size. It would make more sense to have it that on the side with the 5' setback, the upper wall is considered a firewall and does not

allow for windows overlooking the neighboring property. This way the owner can use the complete space above the garage and will result in more acceptable in-fill opportunities. While we understand the thought behind this, it again reduces the ability for the property owner to utilize their lot. I know in some cities, one side has a small setback while the other side has a much larger setback like 5 feet on one side and 12 to 15 on the other side. Before any structure is built on a lot, the setbacks need to be looked for both it and the neighboring lots to be sure there is ample room on one side for emergency response between the structures.

30. Keep the minimum of 5' setback. Do not change to anything less unless structure already exist and is being replaced .
31. This would unreasonably restrict ability to use 2nd story space, which is more economical to build and provides more living space for a given lot coverage. Privacy impacts are a simple fact of life in urban neighborhoods. If both houses are single story or both have a 2nd story, folks can look into windows on the same level, so I fail to see how this would provide privacy. Setting back the upper story might allow more sunlight into yards or not, depending on the orientation of the structure vs the sun (and sun angles vary greatly with time of day and time of year). Also, the few remaining lots vary in size, shape, and slope, so this concept would benefit a limited number of them and unduly restrict options for others.
32. This is what set backs and building heights should do. One additional layer of complication and regulation that will increase design and construction costs, increase building department review requirements (asking more of city staff), and potentially decrease property values. If you live in the city, you should expect to have neighbors.

Question #5 (Paper Question #3b)

Concept: Allow porches and covered entries to project up to 6 feet into the front yard setback. A front yard setback is the required spacing between the house and front property line. What do you think of this idea?

Positive

1. Allow but don't require
2. Allow this – no impact
3. Enlarge getting porches to street good
4. great idea. All for getting porches close to street, creates a much better connection to the street level activity. look around old town. many of the porches there are closer than 20 feet and it feels much better.
5. I think in the rainy climate, this could help to give a dry entry, while still preserving a feeling of open space between the sidewalk and the structure.
6. An entrance way can be a big selling point to a house. It would help getting rid of front facing garages, that would be good.
7. Anything that would bring people closer to their neighbors is good plan.
8. Probably OK. Certainly nice to have covered porches, but also need to limit the width of the projection.
9. This is needed in many neighborhoods with smaller lots sizes, like most of the in-town areas of Anacortes
10. This will allow for better curb appeal to many homes without front porches.
11. This is a great idea because it allows for the entire buildable portion of the lot to be used for living space. Since it is in the front of the house and there will more than likely be a road in front, we wonder if possibly 8 feet would be better. That would allow for sitting on the porch and more of a neighborhood feel for the development
12. Porches okay.

Neutral

13. Depends on front setback, but front yards are nonsense because they're unused space
14. If mixing existing and new construction may have uneven appearance

15. Allow porches. Set garage face behind front of house.
16. I like setback garage
17. Sure, why not?
18. I can see where a covered porch would be ok but then without policing I can see them getting enclosed for more space in the home.
19. I like the free space that setbacks allow.
20. As long as it does not allow a second floor to extend over the porch
21. Should include back yard as well
22. What is the difference between a porch and a covered entry? Suggest some width limit, such as 15 ft. or half the total width of the front wall of the house. Otherwise, you might as well just reduce the setback to 15 ft.
23. A canopy of reasonable height over the front entry is okay but if you allow a covered porch with no size restriction, every home built will soon have one the full width of the front of the house and others will remodel to add one. Keep the width within reason and it will be a good idea. It does rain here.
24. Increases character of neighborhood, promotes community interaction through outdoor covered spaces.
25. I think that there ought to be a proper distance maintained between the house occupants and the folks on the sidewalks and/or streets.
26. Again, how close would this be to the street? More information is needed on this one.

Negative

27. Loss of open area for rain absorption
28. Only leaves 4 feet if plan is predicated on minimal front setback!
29. Also could take away on site parking
30. Bigger is not always better
31. Set backs are there to keep the space open

32. Without further restriction, this just becomes a way to move a house closer to the street. A full width "sun porch" or "enclosed entry room" could become a "bonus feature" that is used to reduce the distance from the house to the street.
33. Concern about a sort of creep in footprint. There is the issue of storm water runoff. More roof=more runoff.

Question #6 (Paper Question #4)

We are considering adding the following package of design standards for small lots and duplexes: Provide a covered entry facing the street; Minimize the impact of garages on the street; Provide a minimum amount of usable open space; Limit the width of driveways along the street; Provide a minimum amount of windows on exterior walls facing the street. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. All good ideas to keep these looking like homes, not boxes. Preserves some yard area.
2. except for the windows idea. solar gain energy conservation trumps privacy.
3. Seems to bring more positive features to a high density scenario
4. Yep!
5. I would like to see homes and duplexes encouraged to be friendly and open to the neighborhood, rather than 'little fortresses'.
6. We have too few small home, duplex, PUD/condo type housing options for those of modest incomes, small families, and retirees. Where appropriate, these kinds of projects, including duplexes, need to be encouraged not discouraged.
7. This would enhance the neighborhood and be more attractive plus might provide an additional parking space that is much needed in today's society depending on how far from the front of the house the garage starts.
8. Design elements that would carry across areas and instill some uniformity would be beneficial.

Neutral

9. Some flexibility for different situations would be good
10. I like code making design standards as opposed to a subjective "standard"
11. For minimum windows, base on square feet not number of windows, front only
12. Again, let's not having have a boring single look
13. No "gingerbread" requirement!
14. Good thoughts, but this may create an infill challenge as each site is very unique. Would hate to create design standards that are so tight they render some lots unbuildable. Would want a design review option as an alternative.

15. Providing a minimum amount of usable open space is a good idea. Forcing owners to all have a covered entry and a certain amount of windows facing the street is an awful idea. Developers will find a way to make these required design elements look terrible and it creates unnecessary restrictions on building design. Do tiny home and SDU have to have these covered porches? Multiple lots should be able to share open space (like the development on 26th Circle, across from Island View).
16. These are all ideas that need to be weighed on each individual project. This is not a one-size-fits-all issue, and should not be treated as such. The designer or Architect should make these decisions, based on the needs of the building, it's owners, and the general aesthetics of the neighborhood.
17. I favor alley access maintaining a safe, no driveway, street and walking area. So I favor minimal impact of garages but that doesn't cover the issue for me.
18. Garage access should be from the back or alley as much as possible. Architects may adopt these ideas. Duplexes out of old town and remain under .5 FAR and fit neighborhood style. Example provided is of poor design.
19. Some good, some bad
20. Having alleyways in new developments would allow homes to park off the street.
21. It sounds like these all fall into categories that could all be classified as safety/security and basic appearance. As long as you don't make the list too long or strict so as to make it "Disneyesque" in nature.

Negative

22. Many lots do not have alleys – where do cars go? Not on street – again – where do they park? I garage houses on 22nd and N will add to traffic problem if they have 2 cars. Build smaller homes to account for parking on site.
23. too much building on such a small space, impact parking and starts looking like a mobile park!!!
24. Don't want anymore duplexes in Anacortes
25. I am concerned this would limit the efficiency of high density, cottage- style developments. Porches seem like a waste of space. Retirees might not want large lots.
26. What is the point of reducing windows facing the street. This idea would, as shown in the drawing above, push the windows onto the side of the residence where they would face the adjoining house across a side setback which is much smaller than the front setback. This would decrease privacy within a neighborhood just to "improve" the look from the street. Additionally, given that much of Anacortes is laid out on an E/W grid,

reducing the windows facing the street reduces the ability of homes on the north side of the street to utilize passive solar tech. The bottom line though is a house exists in a neighborhood which consists of the surrounding houses. It is much more important to create "liveability" between neighbors than some "ideal" street view.

27. OVER-regulating! Should be left to the owners.
28. Allows no architectural flexibility - all houses on small lots would have to look like the example. Not feasible for infill.
29. increases traffic, makes neighborhood too dense
30. You should be providing a maximum amount of usable open space. It is proven that open space is critical to a person's well-being. With a limited width of a driveway where are the extra cars gonna park since lots of family have more than two cars and at least one of them is large.
31. Concern is the removal of existing structures and replacement with inappropriate higher density.
32. Again get out of detailed design.
33. Details are important. HOW will you minimize impact of garage? Should require access from alleys and side streets where they exist. Usable open space should be accessed from main living areas (not very helpful if the only way to get to it is through a closet). Disagree with covered entry facing street. Agree that the route to the entry should be visible from the street, but sometimes a side entry is better for a particular floor plan or necessitated by shape or slope of the lot. Even a rear entry works sometimes (many houses in Skyline have driveway going up behind the house so that the garage and entry can be on the main (upper) view level. A porch facing the street on the lower level would be useless and confusing, so it would be silly to require one. As long as visitors can easily see how to find the entry, many configurations can work. Even if front porches are a dominant pattern in a neighborhood, that doesn't mean that ALL houses should be required to have one. Some variety should be allowed.
34. You need a category called "stupid ideas". What on earth is wrong with a front-facing garage? A footprint is a footprint and the only way to minimize one is by making the structure creating it, smaller. Since when did having a driveway which connects to a street become a bad idea? Most people like windows. Your goofy duplex design seems to eliminate them completely on one side of each duplex unit.
35. Do not like reducing the open space. Is window facing street important???
36. Vague direction which unjustly and inappropriately controls construction. Potentially butchers property values. Imagine a small lot in which the street side faces the view by the Guemes Channel- they need to limit windows on their view side?? Keep standards

fair, don't penalize people who want a smaller lot to maintain or can't afford a larger property.

Question #7 (Paper Question #5a)

We are considering retaining these existing standards for ADUs: Allow in all residential zones; Retain 900 square foot size limit; Retain owner occupancy of home or ADU; Allow ADUs to be attached/detached. What do you think of retaining these standards?

Positive

1. I think these are all good ideas, although I think 700 as a minimum would be better for smaller lots and still large enough for a decent sized unit.
2. I would remove the owner occupancy requirement. Everything else is fine.
3. ADUs are a wonderful way to allow older residents to stay in their homes, while helping with expenses, or providing a place for a care-giver to live. They also help society in general by promoting diversity.
4. Do not allow ADUs to be attached; otherwise OK
5. This not only allows for either a family member or care provider a space of their own but also gives the option of the elderly to stay in a familiar environment. The elders in our communities are experiencing many new obstacles in life. Having the ability to stay in ones home is priceless. ADU living is a wonderful option for our lack of affordable housing or transitional dwelling.
6. Keep doing what you are. Normally 900 square feet is plenty large when a family wants to have a member live in an ADU.
7. Great way to promote affordable housing. Better to keep it legal than have people fly under the radar

Neutral

8. Make sure CCRs can't be overridden.
9. R4? Attach to an apartment building?
10. Owner occupancy requirement maybe makes sense in zones in which higher density not otherwise allowed – doesn't make sense in areas zoned for higher density
11. As long as they did not encourage the proliferation of Air B and B's.
12. Size of the lot and size of the addition should be the factors to determine suitability verse open to all zones.

13. The current standards do not prevent inappropriate ADU's from being dropped into a neighborhood (i.e. manufactured housing box that does not look like any house in the neighborhood. ADU's are a good idea IF they maintain neighborhood character.
14. Have ADU's thus far proven to be a significant source of low income housing?
15. If 900sf is living area, that actually seems overly large... something the size of a typical single bedroom apartment might be a better size limit - perhaps 750sf. And, for example, an old fashion carriage house built over a three car garage might not even be 500sf.
16. Is there a plan to add language for multiple tiny homes on a property?
17. Allow in residential zones but limit it to 450 square feet. Stricter rules if it's a rental re: fire and access codes.
18. Possibly restricting these locations so not available in all areas and limited if opposed by neighbors.
19. The 900 SF size limit should be increased to a 1,150 SF
20. ADU at 900 square feet seems to large unless it is on a lot larger than 6000 square feet.
21. Your examples should have included basement or other space integrated into the bulk of the house, not looking like a tacked-on addition. I have mixed feelings about owner occupancy. I understand the concern about absentee owners, but most landlords are responsible. There is no restriction on renting out a single family home or a duplex, so why is this different? An ADU is basically just a small duplex unit. If I build an ADU and then sell the house, and the next owner chooses to flaunt the law, does the city really want to get involved in enforcement? What if the owner is a snowbird and wants to rent the second unit while they're in Arizona? Or if Navy person owns it and is deployed but plans to return here to retire - they can't rent both units while they're gone? Does the ownership requirement complicate bank financing? I think that the ownership requirement should go away. There are only a few ADU's here and there around town. Renting both units in a few of them will add to the available rental market while having minimal impact overall, and reducing City involvement
22. Should allow non owner occupancy.
23. In the R-3 zoning for example, a 6,000sf lot has 6,000 minimum. Setbacks consume 2800sf of that leaving 3200 sf for the main and accessory structure. Specifying a maximum size for the ADU should be established based on a total percent land coverage within setbacks by both structures. And, what about lots like mine which is 21,000 sf with a 2300sf home and a 1500sf detached garage? Why should I be restricted to a single 900sf ADU?
24. Not sure why an owner has to live on the site.

25. How would this affect areas that don't currently allow these as per HOA guidelines?
What is the minimum lot size required?

Negative

26. Turns all residential areas to duplex areas. Terrible idea.
27. Must have off street parking for ADU for at least one car, if not two.
28. Allowing in all residential areas is not acceptable. There needs to be a minimum lot size to carry an ADU, such as 9000 sq ft
29. If it means that I would have to tear down my ADU if I moved but wanted to rent out my former home, then I think that part of the existing standards are bad.

Question #8 (Paper Question #5b,c,d)

8. We are considering adding the following package of design standards for ADUs: Add flexibility to the height limit (currently 16 feet) to allow them to be built above a detached garage - standards would be provided to protect neighbors' privacy; Allow available on-street parking in front of home to count as the extra parking space needed for an ADU; Add standards to maintain some usable open space in the rear yard. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Parking allowance – yes – important for enhancing density close in!
2. Add minimum extra height to allow living over garage. Do not count on street parking.
3. Everything but the on street parking sounds ok.

Neutral

4. Needs additional design standards. Location of front street? Visible from the street? Prevent AirBNB?
5. If CCRs prohibit ADUs or can't comply with increase parking requirements, then ADUs should not be permitted. Our CCRs don't permit on-street parking. Please respect CCRs.
6. Increase height, but mandate sloped roof with dormers.
7. On-street parking if the main house uses garage or driveway, so there aren't 4 cars on the street
8. Don't require additional parking space at all
9. No required additional parking for ADU
10. Rear yard usable open space is possibly good idea but unnecessary
11. Foundations required? Allow tiny homes on wheels with utility hook-ups
12. ADU vs. duplex? Owner snowbird? Require pitched roof design?
13. How do you determine who can count street parking as their allocation or how many spots? This is a problem for all residential areas, especially cul de sacs.
14. Put square footage to 1200 square feet. Again are streets becoming hazardous with on street parking, i.e. other wise 1st and View, 22nd, 23rd of D – by the schools – the residential neighborhoods all around town

15. Especially if the height is already there.
16. What about
17. The second and third ideas are very site specific, and may be difficult to regulate.
18. I would think that 20 feet height should suffice.
19. Still need to consider what we said in the question regarding height of buildings and the 45 degree setback. If that wall is not allowed windows, it would solve the problem for everyone and would allow the owner to utilize more space above a garage. Windows on the front and back are normal in some areas and no windows between homes and neighbors are also normal.
20. Yes to unit over garage, but it will be impossible to make rules that "protect neighbor's privacy" because every situation is different. Except that some are on the alley, this isn't any different than a 2-story house. Yes to not requiring extra on-site space if parking is available on the street - but how about areas that don't have any on-street parking? Standards for usable open space should not specify "rear" yard, because some ADU's are located on other sides of the house or even in an attic. Could say that tenant should have access to some open space, but why couldn't it be shared with the main unit (i.e. common open space) or on an upper deck? Apartment buildings often don't have private open space for each unit, and it seems to work for many folks. Maybe not everyone wants or needs their own open space to maintain. Perhaps the code could encourage, but not require, open space for the ADU.

Negative

21. Turns all residential areas to duplex areas. Terrible idea.
22. Must have off street parking for at least one car for ADU.
23. I think this needs to be more specific, again height may block neighbors views, on street parking might create congestion.
24. I don't think on street parking should count. What about neighbors views?
25. Again, the lot size minimum would need to be 9000 sq ft minimum to accomodate an extra dwelling. Also, so many residential streets in Anacortes are too narrow as it is, offering street parking is a safety hazard
26. Keep the 16ft limit. Neighbor has illegal 2 story ADU, looking into my living space. Parking should be on the lot. Need to keep some open space
27. Street parking affects neighborhoods. Relaxing street parking standards will lead to street congestion. Usable open space in rear yards should not be more important than

usable open space in front yards. Again, the feel of a neighborhood between neighbors is more important than the look of the neighborhood to someone driving through.

28. Don't allow any blocking of neighbors' views!
29. ADU's should not exceed the height of the primary residence.
30. I don't like on street parking
31. Height limit change good. But, every car/truck/trailer/RV/boat in the city needs to have a place to park that is off streets. Apart from visitor needs, do NOT allow on street parking to be counted in support of an ADU.
32. Wholeheartedly disagree on allowing on-street parking to count. If enough people were doing this in the A-Commercial, I-41st region of town, many streets could effectively become single lane because of lax street parking enforcement by city.
33. Do not allow ADUs to be built above attached garages
34. over crowding parking on streets
35. I can see lots of problems in older parts of town where lots of homes are built on 30 or 45 foot wide lots. It could start getting really crowded.
36. How much height limit flexibility? I know the goal is to add more affordable housing options within the city, but we don't want a lot of density within each lot either. And views should never be sacrificed for additions so this should be stipulated. Yes on maintaining usable open space in yards. No regarding on-street parking as the streets become dangerous with sight-lines negatively impacted by cars parked all along the street like in the metro areas. People should not rely on street parking which should be for the use of guests.

Question #9 (Paper Question #6)

We are considering the following package of standards for cottages: Limit individual cottages to 1,200 square feet; Allow two cottages to count as one dwelling unit for the purpose of density calculations (this is because cottages are smaller than typical new homes and they wouldn't otherwise be economically viable to build); Provide for minimum common and private open space standards; Locate parking areas to the side or rear of cottages to minimize the impact on the street. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Agree on limit footprint and density bonus. Parking location idea is very important.
2. It's only a way to get density up. Let's not build out Anacortes. Our families will need jobs 10-20 years from now. I am for small houses and cottages – both to buy to help families get a start and for rent
3. Given the increase of seniors this is a great idea!!!!!!
4. Good that parking is off street, this can make a big difference in a tight parking neighborhood
5. If is truly designed and available to expand the possibilities of moderate income housing in Anacortes.
6. Basically ok but don't over contract cottage design. Specifically having two levels count in total square footage, keep foundation footprint.
7. Yes, please. However is there any leeway on the square footage to allow for a bit more space?
8. More wonderful options
9. very much needed

Neutral

10. Clusters should have their own grey water system to water the landscape.
11. Must have limits on number of vehicles permitted. Small houses don't mean people will give up vehicles. Must consider of number of vehicles on adjacent street parking. Prohibit RVs, boats, other recreational vehicles.
12. Need to mandate at least one parking space per unit on the lot, so street doesn't have to absorb space for all vehicles
13. Footprint not FAR. Minimum open space depends on minimum number.

14. I like the project that is on 14th Street (M Ave). J Ave. They are good for downsizing seniors, or childless couples, or single people.
15. Location of parking is site dependent.
16. I don't know much about this.
17. 400sf personal "open space" per unit. Remote parking (lot)?
18. Common space needs to be higher than 400sf each, more like 1000.
19. Must have off street parking for two cars per cottage. Also, have at least a 12ft. setback from the next door lots/houses.
20. 1200sqft a good main floor limitation, would like there to be an option for loft or 1/2 story living space. Also key that there be a code provision that allows for a fee simple subdivision of the land (via short plat or binding site plan, etc.) , with a strong HOA provision for the common areas and maintenance standards. Condo subdivision is not a good option, makes it very difficult to for buyer financing.
21. 1200 may be too big, a lot of the houses in Island View and Broadview built in the 60s are that big. <1000 sf may be more appropriate.
22. I think the limit on cottage square feet should be closer to 900-1000. I think we're just immune to the big house phenomena. It used to be most homes were 1200 square feet. We raised a family in a 1200 square foot house with one bathroom. It's totally doable. I think the cottage idea best fits elderly and young couples(with 1 or 2 children).It's more important to KEEP IT AFFORDABLE PLEASE!!!
23. I like some of the ideas. I do not like a minimum private yard space. I do not think there should be a minimum on this. Also, parking seems discriminatory. You are not requiring this for people adding small dwelling on their property.
24. How many parking spaces would be required per unit?
25. Increase the square footage limit on the cottage size.
26. The decade old/existing cottage complex along "J" is a very poor example of what these can be... interior lot, requiring long circular, driveway resulted in excessive paving. Recent city utility service fee changes very much favor large homes over small. If duplexes, cottages, etc are to work financially, their smaller footprints, smaller households, lesser need for all services need to be recognized with lower utility fees relative to large homes and commercial properties.
27. Why 1,200 square feet? Can they be three stories? There should not be minimum private open space standards. People that are buying these cottage-type homes are expecting to share common space.

28. Sometimes parking in the front can save thousands of square feet of otherwise unnecessary paving, and should be encouraged unless there is an alley behind.
29. 1200 square feet is a cottage? "They are popular with young couples, singles, and empty nesters." Maybe 800 square feet...My elderly father and I live in 1000 square feet and it's more home than we really need. You want affordability, think less than 1000 sf. Builders can learn to make a profit on smaller homes. Less materials and burden on the environment.
30. As long as the 'green' space is equal to the constructed space. 50-50
31. Why not a cluster of 3 or 14? What's magic about 4 to 12? How about "clusters" of 3 to 7 cottages, but on a larger parcel there could be more than one cluster? That could keep the intimacy of a small group of cottages, while allowing more units on a larger parcel.
32. I might consider additionally lowering the square footage size to 1000 sq. ft. or requiring the average square footage of the cluster to be 1000 sq. ft. with the 1200 sq. ft. maximum.
33. Provide additional incentives if there are shared common spaces (communal kitchen, gathering room, storage, etc.) to further reduce square footage of individual units.
34. Would impact fees be split as well in order to make them more economically viable?
35. Could be smaller. I live in 720 sq feet and guests love the place. Less expensive to build and maintain

Negative

36. Cottage homes are seldom affordable homes (per Ross Chapin). Maybe requirements for affordability ratio?
37. Should each be counted as individual dwelling. With the demand for housing, it's not clear what you mean by it's not economic to build cottages unless they are counted as one. Need bigger open space for the cluster.
38. Not acceptable in a R2 zone. This appears to allow for less than 7500 sq ft lot for a single family dwelling.
39. They do NOT automatically create more affordable home ownership. Anacortes is a desirable community and expensive cottages are as likely as affordable cottages. The concept is very good but, there need to be measures taken to insure that cottages are not hijacked for second homes, rental properties, upscale retirement homes and the like. Density does not translate into affordability and to just create Cottage housing does not create affordable housing

40. But not in R2
41. Only in areas previously zoned for density. It is a Bad argument to say that this is less impacting.
42. In certain areas, such as the downtown urban streets, this makes some sense. However, I feel that this is a "sleeper" that you are trying to sneak into other zoning areas for the benefit of developers. The idea sounds good on paper (housing for retired folks, singles, married with no kids) but the reality will be much different as time passes. It doesn't make sense to argue that two 1200 sq ft houses are less impacting than one larger home. Really guys, this sets my "B.S. meter" ringing! It sounds like a trendy idea that a few people in city government are behind, but it is a bad idea.
43. 1200 Square feet is the size of some normal homes. And, it is larger than other single family homes. Allowing two to count as one dwelling unit defeats the purpose of infill mandated by GMA. We do agree this would add to the affordable home inventory only if they are built with affordability in mind. Some cottage developments are far more expensive than a normally built SFR that might be twice as large as the cottage.
44. See my earlier comments. The argument that two smaller houses are an equivalent impact as one larger home is ridiculous, and can only make sense if you are a developer looking to make more money. More cars + more people + more noise + more dogs + more density = more impact. It is a rather simple equation. This is bad for Anacortes, bad for peace and quiet, and bad for our wildlife.
45. Not appropriate in the low density R1 habitat supportive zone
46. Everyone who knows nothing wants cottage housing citing how successful they've been elsewhere. Go out to Oakes at Anacopper and look up the hill. That cottage housing development has been a colossal failure that could have been a gold mine given the marine views that command a more substantial home to make things profitable for a builder to develop and for people to invest in.
47. In time these will turn into bad things for the neighbors. It sounds idyllic when you talk about elder, young couples without kids, etc, but that is not the long term reality. It will become a problem for the neighbors and I don't like the idea at all.

Question #10 (Paper Question #7)

We are considering the following package of design standards for townhouses: In the R-3 zone, limit townhomes to four attached units (subject to lot size minimums); Orient buildings to the street and feature a covered entry and parking/garages off of alleys or internal auto-courts; Provide façade articulation standards and minimum façade materials and detailing standards; Require a minimum amount of semi-private open space. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Having façade articulation standards is a good idea!
2. Fee simple subdivision is key on this too. Seattle and many other jurisdictions allow for this. Great when garages can be in rear and preferable, however some infill site may not allow for rear garage due to site conditions or access restraints. Have a design review process or alternative if garages need to come in the front. There are ways to make to lessen the impact.
3. Great way to increase population density without so many single dwelling since we have limited space on part of the Island which is Anacortes city.
4. This is a good idea for the future. The one area of concern is limiting them to four attached units. There are very attractive townhome developments in cities throughout the country that have as many as 6 connected. Agree that 4 would be optimum but keep the door open to more depending on the size of the lot where they are proposed. Possibly two more attached units could be built but if only four are allowed, there might not be room on the lot for the setback requirements to get the other two on the lot if they are not allowed to be attached. Flexibility is needed here and no hard number assigned. Should be determined by setbacks, etc.
5. In the urban parts of town I would support higher density on the form of apartments and townhouses, but building huge multiplexes outside of that area is an awful idea.

Neutral

6. Grandfather conditional use permits in-place
7. Provide articulation standards with flexibility
8. 4-unit limit is highly dependent on lot size.
9. Form a new R3 T zone? So they are compatible with surrounding homes. Alley should be a requirement.
10. Parking location is site-dependent. Open space minimum is reasonable.

11. European inspiration for facades.
12. Two parking stalls per unit.
13. How will you protect these from other buildings blocking them such as happened with Strandberg's on R ave?
14. In addition to off street parking, there should be provision for guest parking on 2 extra cars per 4 townhouse unit to keep cars off streets - in dense areas.
15. Maybe bad idea in R-3 areas as already pretty congested and may change the look of the area. Maybe okay in other areas of town. Dont want to many cookie cutter looking units in the area.
16. Require they fit in with the neighborhood style.
17. Again, there needs to be some enforceable mechanism to insure that affordable town homes are built
18. Allow open space to include decks. Town houses are tall, consider the impact on neighboring properties.
19. While individual buildings might be limited to 4 units, complexes need to be much larger if homeowners associations are to function cost effectively. A minimum of a dozen units are needed; 20+ even better. In our community, an off street parking provision for at least two vehicles per unit is needed.
20. As long as these don't disturb existing neighborhoods.
21. Again let the builders and owners have as much flexibility as possible.
22. Town houses should have equal green space to the constructed-built space.
23. Be careful with the design standards. Details and materials that were the latest and most admired in the '50's were considered tacky by the '90's but are now back in fashion (even has a name - "mid-century modern"). Limit the standards to bulk and scale and let the materials and details take care of themselves so as fashions change you won't have to change the codes. Some sites may work better if units are grouped around an interior entry courtyard rather than facing the street. Allow some flexibility.
24. Limit overall facade standards to prevent driving up cost. Get feedback from local builders on what materials are appropriate.
25. Not entirely sure what is meant by "facade articulation" standards. But if those are design dictates, I'd be careful how far they go. Broad parameters are OK, but again I caution against trying to make things too uniform.

Negative

26. Parking off alleys or internal auto-courts can backfire. If too hard to park in garage, people will parking on street. Be flexible on garage location.
27. It is now 3 – keep it that way. 2 stories only – zero more 3 stories. Many houses in town with alleys park on the street. Really doesn't solve problem. That will only add to expense. Houses are too high already. What one person thinks is min someone else doesn't.
28. Big change, incongruent to current R3 housing.
29. Don't like townhouses
30. Requiring a covered entry is strange and arbitrary and a bad idea. Requiring facade standards could be acceptable, but the requirements should be flexible and allow for deviations if approved by the planning department. Requiring a certain amount of semi-private open space sounds like a bad idea, depending on the definition of semi-private. People living in townhomes are expecting to give up a yard, so the building code should not require it.
31. Only in the urban areas! These look terrible in other parts of town. The ones down by Shannon Point are monsters, in my opinion. The ones on D Avenue look a little better.
32. These also are ideas that depend too much on the specific location or orientation. You could, for example, be dooming a townhome project to never be able to support PV panels, if you require it to be oriented the wrong way.
33. I know it's legal now, but you guys should really quit smoking that stuff. If you want to build stuff like this, start in the R-4. I don't think there's a market for it because people come to Anacortes for the views, the small-town atmosphere, and the lack of crowded rack-'em and stack-'em housing mentality. Time you asked some real estate professionals about market demands.
34. NO place to BBQ outside
35. Old town would be impacted by this type of development and it would destroy the neighborliness of the best neighborhood in Atown.
36. ONLY DOWNTOWN IN THE URBAN AREAS!! They are a monstrosity to look at elsewhere. The ones down by the ferries are awful.
37. Anacortes does not have enough affordable housing options, this could limit certain type investors from considering a project.

Question #11 (Paper Question #8)

We are considering the following package of design standards for apartment buildings: Orient buildings to the street and feature a covered entry and parking/garages off of alleys or internal auto-courts; Provide façade articulation standards and minimum façade materials and detailing standards; Require a minimum amount of usable open space. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Covered porches for apartment are a good idea, while it is terrible idea for individual homes.
2. This will certainly enhance the attractiveness of the apartment building facing the street. This has been done in other cities for decades.
3. Good to get parking away from street. Be flexible on where entry is, as long as it is easily accessed from the street. On some sites, locating the main entry on the side or even the rear may work better.

Neutral

4. 22nd and J apartments are not oriented to street but look good
5. Provide articulation standards with flexibility
6. Consider parking!
7. Open space depends on number.
8. The parking problem (too hard to reach from court) usually doesn't occur with apartments. Be careful not to introduce delay/micromanagement that slows permit review.
9. Orienting to street as long as there is a small or no setback in front of lot. Open space is location based – what's the public open space around it.
10. Designs/trees in parking areas. Need design features. Need local park space. Need green space.
11. Having a common place in center would be good for kids to play away from cars or people to congregate. Why make building more expensive?
12. Two parking stalls per apartment.
13. Good ideas, but keep infill in mind. Not all sites may allow for this. There are a lot of small parcels in R4.

14. I don't know the facade issue is addressing??
15. As long as the Design Standards are clear and concise, with reasonable economics in mind.
16. I think it would be fine to orient some units to street and some sideways to street if you are looking at preserving green space (interior courtyard/play hard feel)-- As long as walls facing streets have some windows and trim and exterior features so they do not look like blank walls.
17. Be careful of the cookie cutter look alikes.
18. Open space isn't very important with apartments, unless perhaps the complex is designed with large numbers of children in mind.
19. Keep an eye on that "open space".
20. I would like them to have some semblance of thoughtful, pleasing design that has some distinction.
21. *Critical Architectural Design considerations and need material and design standards. Concerned about parking issues. Need pervious surfaces, good landscaping, proper storm water requirements. Add courtyards.

Negative

22. No more apartment buildings please.
23. Once again, the idea seems to be that the most important feature of a project is how it looks from the street. This ignores that real people live in the dwellings and that the most important thing is how they interact with their neighbors, not how it looks to someone driving by. Generally the ideas above are appropriate but, like so much of the proposals, it is about the look to the passerby rather than the person living there
24. As with townhomes, these rules could prevent the successful implementation of solar energy collection or production.
25. How is minimum calculated???? Lot size or what??
26. Some of these ideas will be difficult or impossible on some sites. Facade costs can drive prices.
27. Leave such matters to the architects, builders, and developers. People in City Hall don't need to be inflicting their ideas on the housing industry in terms of design, esthetics, or functionality. Stick to setbacks, lot coverage maximums, etc. Every situation is different and I know from many years of dealing with this stuff (12 years on the CC and 25 as the

owner/broker of a local real estate company) that there's a lot more to deciding on a building design than what you saw on HGTV last week.

Question #12 (Paper Question #9a)

Currently the CBD and Commercial zones allow multi-family uses (e.g. apartments) but only above the ground floor of buildings. We are considering allowing residential on the ground floor on side streets in the Commercial and CBD zones. What do you think of this idea?

Positive

1. Space for live/work artists would be a great addition
2. good use of downtown infrastructure.
3. If you can deal with the parking issues, this is a great idea
4. Ground floor will probably be used for parking and pedestrian entry. Perfectly acceptable.
5. This is probably a good idea but a look at what Anacortes currently has should be done. You already have businesses on side streets that would need to be considered in the zoning so it cannot be one size fits all. Good idea overall and should help out the downtown.

Neutral

6. Residential above retail.
7. Only with off-street parking.
8. Use side streets between Commercial and O, Commercial and Q (not residential side of O and Q)
9. Except corner lots.
10. I have never liked adding more retail to ground floor/ The empty lot at 10th and Commercial might sell.
11. Parking requirements?
12. Two parking stalls per apartment
13. You have to be careful to protect walkability type of resources. For example if density increases then having a small shop/coffee shop. other businesses on the ground floors within residential communities enhances community spirit and promotes sustainable living
14. This would not strengthen the walkability of Anacortes business districts much. Instead, focus on making South Commercial Ave a more vital portion of the business district

(restaurants and shops). Lack of attractive options on S. Commercial means residents who ought to be walking are driving to the commercial districts despite being within walking distance.

- 15. Not a bad idea, but I think second level (or higher) residential would be better...and more attractive to buyers.
- 16. I think that the half-block of the side streets closest to Commercial should not have apartments on the ground floor, so that the commercial uses would wrap around the corner. The half of those blocks facing Q or O Ave's could be residential, so that a residential building facing Q or O would wrap around onto its half of the numbered street. Residential and/or commercial should be allowed on Q and O.
- 17. There really hasn't been great utilization of the CBD residences, it might be good to figure out how to incentivize that better first.
- 18. It is difficult to make a retail biz viable with Amazon available.
- 19. Side streets is an important requirement.

Negative

- 20. Where will retail go? We have to think about the long term future too.
- 21. Residential should be above the noise and traffic.
- 22. Commercial zones are commercial by design and therefore if residential housing is to be incorporated it is only logical to have located in the upper, less accessible real estate.
- 23. Leave the ground floor for businesses. If we are planning to pack this island with humanity then we will need it.
- 24. Watch out for too much flexibility.
- 25. Good to have living spaces, would not want living units on main streets lowest level (commercial and within 1 block)
- 26. Not just a Bad idea....it's an extraordinarily BAD idea!!! Parking is a big problem downtown. Most people have cars. Letting them live downtown means they will be parking those cars downtown around the clock since that's where they live. That was my argument against the rehab of the New Wilson Hotel when a ton of taxpayer money was used to rehab that thing smack in the middle of the CBD when the only parking it could provide for its eventual 24 rooms of residents was ONE OFFSTREET SPOT. But actually, I don't care. I only come downtown to get my mail a couple times a week and I just park in a loading zone for the minute it takes me to run in and get it.
- 27. Horrible idea

28. In time, if we are dead set on packing this island to the gills (and it seems that we are, as long as the builders hold sway), we will need more room for businesses to service the added population.
29. parking availability is bad enough already

Question #13 (Paper Question #9b)

We are considering allowing bonus heights in exchange for special uses or design features, such as: Affordable housing (rents capped for qualified low-income tenants); Additional publicly accessible open space; Special streetscape design improvements; Ground floor commercial space. What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Additional open space especially, or only, if greenway/public. Not sure if bonus density required for vertical mixed-use.
2. Affordable housing at a different site? Special streetscape not just as a bonus. Vertical mixed-use would be good – not just as a bonus but across the board.
3. Allowing residential above commercial space is excellent idea.
4. Bonus heights generally seem like a good idea. Yes to affordable housing. Improved public transit to decrease need for too many cars.
5. In the urban areas I think it is fine to have taller buildings.
6. In the urban part of town it makes sense to "go high". I would rather see that than an increased density along the city's margins.
7. These should be requirements without allowing height variances.
8. Can't have enough publicly accessible open space to satisfy me. It builds community!
9. good idea for options. We provide a couple lower cost rental units in exchange for an additional floor.
10. All of the considerations are good, however, additional heights in exchange for...is too loose. If design standards are met, there may be reason to build up. Wording is too flexible. Be specific.
11. Bonus for affordable housing and public open space - yes. Not for design - too subjective, and if it's needed for good design it should be a requirement, not allowing bad design if you have a shorter building. Ground floor commercial space should be required on Commercial and adjacent half block of side streets. I'm OK with going to 65' on Commercial, as well as west side of Q and east side of O.

Neutral

12. Only with off-street parking.
13. Dedicated parking for residents to keep vehicles off street parking.

14. Density bonus. May not remove height variance but increases lot coverage.
15. Dependent on location as far as raising the height limit. what about promoting mixed affordable and higher cost housing together? This seems a bit vague so it is hard to comment
16. Be more specific on all the exceptions???
17. But only in CBD. MMU it should be a conditional use.
18. Off street parking could be another incentive for higher height qualification, not a problem now, but I would hate to see it get like Capitol Hill in Seattle
19. The only one of these that seems like a reasonable exchange for extra height is affordable housing. The other things are not significantly beneficial to the community to warrant the bonus to developers.
20. As long as the impacts are OK with the neighbors and the buildings do not create the effect of canyon walls for others such as blocking off access or views of the natural surroundings
21. the view of the water should be preserved as much as possible
22. Seems like a great idea except rent control shouldn't be in the mix of zoning or bonus height adjustments. If the city wants to offer height bonuses they should be specific about what is expected permanently for the units such as a designated affordable housing unit overseen by an established 501.C.3 organization and that is where it should stop. Yes, there is a need for affordable housing, rent, etc. but as we all know, the market drives what rent a landlord can collect. The city shouldn't be in that mix. If the developer donates the unit to the 501.C.3 it is up to that group to control what the rent should be on that particular unit without the city needing to place a cap on the rent.
23. Sounds like a gift for developers. Give them the extra height in urban areas, but make them contribute to public spaces. Especially sports fields or indoor athletic centers that benefit families and active lifestyles.
24. Consider affordable housing that is affordable by design rather than regulation (i.e., small apartments, or condos with shared spaces). In other words, units which limit rent by market conditions to limit things that the city needs to monitor.
25. Depends on what the bonus is.
26. Sounds very stylish, as my cousin Clint said in a movie. All you need now are some developers who have lots of money and no brains.

27. I don't think I'd do it for ground floor commercial space, as that's already a benefit to the developer. The others are generally seen as benefits to the community for which incentives are often provided, such as the bonus height allowance.
28. No views should be impacted. The whole town should gravitate toward a charming maritime theme, like an old eastern seaboard town except in the NW. Think of Leavenworth - it has the Bavarian theme. Anacortes should capture the identity it started with - NW maritime and not allow strip malls, unattractive warehouses, etc. to clog up any areas in the city.

Negative

29. Bonus height should not be 65 feet!
30. 40 feet max to keep city. Zero 65 height at all anywhere. Small homes – for people to buy so they can be part of dream. Some people own larger home and want to greatly downsize without losing investments. Why should landlords, builders, real estate reap all benefits?
31. These deals do not provide benefits to the community.
32. What's a truly affordable housing option??? Height can overwhelm a neighborhood. Don't allow THAT.
33. Do not want to allow bonus heights
34. Will take out views of residents who paid for them
35. Increased height limits will destroy the city skyline and will negatively impact the city in the long run.
36. I am not in favor of bonus heights that will off set the remaining area.
37. Why open this can of worms could you imagine the headache you would cause yourself
38. Ground floor retail space is not viable with Amazon being available.
39. Sounds like something that will benefit few people other than the developer.

Question #14 (Paper Question #9c)

We are considering allowing flexibility for residential uses on the Central Fidalgo Bay waterfront property. To allow for this flexibility, the new Marine Mixed Use (MMU) zone would require a mix of uses be integrated and that special internal circulation, site, and building design standards are met. What do you think of this idea?

Positive

1. Definitely!
2. In general I agree with encouraging residential development in this area.
3. People have commented to me on the lack of condos here on the water for a seaside town, some additional mixed-use live/work spaces could revitalize this area.
4. Residential, restaurants, pathway, retail and office all good. Marine uses certainly good, but no more boat storage; boat marketing..
5. This space has great potential and allowing residential use is a good idea.
6. On the condition that the waterfront will be developed for public use! We need more waterfront, it is our best asset moving forward.
7. Make sure that the waterfront is open for public use! We need it in this town. A promenade and parklands would help our city achieve a lot of it's goals of becoming a destination. If we don't do this then we should stop calling ourselves a waterfront community.
8. I would like to see plans for a residential marina in this area, with small townhomes and boat docks attached, plus restaurants and chandler stores
9. I would love to see and feel a vibrant waterfront with shops and open air restaurants. To construct some quality residential quarters on the second floor above the shops only makes sense. Shop owners used to reside over their shops.
10. We think this is a great idea because it opens up that area for development infill that will only enhance the waterfront in the future.
11. Promote mixed use here, touristy on main level, residential above. Add sidewalk at water and connect to Tommy Thompson.
12. I think it has great potential in the hands of the right developer.

Neutral

13. This land was set aside for industrial use. Land taken and homes destroyed for industry.

14. Keep strong concept for commercial marine access
15. Need a look at public access to water.
16. More RV and tiny home space.
17. Mixed use – Master Plan. No regional scale (big) box. Possible increase up to 75,000sf. “Souq” retail – mixed residential.
18. Public access to waterfront/open space. Design/façade articulation standards for both commercial/residential and industrial buildings. Preserve street end water views!
19. This would be better for commercial, convention center, hotels.
20. This should be commercial/tourism focused with public access to the shore.
21. Needs more detailed proposal
22. Need to be much clearer and specific on what the flexibility for residential would include, alot of buzz words and not a lot of specifics. This is primo property and needs to be be specific is usage.
23. This will inevitably go high end condos, which is OK, but, There needs yo be a plan to preserve the industrial waterfront access between 19th and 22nd.
24. Although that may aggravate the families that were displaced 50 years ago for commercial development
25. There needs to be an affordable housing component attached, either directly on site, or through developer fees to create affordable housing in other areas
26. Need more info
27. You just got the Fidalgo Bay Aquatic Reserve back on track after multiple clean-ups. A waterfront park with boutique shops/restaurants that run along R/Q Ave and a waterfront park would be better.
28. needs to have public access to beach front area
29. You will only ever have so much waterfront, and very little of it is flat. Be careful what you do with it!
30. Short on explanation to know just what this would mean. In general I am in favor of the concept of mixed use.
31. Make certain that the waterfront is developed for public access. It is possibly our most precious asset if we want to become the vibrant city that we claim to be. Walkways, and

parks are needed along those shorelines, not million dollar condos or over-priced retail units.

32. Definitely need specific requirements to create the best design for this area. A great example is Portland's city riverfront mixes commercial-residential well.
33. Excellent idea, but again, the devil is in the details. Need public review of how this would be done. The Port had an opportunity to do this a few years ago at Seafarer's Park and they blew it.
34. As long as there are square footage requirements added for retail spaces. We need to protect our local businesses from large corporations.
35. It should have been allowed when MJB first proposed it over 20 years ago but perhaps by now there's been enough prominent funerals that a lot of the faithful who knew "Industry" was just about to come back are no longer with us. Only real question is what we'd do with all that new property tax revenue.
36. If you think that is the best idea for waterfront property?
37. Every one who lived in this failed urban renewal area has died. It is time to move on. Major industry is not going to develop here. This is a retirement community and retired people do not want to work!! Build houses, apartments, anything but boat storage yards.
38. Please, just make sure that we have more, not less, public access to the waterfront! A promenade and parkland along the water should be mandatory. We'd be world-class if we had developed our Guemes Channel better, but we were too focused on resource extraction at the time. Let's be mindful of a future that we don't see yet.

Negative

39. No cottages.
40. Not 65 feet tall! 4 stories maybe.
41. No no no. There is only so much land like this (near water, near downtown). It will eventually be used. Don't misuse this land.
42. Between 22nd and 17th Streets, don't allow condo "walls" to block water views – see Oakes Avenue. "Wall" created by fencing/dense planting.
43. Let's keep it as is. Zero apartment/housing business.
44. Keep it marine related.
45. This is waterfront, thus it should be used for water-related businesses, recreational boating, marine industry, etc. not apartments or hotels

46. Keep for water dependent uses

Question #15 (Paper Question #10)

We are considering the following standards for large lot subdivisions: Allow variable lot sizes provided the overall density and design standards are met; Consider allowing modest density bonuses in exchange for public amenity features (such as a publicly accessible trail or open space). What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Allow mixed-use – promote co-housing options for mixed density.
2. especially needed in the r-l zone.
3. Be specific of how the lot sizes and dwelling design standards will be met??
4. I like the idea of fostering public/ private cooperation on this and offering builder/developer incentives for trails and green spaces, particularly connections to existing green spaces and dead-ended trails.
5. Obtaining publicly accessible trails and/or open space is generally is good objective.
6. Would be nice to have neighborhoods where a variety of housing types, sizes, and prices could accommodate people with a variety of incomes and family types. Could even allow a few small multi-unit buildings mixed in. If they are part of a planned development, then folks buying a home or unit would already know what is next door.

Neutral

7. Public amenity bonus must have specificity.
8. Needs to be self-sustaining from water collection grey water system for the landscaping.
9. Affordable housing integrated into market rate.
10. Affordable housing public use area
11. Let's watch density – there will be traffic problems and not everyone can bike or walk. What's modest?
12. As long as it is mixed, and the whole thing dose not become higher density
13. Consistency is important. The variable lot size is not well defined. This variable factor needs limits.
14. Min lot sizes are already pretty small. What defines a "public amenity"? Developers are pretty creative.

15. The trail or open space should be of value. and not just a square of grass.
16. developers should have to provide streets wide enough to provide parking on both sides and still allow for two lanes of traffic
17. We don't do this already???
18. Are the current conditional use rules not sufficient for this?
19. smaller homes with good design
20. Especially since current existing lot standards require more than an original Anacortes platted lot (so ownership of single lot would be worthless)
21. I like the second bullet point, but I am not as confident about the first one.
22. San Juan Passage is an example

Negative

23. Variable lot sizes are a problem – developers manipulate and rarely benefits the public.
24. We do not need high density neighborhoods like Seattle, that can ruin the charm of an area. We must be care when considering increasing the density of our city.
25. Sounds like more PUDs that hurt neighborhoods and don't really provide for the community.
26. If open space includes wetlands or are adjacent the forest land then this is not only a bad idea, it is a horrible idea.
27. I love the trail and open space idea but honestly I think the builder benefits from those when they sell ,without any modest density bonuses. Realtors always advertise the point of trails and open space nearby . It's a plus when selling. NO density bonus for the builders.
28. This is just another way to say PUD. What is more important is how the subdivision fits with the surrounding neighborhood. Trails and/or openspace do not compensate existing neighborhoods for density. If the NEW subdivision can be achieved without changing the existing neighborhood that is one thing. To create some nebulous "amenity" does not do the existing neighborhood any good
29. I say this because in my experience, the city has a money/developer first mentality regarding this and has not taken into account character of neighborhood, resident concerns/comments, etc. Increasing population density may increase city revenue, and the city's argument is always that this increases services/things, however, rarely do I see

an evaluation of the quality of service increase from the city. Until that assessment is done, sub-dividing plots by the city is something to be skeptical of.

30. Large lot subdivisions already have the structures too close together. Providing a mowed area (open space) to that a developer can cram building closer together is not a equitable compromise.
31. Not using wetland as a open space for density
32. I think this could backfire on the neighbors, but is certain to benefit developers.
33. Not in R-I! Keep it less dense, there is not much of it left.
34. Open space should be required not as a negotiable.
35. Most city codes already allow for density bonuses based on parks, trails, etc. the developer proposes to install. There is no need to change a practice that is already in play. Anacortes has already experienced this in one of the developments out toward the ferry terminal and it seems to work very well.
36. Again, it is hard to trust that certain elements of our planning have not been captured by entities who are motivated by personal gain over the good of the commons. Density increases in the downtown urban areas is fine, but let's not sell our souls to the quick buck.
37. Not pleased with most of the large lot subdivisions in this community. We need an overall style or theme that reflects the pacific northwest. One example of a pleasing development is at Roche Harbor on San Juan Island. Beautiful design and green spaces near marina, restaurants and shopping.
38. Go out to Westwood off D Ave. That development is in the R-I which requires 15,000sf minimum lot sizes. After city allowed a rear of lot greenbelt to be created using part of each lot and a few other carve-outs, the appearance of the neighborhood became just another subdivision of nice homes. Most property owners aren't fond of having public trails running adjacent to their back yards and "open spaces " the city extorted from developments all over town have turned into city-owned weed-patches that no one maintains unless the neighbors do. I mean, crap! The city won't even maintain its waterfront park next to the Guemes Ferry terminal.

Question #16 (Paper Question #11)

We are considering the following for street design standards in residential areas: Provide for a mix of street designs emphasizing modest roadway widths, planting strips, street trees, and sidewalks; Allow strategic flexibility for infill situations (auto courts, private lanes, and fee-in-lieu of improvements). What do you think of these ideas?

Positive

1. Like the idea of different standards for different widths and bike lanes.
2. All sound like inviting ideas for walkability and biking and to encourage street life, not just cars
3. I like the first bullet. I am unsure about a fee in lieu of improvements.
4. Flexibility is good as long as it respects existing residents.
5. Anything that it takes to get more sidewalks! This city is in dire need of safe ways to walk around.
6. Don't make streets so wide that there freeways. Keep the 30' city street feel!

Neutral

7. Optional? Only where cross section integrates into existing neighborhood.
8. Identify bike and pedestrian routes that get priority in construction and maintenance.
9. I would like to see small traffic circles on Anacortes city residential streets – Old Town
10. Very important for flexible standards for infill development
11. Not sure I understand the question – what are auto courts?
12. Parking on one side as much as possible with narrower streets. Planting strips or at least intermittent areas of green space instead of huge areas of pavement.
13. Let's put B Street through. Access is still available and would help traffic flow out of D West. We have so few through streets and this could lead to possible through street design to be scuttled.
14. We need more planting strips and street trees!
15. need a menu of street options for infill

16. Again, more specifics are needed we are reaching a real traffic flow issue on 12th. D and some of the other major streets which need roundabouts and other traffic flow strategies. I think if we are going to increase population by 5,000 we need to think about how we are moving people in some of the areas which seem to be increasing in the building of residents.
17. As long as main arterials and feeder streets allow for future traffic and commercial uses, unlike the stupid center medians on R/Q ave. which prevent the ease of flow for the traffic load and large commercial vehicles (& moving boats)
18. Can we have more access for pedestrians and bicyclists to cut thru blocked or vacated areas??
19. In newer developments. Although replacing the 2000' of center street island that was ripped out of 8th street 20 years ago would keep the speeding down and may enhance the value of homes in the area
20. Look into stormwater friendly designs and minimise hard surfaces.
21. Assume that this applies only to new development
22. Seems OK, but not sure that I am visualizing all this may imply.
23. Street designs should be standardized: handicap accessibility, bike lanes, planting of street trees, not a negotiable.
24. I would agree if the streets were wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides, and still allow two cars to pass. some of the streets are so narrow that when there are cars parked on both sides, there is only room for one car to pass at a time...
25. The city has to be careful in street design and enforcement of parking regulations when it comes to smaller streets where specific parking courts are depicted. A great example is the development in Mount Vernon where additional parking stalls are included but tenants continue to park on the street and make it almost impossible for emergency vehicles to get through. The city council has to buy into this and understand that enforcement of the parking regulations is paramount for this to work regardless of the political backlash they might get from their constituents because they got a ticket or were towed.
26. We should be careful about how we proceed. It sounds ok on paper but what are the long term consequences of narrow streets in a high density area? Drive in Seattle neighborhoods to find the answer.
27. Two lanes are sufficient for most roads. The runway on 6th Street is way too wide. The sidewalks resemble another lane making the street undesirable. Need street trees throughout the City along all streets. Encourage a balance. Developers will take advantage of any weakness in the laws and regulations.

28. Good ideas to reduce pavement and cost. But don't forget that people still invite friends over for a birthday party, or hire a plumber to fix the toilet, or get a delivery from UPS. Plan for some guest parking and loading zones. Fee-in-lieu will not work unless it is truly related to the cost of what would have been required - otherwise builders will just pay the fee and we'll lose out on amenities like parking and parks. Builders should be required to do certain things if feasible, and only allowed to pay their way out of it if it is truly not feasible (like parking for existing buildings in CBD).
29. Could be good or bad depending on area and how it is implemented
30. All new roadways should be engineered to bicycle and pedestrian friendly standards. Traffic calming should be built in so that it need not be retrofitted later on. Streets should be sized for bicycle lanes and striped accordingly upon initial construction.
31. You gotta have strict street standard minimums that provide for two adequate driving lanes, curbside parking on both sides and, I suppose, bike lanes and all the other crappola that seem to require painted stripes these days. When you start backing off requirements arbitrarily, you're gonna get really screwed! And by the way, so called "street trees" eat utilities, shed leaves that clog drain gutters, and block views if the lot had one before you planted them. Views = value = more property value = more revenue for city and schools. We already have some "strategic flexibility for infill. More might be good.
32. Again, encouraging parking off-street is important. Streets should maintain good visibility for both safety and appearance.

Negative

33. If you don't force developers and builders to create infill situations, they will simply pay fees. Won't create desired end product.
34. Don't end sidewalks 1-5 feet from the street, as is now the case in an erratic pattern throughout Anacortes. I walk a lot. Don't understand the city's sidewalk construction standards.
35. Some of this seems good, some not so good. It is difficult to administer flexibility because clear standards exist elsewhere. Easy to see a lot of protests about uneven decision making here.
36. Not a fan of private lanes. I don't see anything about bike or pedestrian pathways in this, and feel it needs to be incorporated.
37. Again, an existing neighborhood is being asked to change for some "private lane" or "fee in lieu". If the relaxation of design standards is offset by a benefit to the existing neighborhood that may be acceptable. If the relaxation of standards is for the developers benefit, that ignores the character and livability of the existing neighbors.

38. street should not be of modest width they should be wide enough to drive safely
39. Fee-in-lieu of improvement is not a good idea. Nobody in town is going to look at a location and be happy that the city got a little money and the area looks bad for the next 50 years. This is completely counter to all the proposed design requirement for homes, ADUs, and apartments. Allow people to pay keep things looking bad.



WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS: APPENDIX B - COMMENT CARDS AND WRITING PAD COMMENTS

April 2017

Below is a transcription of written comments provided on the workshop on comment cards and writing pads.

Comment Cards

- Are we still having the Fire Department drive the road standards in our developments?
- Please do not let the fire dept. dictate road standards. They need to relax their standards. The ladder truck should not be a factor.
- I really want to see the Old Town zone between CBD and M Ave have a transition zone for higher uses. There is a lot of public uses in this zone and is of different character than the neighborhood west of M Ave.
- Very difficult to hear questions. Please ask speakers to summarize question before answering. Great charts and handouts! Lots of good info presented. Thank you for hosting the open house. Great transparency for the public.
- Handouts are very informative. Presentation well-done. "Flexibility" frequently has set precedents. Watch out for pedestrian facilities.
- Nice job guys! Well done. Very informative. Easy to follow.
- Start Comp Plan over.
- R-3 zone – lot size to minimum 4500sf. No 65 feet buildings anywhere. Put B Street through for easier access down hill – with all the new building going on we need more than D Avenue west of D. For more parking add a 2nd level to parking garage by Guemes Ferry – it would not interfere with any views. Please let's keep a city that not only likes our open spaces but one that is easy to get around. Cool down on the building. Money now, mess later.

Pad #1

- Cost break for multifamily? For sewer etc.
- Smaller streets preferred. Mix planting strip with space for parking on same street.
- Multi-dwelling units should be self-sustaining
- Electric, charging stations on the street
- Are you going to provide pocket parks for this density?
- Large lot design option – co-housing with single family, tiny homes, senior housing (single story)

Pad #2

- Need more open space with cottage developments

Pad #3

- Options for tiny homes on wheels/foundations – lot ownership/sharing?
- Zero lot line condos
- Small, low cost cottage housing

Pad #4

- What is it about DADU permitting that should require owner in residence on the property?
- New construction should be self-sustaining from power to water collecting to sewage
- Tiny homes on wheels as ADUs? Less than 400sf?
- What restrictions does the Department of Ecology have on these standards?



WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS: APPENDIX C - PRESENTATION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

April 2017

Below is a listing of the questions and answers during the presentation portion of the workshop. We've inferred the questions due to lack of recorded audio for the audience and paraphrased answers provided by MAKERS and City staff.

Question: Is garage included in FAR calculation?

Answer: Yes, livable floor area is what is counted, including the garage

Question: Does FAR include a daylight basement?

Answer: If it's improved, it should probably count, but we could potentially exclude it depending on public feedback. But the other argument is a basement is not part of the visual bulk of the building if more than half is below grade.

Question: (no audio)

Answer: FAR addresses only the size of the house, not the use.

Question: (no audio)

Answer: We'll address existing standards and might make adjustments.

Question: Would the proposed height limit change allow taller homes?

Answer: Potentially, maybe we lower the midpoint measurement even further to 25 feet.

Question: Is view protection being considered?

Answer: Views are very difficult. 35 foot height limit is existing, and changes are proposed in C and CBD.

Question: Question about size of house and size of lot

Answer: Two separate standards would need to work together for small lots

Question: Question about 16 foot height limit.

Answer: 16 feet is current height. Increasing it would make it more feasibility to build an ADU above a detached garage. Daylight plane could also apply.

Question: (no audio) Is an attached ADU the same as a duplex?

Answer: There are size differences. In some zones you can actually have a duplex. ADUs would be useful for where you don't have enough lot area for a duplex.

Question: Question about requirement for living on the property with an ADU

Answer: Don explained that the code requirement is recorded in the title. City doesn't check for compliance every year. Bob explains ADUs help provide housing opportunities for a variety of people.

Question: Question about ADU design

Answer: Only one entrance may be visible from the street for single-family lots. The goal is to avoid making ADUs look like duplexes.

Question: Question about requirement for living on the property with an ADU

Answer: Compliance check is complaint-initiated. Goal is to maintain properties. Not one complaint received since ADU regulations enacted.

Question: What is the ownership structure of cottage housing?

Answer: Sold as ownership properties, often as a condominium style with a homeownership association. Can be rented out.

Question: How much common open space is required?

Answer: Typically 400 square feet per unit

Question: How do apartment buildings manage stormwater?

Answer: There are existing standards that multi-family developments must meet to manage stormwater.

Question: How much open space would be required for apartment buildings?

Answer: Perhaps 150-200 space per unit, which could be balconies, rooftop decks, courtyards, etc.

Question: How would parking requirements change?

Answer: Might be adjustments in C and CBD. On-site parking will continue to be required.

Question: How flexible are the street standards?

Answer: We'll be coordinating with staff and Public Works to ensure there are options. The City has plans/standards for bike lanes, trails.

Question: Would there be places to turn around on dead end streets?

Answer: Yes, those standards would not change. Usually if the street is less than 150 feet the hammerhead is not required.

Question: Can emergency vehicles move on the proposed streets?

Answer: Yes, the proposed widths have been demonstrated to be accessible to emergency vehicles.

Question: What about manufactured homes and tiny homes?

Answer: Manufactured homes are allowed anywhere they are not prohibited by CCRs. Tiny homes will be explored by staff, as directed by Comprehensive Plan.