



City of Lake Forest Park

Planning Commission Meeting Tuesday, September 14, 2021 PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA

Meeting to be Held Virtually

See second page for information about how to participate virtually

City Hall is Closed to the Public

- 1. Call Meeting to Order—7:00 p.m. (confirm recording start)**
- 2. Land Acknowledgement**
- 3. Approval of Agenda**
- 4. Approval of Meeting Minutes – August 10, 2021**
- 5. Meeting Dates**
 - Next regular meeting is scheduled for October 12, 2021
- 6. Citizen Comments (Each speaker has three minutes to comment)**

The Planning Commission accepts oral and written citizen comments during its regular meetings. Written comments are no longer being read during the meeting. Instructions for how to make oral Citizen Comments are available here: <https://www.cityoflfp.com/617/Virtual-Planning-Commission-Meetings>
- 7. Old Business**
 - Evaluation of LFP's Accessory Dwelling Unit (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.050) and Accessory Structure (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.060)
 - Presentation on draft amendments to Accessory Dwelling Unit (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.050) and Accessory Structure (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.060) code provisions
 - Invite attendees to comment on current draft of proposed amendments LFPMC Ch. 18.50.050 and Ch. 18.50.060
 - Discuss and finalize the recommendation to Council
- 8. New Business**
- 9. Report from City Council Liaison**
- 10. Reports and Announcements**
- 11. Agenda for Next Meeting**
- 12. Adjournment**

Planning Commission's Land Acknowledgement

We'd like to acknowledge we are on the traditional land of a rich and diverse group of Native Peoples who have called this area home for more than 10,000 years. We honor, with gratitude, the land itself and the descendants of these Native Peoples who are still here today. In doing this we aim to illuminate the longer history of this land we call home, our relationship to this history, and the heritage of those peoples whose ancestors lived here before the European-American immigration that began in the 1800s.

Instructions for participating in this meeting virtually:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/92352877390>

Or One tap mobile :

US: +12532158782,,92352877390# or +16699006833,,92352877390#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 408 638 0968
or +1 646 876 9923 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799

Webinar ID: 923 5287 7390

International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kyjt75HfV>

**City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission
Draft Regular Meeting Minutes: August 10, 2021
Virtual/Zoom Meeting**

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Maddy Larson, David Kleweno, Richard Saunders, Melissa Cranmer, T.J. Fudge, Ira Gross

Staff and others present: Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Nick Holland, Senior Planner; Councilmember Lorri Bodi (Planning Commission Liaison); Cameron Tuck, Assistant Planner

Members of the Public: Mike Dee, Don Fiene

Planning Commissioners absent: Vice Chair Rachael Katz, Lois Lee

Call to order: Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Land Acknowledgement:

Cmr. Gross read the land acknowledgement.

Approval of Agenda

Mr. Gross made a motion to approve the agenda, Mr. Kleweno seconded and the motion to approve the agenda was approved unanimously.

Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 13, 2021

CMR. SAUNDERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 13, 2021 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED, CMR. GROSS SECONDED, CMR. FUDGE ABSTAINED; THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.

Meeting Dates:

Meeting Dates: Next regular meeting is scheduled for September 14, 2021.

Citizen Comments:

CITIZEN
None

Report from City Council Liaison

Report from City Council Liaison
Councilmember Bodi said that Director Bennett will be presenting growth target information on housing targets and job targets at the Council work session on Thursday. She said the numbers didn't really reflect the effects of the pandemic. She went on to explain the reasons for the study and potential regulations the County may adopt on the topic of affordable housing. She said that LFP may need to amend the Comprehensive Plan due to potential County legislation. She noted that LFP has sufficient capacity for housing units with the current land supply.

She said that there will also be a presentation from Police Chief Harden regarding the new State legislation on police reform. Councilmember Bodi added that the other Council meetings for August have been canceled.

Councilmember Bodi provided an update on the Sound Transit appeal. She said the summary judgement requested by King County was denied and that the exhibits they've asked to be added to the record were also denied. Director Bennett said that the scheduled hearing date has been postponed until December. Cmr. Fudge asked about the timing of the appeal relative to the parking garage schedule. Councilmember Bodi said that it should not affect the timing of the appeal. She said that Sound Transit has an optimistic schedule for their projects given their current budget. She also said that the LFP parking garage has been postponed

1 until 2044 because the timing of the Sound Transit station at 130TH has been moved up, which should allow
2 riders in LFP to access that facility.

3
4 Chair Larson asked whether a subdivision has been applied for the town center property. Director Bennett
5 indicated that the property owner has not contacted the City about submitting an application since their
6 community meeting earlier this year.

7
8 **Old Business**

9
10 *Evaluation of LFP's Accessory Dwelling Unit (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.050) and Accessory Structure (LFPMC Ch.*
11 *18.50.060)*

12 • Discuss draft amendments to Accessory Dwelling Unit (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.050) and Accessory
13 Structure (LFPMC Ch. 18.50.060) code provisions in response to Commission guidance provided at
14 July 13th regular meeting

15
16 Chair Larson provided an update for Cmr. Fudge who had not been able to attend the last meeting. She also
17 mentioned a few items that Cmr. Katz had wished to discuss. She said that if code language can be decided
18 upon at this meeting, the Planning Commission could potentially propose recommendations to Council in
19 September, which was the Council's desired timeline.

20
21 Chair Larson asked the Commissioners if they understood the provisions presented in the packet materials.
22 Director Bennett provided some background on the draft code amendments which, as drafted, would allow
23 for detached ADUs on lots as small as 7,200 square feet. Cmr. Gross said he was in favor of this provision.
24 Cmr. Fudge said he disagrees with the language and that he favored a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet.
25 Cmr. Saunders said he supports the 7,200 square foot lot minimum. Cmr. Kleweno said he agreed with Cmr.
26 Fudge, and that he is worried about allowing detached ADUs on smaller lots. Cmr. Cranmer reminded
27 Commissioners of some of the public input, and that privacy was a concern for the people surveyed. Cmr
28 Fudge provided a graphic example which illustrated the implications of detached structures on smaller lots.
29 He said that privacy would be impacted by detached structures on smaller lots.

30
31 The Commission discussed the idea of detached structures on smaller lots. Chair Larson said that the
32 Commission seems to be divided on the issue of detached structures on lots with 7,200 square feet. Cmr.
33 Saunders said that he was fine with recommending 10,000 square feet as a minimum lot size for detached
34 structures, if only to bring the idea to Council for deliberation. He also suggested that the Commission
35 prepare a memo to Council stating that the Commission considered allowing detached ADUs on lots as small
36 as 7,200 sq. ft. but that there were concerns about privacy.

37
38 In response to a question about administrative deviations from Cmr. Gross, Director Bennett said that an
39 individual with a 7,200 square foot lot who wishes to construct a detached ADU would need to receive
40 zoning variance approval which would require a public hearing. In response to discussion about subdividing
41 lots in the larger single-family zones, Director Bennett also explained the nature of the 75-foot street frontage
42 zoning requirement and how it limits the development of those larger lots in LFP. Cmr. Saunders said that
43 those larger lots may be good candidates for attached ADUs as well as an additional detached ADU. He also
44 mentioned the Fiene-Tonkin materials which emphasize that adding an ADU to a lot is much less
45 environmentally impactful than subdividing a lot. Cmr. Gross said he would be in favor of Cmr. Saunders
46 proposal. Cmr. Fudge said that he disagreed because there may be unintended consequences from providing
47 flexibility in development of larger lots. Cmr. Kleweno said it could be risky because of the unintended
48 consequences that may arise from multiple accessory dwelling unit development in single family zones. Chair
49 Larson asked for other Commissioners to comment on whether they were interested in making a
50 recommendation like what Cmr. Saunders was describing. Cmr. Cranmer said that she would support
51 multiple ADUs on a site if additional parking was required. Chair Larson said that there seems to be a

1 majority interested in having multiple ADUs on a lot of larger size and asked what the appropriate minimum
2 lot size would be. It was suggested that a minimum one-acre lot size be recommended to Council. Cmr.
3 Fudge suggested that the lot size recommendation should be twice the underlying zoning's minimum lot size.
4 After some discussion, Chair Larson said she was hearing consensus from Commissioners that an acre should
5 be the recommended lot size and that parking be required for each ADU. Director Bennett summarized the
6 changes he would make for the next draft.

7
8 Chair Larson started the discussion on the next code amendment topic pertaining to the minimum square
9 footage for ADUs in 18.50.050 (B). Director Bennett suggested that one option would be to amend the
10 minimum square footage to 150 square feet based on the example provided through a link in the materials.
11 Cmr. Saunders and Cmr. Gross said they supported reducing the minimum size. Cmr. Fudge and Kleweno
12 agreed with reducing the size. Cmr. Cranmer said that she doesn't favor any minimum size. Chair Larson
13 suggested eliminating the minimum size and there was no objection.

14
15 Chair Larson introduced the next topic related to allowing detached structures on lots of at least 10,000
16 square feet as shown in draft amendments for 18.50.050.C and D. Director Bennett clarified how the
17 difference between attached and detached units are interpreted. He made note of a change in the definitions,
18 which was a part of the materials provided in the draft code. Chair Larson asked if Commissioners supported
19 the change and all indicated agreement with the amendment as drafted allowing for detached ADUs on lots
20 of as small as 10,000 square feet.

21
22 There was discussion about any potential changes to the owner-occupation requirement in subsection
23 18.50.050(E). Chair Larson asked for input and all indicated agreement on leaving the requirement
24 unchanged.

25
26 There was discussion about the existing language in section 18.50.050 (F). Chair Larson asked if this section
27 would be appropriate to address the idea of a living space over a detached garage. Director Bennett provided
28 insight on the existing language which is intended to make sure parking is replaced when a garage is converted
29 into an ADU. Cmr. Gross asked about parking requirements when garages are converted to ADUs and
30 Director Bennett provided explanation. Chair Larson suggested tabling any change to this requirement and all
31 indicated agreement.

32
33 Chair Larson opened the discussion on proposed changes to the parking requirements in section 18.50.050
34 (G) in the draft code. She talked about new State legislation that prohibits required parking in most
35 circumstances for ADUs located within a ¼ mile of a major transit stop. There was general support for
36 continuing to require a parking space for each ADU. Chair Larson brought up the situation on Brookside
37 and how this might be an area where the exception to the requirement may be applicable. Chair Larson asked
38 Director Bennett to research the parking requirements and how the potential change would relate to a future
39 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stop. Director Bennett suggested creating a map that showed areas within a ¼ mile
40 of a major transit stops for Commission consideration. Chair Larson asked who supported the idea and all
41 indicated agreement with eliminating parking requirements for ADUs for projects within a ¼ mile of a major
42 transit stop.

43
44 Chair Larson moved the discussion to proposed changes to the accessory building provisions in section
45 18.50.060 (A) which limits lot coverage for such structures. Director Bennett reminded Commissioners of
46 their discussion at the July meeting regarding increasing the maximum coverage for accessory buildings from
47 1000 to 1500 sq. ft. Chair Larson asked which Commissioners supported the amendment and all indicated
48 that they did support it.

49
50 Chair Larson opened the discussion of the draft provisions in section 18.60.060 (B). Cmr. Saunders said that
51 critical areas could limit where accessory structures are located and that he supported providing the flexibility
52 to have structures within the front yard. Director Bennett provided clarification on how accessory buildings

1 are defined. He said that the proposed amendment would allow for accessory structures that included ADUs
2 to be sited in places other than the rear yard area and that the amendment works in tandem with subsection
3 (E). Chair Larson summarized her understanding of the draft language and asked if the Commission would
4 like to recommend allowing for accessory structures in places other than the rear yard. Cmr. Gross said that
5 neighbors would be more likely to see accessory structures with this change but that he supported side yard
6 placement. Cmr. Fudge said that he doesn't want the Commission to recommend any change to this
7 provision and that these changes don't relate directly to ADUs. He said that there could be unintended
8 consequences for this change. Cmr. Cranmer agreed with Cmr. Fudge. Cmr. Kleweno said that he would
9 prefer not to discuss the issue. Chair Larson summarized the options to this point. She asked for the
10 Commission's opinion on what should be recommended. Cmr. Saunders said that he would support leaving
11 the language as is.

12
13 Chair Larson asked for Commissioners' opinions on the provisions in section 18.60.060 (C). There was
14 consensus to support the provision as drafted.

15
16 Chair Larson then asked for Commissioner comments on the draft changes to section 18.60.060 (D). Cmr.
17 Cranmer said that five feet from the property line seems close and could potentially cause issues if one
18 neighbor is allowed to build close to the property line and another may not, depending on who built first.
19 Director Bennett described the nature of the change and how the current regulations are applied and added
20 that the change would simple allow ADUs to be five feet from the rear lot line like other accessory buildings
21 including workshops. Chair Larson asked if there was support from Commissioners for the draft changes.
22 Cmr. Fudge said that he does not support the language as drafted and said that the ADUs should have the
23 same setback as the primary structure. He said that he would support five-foot setbacks for non ADUs.
24 Chair Larson asked if the Commissioners wanted to reduce the setback for ADUs in the rear yard. Cmr.
25 Gross suggested keeping the same setbacks as the primary dwelling unit. Commissioners indicated that they
26 supported having the same setbacks for ADUs as the underlying zoning district currently requires for primary
27 structures, however, after some additional discussion it was decided to not recommend any change to section
28 18.60.060 (D).

29
30 Chair Larson moved the discussion to the amendments proposed in section 18.60.060 (E) dealing with
31 building height. Director Bennett clarified that no change has occurred to the proposed amendments in this
32 section from the last meeting. He said that there seemed to consensus regarding the idea that the ADU could
33 be up to 25 feet in height if it doesn't exceed the height of the primary dwelling unit. Cmr. Gross asked how
34 height is measured and Director Bennett clarified how the city calculates building height. Chair Larson asked
35 if there was support from the Commissioners regarding the drafted language. All agreed except for Cmr.
36 Fudge. Cmr. Fudge said that a height increase to 25 feet could have some negative implications. He asked if
37 setbacks changed for differing building heights and Director Bennett responded that they did not. Cmr.
38 Fudge said he is concerned that privacy may be violated with higher buildings closer to lot lines. Chair Larson
39 asked whether there was support for the drafted language. Cmr. Saunders summarized the past discussions
40 on building height. Cmr. Gross suggested increasing rear setbacks an additional five feet for buildings above
41 15-feet in height. Chair Larson asked again where there was support from the Commissioners regarding the
42 drafted language. All but Cmr. Fudge indicated supported the draft language.

43
44 Chair Larson asked if anyone had questions about the proposed definition changes. There were no questions
45 or discussion. Chair Larson asked if anyone had reservations with the code language as discussed tonight.
46 Additional discussion occurred on building height. The Commission also discussed maximum floor area for
47 ADUs. Cmr. Fudge said that a builder he met indicated that there are ways to circumvent the ADU rules.
48 Director Bennett indicated that neighbors typically watch each other's activities, and that violations are kept
49 in check. Chair Larson asked if the amendments as proposed could result in an ADU that is over 2,000
50 square feet. Director Bennett asked for clarification of the question and Chair Larson said that section B in
51 18.50.050 and section A in 18.50.060 could result in an excessively sized ADU. Director Bennett responded

1 that the floor area of an accessory building could be over 2000 sq. ft. but that the ADU could never exceed
2 1000 sq. ft in floor area.

3

- 4 • Discuss public engagement event for Commission's proposed set of recommended amendments

5

6 Chair Larson asked the Commission how they wanted to involve the public in the discussion of their ADU
7 code recommendations. She suggested notifying the public that the Commission is close to a
8 recommendation and doing a presentation before a regular meeting. Cmr. Saunders indicated that he liked
9 that idea but would like to see a clean draft of the code amendments prior to the meeting. Chair Larson
10 asked if the draft could be published prior to the meeting with the public. Director Bennett said that he
11 could get the material out two weeks before the next meeting. Cmr. Fudge agreed with having public
12 comment prior to recommending changes to the Council. Cmr. Saunders agreed with having a draft
13 presented and said that a summary of the Commission's intentions should be provided to the public. Chair
14 Larson summarized the public involvement and suggested using the first hour of the meeting to introduce it
15 to the public and the second hour to finalize items. There was no objection to the approach outlined by
16 Chair Larson. Cmr. Kleweno asked if the draft code amendments could be published prior to public
17 outreach. It was determined that they could be published in advance.

18

19 **New Business**

20 None.

21

22 **Reports and Announcements**

23 None from staff.

24

25 **Additional Citizen Comments**

26 Don Fiene located at 4014 NE 178 Street - Mr. Fiene indicated that the maximum square footage in his study
27 represented all floor area within the structure. He said that he looked at relief of setbacks on some lots and
28 indicated that there are a significant number of larger lots that could site an ADU. He suggested relaxing
29 setbacks but enforcing height on smaller lots. He went onto describe some background on the study he was
30 involved with in the past.

31

32 **Agenda for Next Meeting:**

33 Similar to this agenda. It was determined that the first hour of the meeting would be spent on public
34 engagement and the second would be for finalizing the recommendation for code amendments to Council.
35 Director Bennett said that the next meeting would be advertised as a hearing for the recommendation of the
36 ADU regulations as drafted.

37

38 **Adjournment:**

39 Cmr. Gross moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Fudge seconded, and the motion carried unanimously. The
40 meeting was adjourned at 9: 22 pm.

41

42 APPROVED:

43

44

45

46 _____
47 Maddy Larson, Chair



Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Steve Bennett, Planning Director
Date: August 31, 2021
Re: September 14, 2021 Meeting Agenda Materials (first installment)
Attachment: 1. Draft Amendments to Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Accessory Structure Regulations being considered by the Planning Commission (PC) at the Sept. 14, 2021 Meeting

At the July 13, 2021 meeting, Commissioners reviewed draft amendments to LFPMC Ch. 18.50.060 (Accessory Structures) and discussed which provisions of Ch. 18.50.050 (Accessory Dwelling Units) regulations should be the focus of recommended amendments to the Council.

At the August 10th meeting, draft amendments, options for potential amendments, and policy questions pertaining to both LFPMC Ch. 18.50.060 (Accessory Structures) and Ch. 18.50.050 (Accessory Dwelling Units) were reviewed and discussed by the Commission. Attachment 1 is an updated set of amendments to Chapters 18.50.050 and 18.50.060 that reflects staff's interpretation of Commissioners' guidance at the August 10th meeting.

At the August 10th meeting, the Commission directed staff to use the City's social media platforms to reach out and encourage public comment on the draft changes in Attachment 1 at the September 14th regular meeting. To assist those who may not have been following the Commission's discussions, the comment column of Attachment 1 includes explanations of the draft changes and notes on any linkages to other changes.

After the public engagement portion of the meeting, Commissioners can discuss whether any additional changes are warranted based on public comments and potentially vote on a recommended set of amendments. If Commissioners do not feel they are ready to make a recommendation to Council, it may be advisable to schedule a second meeting in September.

1 **Draft Amendments to Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Accessory Structure**
2 **Regulations being considered by the Planning Commission (PC) at the Sept. 14,**
3 **2021 Meeting**

4 **18.50.050 Accessory dwelling units.**

5 Accessory dwelling units, as defined by this title, may be permitted on lots of at least 7,200
6 square feet, and provided they meet the following development criteria:

7 A. Only one accessory dwelling unit will be permitted per residential lot. except that one
8 attached and one detached accessory dwelling unit may be permitted on lots with an area over
9 one acre;

10 B. The accessory dwelling unit floor area must be at least 300 square feet, but may not exceed 50
11 percent of the total area of the principal residence or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less;

12 C. Accessory dwelling units on lots less than 15,00010,000 square feet in area must be developed
13 within the existing primary residenceattached;

14 D. Accessory dwelling units on lots of 15,00010,000 square feet or greater may be developed as
15 an accessory structuredetached or part of an accessory building; provided, however, that the
16 accessory dwelling unit shall meet the requirements of LFPSC 18.50.060;

17 E. Either the primary residence or the accessory dwelling unit must be owner-occupied;

18 F. Garage space may be converted only if the same number of off-street parking spaces are
19 provided elsewhere on the property;

20 G. One off-street parking space per accessory dwelling unit, in addition to that required for a
21 single-family dwelling, shall be provided except no off-street parking is required for accessory
22 dwelling unit(s) when it can be demonstrated that some portion of the subject parcel is within ¼
23 mile of a transit stop located in the SR 522 right-of-way;

24 H. The total number of people who may occupy principal residence and the accessory unit,
25 together, shall not exceed the number of people who may occupy a one-family dwelling.

26 **18.50.060 Accessory structures and buildings.**

27 Accessory buildings and structures are permitted uses in single-family dwelling zones, provided:

28 A. The total combined lot coverage of accessory buildings shall occupy or cover no floor area of
29 all accessory buildings shall not occupy more than 10 percent of the total area of the lot up to a
30 maximum of 1,0001,500 square feet;

Commented [SB1]: Draft language provided in response to PC discussion allowing one attached and one detached ADU on lots greater than one acre.

Commented [SB2]: Draft deletion provided in response to PC discussion regarding removing minimum floor area requirement. Building codes would ensure that no room for habitation is less than 7 ft. by 10 ft. and address other minimum living standards. All dwelling units (including ADUs) must also comply with this zoning definition:

“Dwelling unit” means a single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons, not to exceed one family, and which includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

Commented [SB3]: PC proposes to amend subsections C. and D to lower this threshold so that lots of 10,000 sq. ft. or larger can have a detached ADU. Lots with an area between 7,200 and 10,000 sq. ft. would only be allowed to have an attached ADU.

Commented [SB4]: With the passage of Senate Bill 6617, it is the City's understanding that there needs to be an exception to the parking requirements for areas within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the transit stops on SR 522. At Sept. 14 mtg, the PC will be reviewing more information about the areas where this exception may apply.

Commented [SB5]: LFP's residential zoning provisions generally regulate the horizontal size of buildings through ‘lot coverage’. This change would make it the same for accessory structures. This change will also create flexibility to build a two-story accessory building if it includes an ADU (also see proposed changes in subsections B. and E. below).

Commented [SB6]: This change will allow owners of lots larger than 10,000 sq. ft. to have an additional 500 square feet of lot coverage devoted to accessory buildings while still having to meet the maximum lot coverage for the all buildings on the lot.

1 B. Accessory buildings ~~that do not include an accessory dwelling unit~~ may only be placed in a
2 rear yard;

3 C. Accessory buildings shall be 10 feet or more from the ~~principal main~~ buildings;

4 D. Accessory buildings may be placed no closer than five feet to the rear lot line, excluding
5 accessory dwelling units, which may be placed no closer than 15 feet to the rear property line;

6 E. Accessory building height shall not exceed 15 feet, ~~except those accessory buildings which~~
7 ~~include an accessory dwelling unit, which can be up to 25 feet in height provided that the~~
8 ~~building meets all zoning regulations pertaining to the primary or main building. In no case shall~~
9 ~~the accessory building exceed the height of the primary building.~~

10

11 **Chapter 18.08 DEFINITIONS**

12 **18.08.020 Accessory use or accessory building.**

13 “Accessory use” or “accessory building” means a subordinate use, structure, building or portion
14 of a building located on the same lot as the main use or building to which it is accessory.

15 **18.08.030 Accessory dwelling unit, attached.**

16 “~~Attached Aa~~ccessory dwelling unit” means a dwelling unit subordinate to a single-family
17 dwelling unit which:

18 A. ~~Is located within the or attached to a~~ single-family dwelling unit ~~or~~

19 B. ~~Is located within an accessory building.~~

20 **18.08.033 Accessory dwelling unit, detached.**

21 “~~Detached accessory dwelling unit~~” means a dwelling unit subordinate to a single-family
22 dwelling unit which is constructed as part of an accessory building.

23 **18.08.290 Dwelling, single-family.**

24 “Single-family dwelling” means a detached residential dwelling unit, designed for and occupied
25 by one family.

26 **18.08.300 Dwelling unit.**

Commented [SB7]: This change works in tandem with proposed changes to subsections A. and E. to provide more flexibility for accessory buildings that include an ADU. The result of this change is to allow accessory buildings that include an ADU in the side and front yards provided all other setback, lot coverage and height restrictions are met.

Commented [SB8]: This change works in tandem with proposed changes to subsections A. and B. to provide more flexibility for accessory buildings that include an ADU. The result of this change is to allow accessory buildings that include an ADU to be 25 feet in height provided all other setback and lot coverage restrictions are met and that it is no taller than the primary residence.

1 “Dwelling unit” means a single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or
2 more persons, not to exceed one family, and which includes permanent provisions for living,
3 sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.