
DOCKET REQUEST NARRATIVE – REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

Please attach a narrative responding to the following questions. Attach any additional sheets, supporting maps or graphics. Answer each question separately and reference the question number in your answer. **The application will be considered incomplete without a narrative answering all of the following questions.**

1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.
 - a. Indicate the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements, maps, goals or policies or the specific sections of the development code you propose to amend.
 - b. If the proposal would amend existing Comprehensive Plan or development code text, please provide the proposal in underline/strikeout format with text to be added indicated by underlining and text to be deleted indicated with ~~strikeouts~~.
 - c. If a map amendment is proposed, please provide a map that clearly outlines the areas proposed to be changed.
2. How does the proposal benefit the community or the environment?
3. Explain how the request relates to the applicable decision criteria (MICC 19.15.250(D) for code amendments, and MICC 19.15.230(F) for Comprehensive Plan amendments, see below).
4. For Comprehensive plan amendments: Is the proposal consistent the Growth Management Act and King County Countywide Planning Policies?
5. For development code amendments: how does the proposal align with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Signature:  Date: 9-30-2022

I

SUGGESTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CODE AMENDMENT

MICC 19.02.020 Residential Development Standards

MICC 19.02.020(D)(2)(a) Gross Floor Area

Suggested Code Amendment:

I suggest MICC 19.02.020(D)(2)(a) be amended to reduce ceiling height from 12 feet to 10 feet before it is counted as clerestory space at 150% of GFA.

Analysis:

The Citizens and Council spent approximately three years rewriting the Residential Development Code. A primary motivation in the rewrite was to deal with citizen concern over “massing”, or what citizens considered out-of-scale residential development, which the Planning Commission addressed as Gross Floor Area to Lot Area Ratio (GFAR).

One of the factors that increased GFAR and led to the code rewrite was Administrative Interpretation 13-01 that allowed all clerestory space to be counted as 100% GFA.

Massing is a three-dimensional concept based on the exterior volume of the house. Whether interior space is counted as GFA or not, it is a reality in the exterior volume, or massing, of the house. GFA, meanwhile, is a two-dimensional term subject to exemption.


Ten-foot ceiling height is the industry standard for a maximum non-cathedral ceiling. The Planning Commission never recommended a 12-foot ceiling height in its recommendation to the Council, but recommended 10 feet. 12 feet was the sudden recommendation of former council member Dan Grausz at the Council’s final adoption hearing for the new Residential Development Code.

A ceiling height of 12 feet, before counting as clerestory space, allows each floor of a two-story house to increase its interior and exterior volume by 20%, directly contrary to the goals of the RDS. Furthermore, it creates a much greater need for heating and cooling, and is contrary to the purposes of green building standards.

DOCKET REQUEST NARRATIVE – REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

Please attach a narrative responding to the following questions. Attach any additional sheets, supporting maps or graphics. Answer each question separately and reference the question number in your answer. **The application will be considered incomplete without a narrative answering all of the following questions.**

1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.
 - a. Indicate the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements, maps, goals or policies or the specific sections of the development code you propose to amend.
 - b. If the proposal would amend existing Comprehensive Plan or development code text, please provide the proposal in underline/strikeout format with text to be added indicated by underlining and text to be deleted indicated with ~~strikeouts~~.
 - c. If a map amendment is proposed, please provide a map that clearly outlines the areas proposed to be changed.
2. How does the proposal benefit the community or the environment?
3. Explain how the request relates to the applicable decision criteria (MICC 19.15.250(D) for code amendments, and MICC 19.15.230(F) for Comprehensive Plan amendments, see below).
4. For Comprehensive plan amendments: Is the proposal consistent the Growth Management Act and King County Countywide Planning Policies?
5. For development code amendments: how does the proposal align with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Signature:  Date: 9-30-2022

II

SUGGESTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CODE AMENDMENT

MICC 19.02.020 Residential Development Standards

MICC 19.02.020(D)(2) Gross Floor Area

MICC 19.16.010(G)(2)(b) Gross Floor Area Exemption for Covered Decks on the First Level

Suggested Code Amendment:

I suggest MICC 19.02.020(D)(2) be amended to include exterior covered decks in the definition of Gross Floor Area, which presently only references exterior walls even though covered decks on levels above the first level are counted towards the GFA limit.

I further suggest that MICC 19.02.020(D)(2) and 19.16.010(G)(2)(b) be amended to include covered porches on the first level in the calculation of Gross Floor Area.

Analysis:

The Citizens and Council spent approximately three years rewriting the Residential Development Code. A primary motivation in the rewrite was to deal with citizen concern over "massing", or what citizens considered out of scale residential development, which the Planning Commission addressed as Gross Floor Area to Lot Area Ratio (GFAR).

One of the main actions in the new Residential Development Code was to remove discretion from the City Planning Department (Development Services Group at that time, now Community Planning Department), especially when it came to deviations and variances. Unfortunately, that led the prior director to simply amend the entire code when attempting to address a request from a citizen for relief from the Code.

One of these Amendments was to exempt covered decks on the first level from the GFA limits because the applicant wished to have a covered barbecue area. Instead, the code amendment exempts all covered decks on the first level from the GFA limit.

There is very little difference in massing between a deck with a railing and roof from a room. The only difference is a window. Exempting first level decks from GFA limits greatly expands the massing of the house.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT 2

To be fair to Evan Maxim, amending this definition to limit its scope was on his agenda before his departure.

A homeowner already has the benefit of an 18-inch eave that is exempt from the GFA limit. At most, any barbecue area that needed to be sheltered from the elements would be 5'x 5', or 25 square feet. I suggest that covered decks on the first level be counted in their entirety towards the GFA limit, or in the alternative a 25-foot exemption be allowed for a barbecue area.

DOCKET REQUEST FORM

The following information is required to be included. Failure to complete this form may result in the application being incomplete. Incomplete applications will not be considered during the annual docket process.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name: Daniel Thompson
Address: 7265 N. Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA 98040
Phone: (206) 622-0670
Email: danielphompson@hotmail.com

AGENT/CONSULTANT/ATTORNEY: (COMPLETE IF PRIMARY CONTACT IS DIFFERENT FROM APPLICANT)

Name: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____
Email: _____

REQUEST INFORMATION

Please complete a separate Docket Request Form for each item you are requesting to be added to the Docket.

Is this request related to a specific property or zone? Yes No

If yes, please complete the following information:

Property Owner: _____
Address: _____
County Assessors Parcel No.: _____
Parcel Size (sq. ft.): _____

If the application is submitted by an agent/consultant/attorney, please demonstrate that that the application has been submitted with the consent of all owners of the affected property. For example, attach a signed letter providing consent.

Is this request for a Comprehensive Plan amendment or a development code amendment?

Comprehensive Plan amendment Development code amendment


Would you like to submit a suggestion for a comprehensive plan or development code amendment, or is this an application for a specific amendment (check boxes)? Please note: applications are subject to applicable permit fees.

Suggestion Application

DOCKET REQUEST NARRATIVE – REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

Please attach a narrative responding to the following questions. Attach any additional sheets, supporting maps or graphics. Answer each question separately and reference the question number in your answer. **The application will be considered incomplete without a narrative answering all of the following questions.**

1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.
 - a. Indicate the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements, maps, goals or policies or the specific sections of the development code you propose to amend.
 - b. If the proposal would amend existing Comprehensive Plan or development code text, please provide the proposal in underline/strikeout format with text to be added indicated by underlining and text to be deleted indicated with ~~strikeouts~~.
 - c. If a map amendment is proposed, please provide a map that clearly outlines the areas proposed to be changed.
2. How does the proposal benefit the community or the environment?
3. Explain how the request relates to the applicable decision criteria (MICC 19.15.250(D) for code amendments, and MICC 19.15.230(F) for Comprehensive Plan amendments, see below).
4. For Comprehensive plan amendments: Is the proposal consistent the Growth Management Act and King County Countywide Planning Policies?
5. For development code amendments: how does the proposal align with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Signature:  Date: 9-30-2022

III

SUGGESTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CODE AMENDMENT

MICC 19.02.020 Residential Development Standards

MICC 19.02.020(c)(2)(a)(iii) Yards for Waterfront Lots

MICC 19.02.040(D)(1) Garages and Carports/Yard Intrusion

Suggested Code Amendment:

I suggest MICC 19.02.040(D)(1) be eliminated. In the alternative, I suggest that MICC 19.02.040(D)(1) not be applicable to a waterfront lot if the waterfront lot has switched its front and rear yards subject to MICC 19.02.020(c)(2)(a)(iii).

Analysis:

MICC 19.02.020(c)(2)(a)(iii) allows a waterfront lot to switch its front and rear yard because the Department of Ecology requires a 25-foot buffer between the structure and the ordinary high water mark.


However, MICC 19.02.040(D)(1) allows garages and carports to be built within 10 feet of the property line of the *front* yard if there is more than 4 vertical feet difference as measured between the bottom wall of the building and ground elevation of the front yard property line where such property is closest to the building.

Ideally, 19.02.040(D)(1) should be eliminated. It is a building or structure above the ground level that extends into the yard setback. However, in the alternative, 19.02.040(D)(1) should not be available to waterfront lots that have flipped their front and rear yards pursuant to 19.02.020(c)(2)(a)(iii) because essentially it reduces the yard between the upper house to 10 feet. The effect of this provision can easily be seen as one takes a boat around Lake Washington. The waterfront house and the house directly behind look as though they are one contiguous property.

DOCKET REQUEST NARRATIVE – REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

Please attach a narrative responding to the following questions. Attach any additional sheets, supporting maps or graphics. Answer each question separately and reference the question number in your answer. **The application will be considered incomplete without a narrative answering all of the following questions.**

1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.
 - a. Indicate the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements, maps, goals or policies or the specific sections of the development code you propose to amend.
 - b. If the proposal would amend existing Comprehensive Plan or development code text, please provide the proposal in underline/strikeout format with text to be added indicated by underlining and text to be deleted indicated with ~~strikeouts~~.
 - c. If a map amendment is proposed, please provide a map that clearly outlines the areas proposed to be changed.
2. How does the proposal benefit the community or the environment?
3. Explain how the request relates to the applicable decision criteria (MICC 19.15.250(D) for code amendments, and MICC 19.15.230(F) for Comprehensive Plan amendments, see below).
4. For Comprehensive plan amendments: Is the proposal consistent the Growth Management Act and King County Countywide Planning Policies?
5. For development code amendments: how does the proposal align with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Signature:  Date: 9-30-2022

IV

SUGGESTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CODE AMENDMENT

MICC 19.02.020 Residential Development Standards

MICC 19.02.020(D)(3)(b) Gross Floor Area Incentives for ADU's

Suggested Code Amendment:

I suggest limiting the Gross Floor Area Incentives for ADU's in MICC 19.02.020(D)(3)(b) to lots 8,400 square feet or smaller.

Analysis:

One of the primary purposes of the rewrite of the Residential Development Code was to address the massing and out of scale development in the smaller lot neighborhoods, with lots 8,400 square feet and less. MICC 19.02.020(D)(3)(b) allows a lot 10,000 square feet or less to have up to 5% additional Gross Floor Area for an ADU. (19.02.020(D)(3)(a) already allows a lot 7,500 sf lot or below an additional 5% GFA or 3,000 sf for either an ADU or the main house.)

A 10,000-square foot lot that can have a 4,000-square foot house does not need an additional 5% Gross Floor Area for an ADU. The primary tool used by the Planning Commission to reduce massing and out-of-scale residential development was to reduce GFAR from 45% to 40%, except this provision is directly contrary to that goal.

MICC 19.02.020(D)(3)(b) should be amended to limit the 5% additional GFA to lots 8,400 square feet and less.

DOCKET REQUEST FORM

The following information is required to be included. Failure to complete this form may result in the application being incomplete. Incomplete applications will not be considered during the annual docket process.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name: Daniel Thompson
Address: 7265 N. Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA 98040
Phone: (206) 622-0670
Email: danielphompson@hotmail.com

AGENT/CONSULTANT/ATTORNEY: (COMPLETE IF PRIMARY CONTACT IS DIFFERENT FROM APPLICANT)

Name: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____
Email: _____

REQUEST INFORMATION

Please complete a separate Docket Request Form for each item you are requesting to be added to the Docket.

Is this request related to a specific property or zone? Yes No

If yes, please complete the following information:

Property Owner: _____
Address: _____
County Assessors Parcel No.: _____
Parcel Size (sq. ft.): _____

If the application is submitted by an agent/consultant/attorney, please demonstrate that that the application has been submitted with the consent of all owners of the affected property. For example, attach a signed letter providing consent.

Is this request for a Comprehensive Plan amendment or a development code amendment?

Comprehensive Plan amendment Development code amendment


Would you like to submit a suggestion for a comprehensive plan or development code amendment, or is this an application for a specific amendment (check boxes)? Please note: applications are subject to applicable permit fees.

Suggestion Application

DOCKET REQUEST NARRATIVE – REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS

Please attach a narrative responding to the following questions. Attach any additional sheets, supporting maps or graphics. Answer each question separately and reference the question number in your answer. **The application will be considered incomplete without a narrative answering all of the following questions.**

1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.
 - a. Indicate the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements, maps, goals or policies or the specific sections of the development code you propose to amend.
 - b. If the proposal would amend existing Comprehensive Plan or development code text, please provide the proposal in underline/strikeout format with text to be added indicated by underlining and text to be deleted indicated with ~~strikeouts~~.
 - c. If a map amendment is proposed, please provide a map that clearly outlines the areas proposed to be changed.
2. How does the proposal benefit the community or the environment?
3. Explain how the request relates to the applicable decision criteria (MICC 19.15.250(D) for code amendments, and MICC 19.15.230(F) for Comprehensive Plan amendments, see below).
4. For Comprehensive plan amendments: Is the proposal consistent the Growth Management Act and King County Countywide Planning Policies?
5. For development code amendments: how does the proposal align with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Signature:  Date: 9-30-2022

V

SUGGESTION FOR RESIDENTIAL CODE AMENDMENT

MICC 19.02.020 Residential Development Standards

MICC 19.02.020(G)(2)(a) and (b) Parking Requirements

Suggested Code Amendment:

I suggest that MICC 19.02.020(G)(2)(a) and (b) be amended to reduce house GFA from 3,000 sf to 2,000 sf in order to reduce covered parking spaces to one covered and one uncovered space.

Analysis:

During the Residential Development Code rewrite, parking requirements for residential houses were reduced based upon the square footage of the house pursuant to MICC 19.02.020(G)(2)(a) and (b). This was a very contentious amendment. Ironically, many builders are hesitant to not build a 3-car garage on Mercer Island since many of their first-time home buyers come from off-island to the east, where a 3-car garage is common.

A 3,000 sf home is quite large. For example, I have raised two children in a 2,700 sf house with a 3-car garage on Mercer Island. A 3,000 sf house can accommodate a two-covered garage space.

Ancillary issues from reducing parking requirements for houses 3,000 feet and below that were not well-discussed during the Residential Code rewrite include:

1. Mercer Island effectively has no intra-island transit. The 201 that circled the Mercers was eliminated because of low ridership, in part because it is very difficult for citizens to even get up their steep drives to one of the Mercers, and the 201 was very slow.
2. One covered garage space is usually required for the three different bins – garbage, recycle, and yard waste – plus storage of bikes, skis, tools, and other personal equipment. For the first 16 years I lived in a small house on First Hill with a one-car garage, which effectively was a zero-car garage since there was too much stuff in the garage to park a car in it. This effectively moves either cars, or items such as garbage bins, out into the yard and street.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT 5

3. Since Mercer Island residential neighborhoods have few sidewalks, cars parked along the street push kids walking to the school bus out into the middle of the road. This is especially problematic when it is dark.
4. Overflow street parking in the residential neighborhoods makes dedicated bike paths almost impossible, including on the Mercers. Not unlike the Town Center that only requires one parking stall per unit, reducing parking requirements simply subsidizes builders by shifting parking from onsite to the street.

The original intent was to ameliorate the reduction in GFAR limits in the new code. A resident would convert one parking space to living area. However, a 3,000 sf house simply does not need this incentive, and the GFA necessary to qualify for reduced parking should be reduced from 3,000 sf to 2,000 sf.