



King County
Department of Development
and Environmental Services
3600 - 136th Place Southeast
Bellevue, Washington 98006-1400

REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE - MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: March 24, 1995

TO: Greg Kipp
Terry Brunner
Harold Vandergriff
Mike Sinsky

Lisa Pringle
Anna Nelson
Ken Dinsmore

FM: Jerry Balcom *JB 3/21/95*

Present: Terry Brunner, Anna Nelson, Ken Dinsmore, Henryk Hiller

1. KCC 21A.18.110(A) provides that off-street parking for single detached dwellings must be located on site. It goes on to state: "For all other residential dwellings, at least a portion of parking areas shall be located within 100 feet from the building(s) they are required to serve" (KCC 21A.18.110(A)(2)). Can off-street parking for multifamily projects be located on a different lot than the residential units? If so, would that parking area be considered a permitted primary use on that other lot?

The committee determined that parking for a multifamily project may be located on another lot if some portion of the parking area is within 100 feet of the buildings being served (KCC 21A.18.110(A)(2); see also KCC 21A.18.020(C)).

Parking areas are permitted uses only under KCC 21A.08.060(A), which refers to SIC 752. SIC 752 identifies only establishments engaged in the temporary parking of cars, usually on an hourly, daily, or monthly contract or fee basis. The committee determined that this use category would not include the parking for a multifamily project. As a result, parking for multifamily project can be located on another lot only if it meets the shared parking requirements of KCC 21A.18.040.

A code amendment should be considered to clarify the ways in which parking may be located on a lot different from the one with the multifamily dwelling.



2. Legislative update.

- A. **Swimming Pools.** The swimming pool ordinance (95-072), extending fencing standards to above-ground pools, passed out of the GMH&E Committee on March 22. The committee determined that the proposal is subject to the 60-day state notice requirement.
- B. **Lot Coverage.** The lot coverage amendments (95-158) also passed out of the GMH&E Committee on March 22. The amendments would remove building coverage as a separate zoning code standard, increase impervious surface coverage limits in the Rural, UR, R-1 and R-4 zones (as proposed by the Master Builders), reduce interior setbacks in the Rural, UR and R-1 zones to 5 or 10 feet (as proposed by the Master Builders), exclude from the definition of impervious surface certain roadway and driveway areas over which the applicant has no control, and permit extra impervious surface with a CUP. They would also reduce the RA-2.5 density to 0.2 units per acre. The amendments cannot be adopted until 60 days notice is given to the State. In addition, an emergency ordinance to permit development in subdivisions and short plats under the old zoning code for five years from the date of recording will be considered at next week's Committee meeting. That emergency ordinance will not need the 60 day notice period.
- C. **Vesting of Rezone Applications.** A proposed ordinance has been transmitted from the Executive which would vest rezone applications that were submitted in conjunction with a subdivision application prior to October 1, 1994 and which were still pending when Title 21A went into effect. This would allow the continued processing of the rezone under Title 21.
- D. **Minimum Density.** The proposed ordinance to clarify the minimum density calculation has been transmitted from the Executive but not yet scheduled before the GMH&E Committee.
- E. **Public Rules.** Emergency rules are in effect for trails, notice on title, and zoning adjuster hearings. Permanent rules will take effect in April for these as well as for the separate lot rule and the p-suffix sign rule.

JB:HH

cc: Bob Derrick
Tom McDonald
Mark Carey

Ikuno Masterson
Priscilla Kaufmann
Henryk Hiller