

Appendix B: Adequate provisions checklists

This appendix provides checklists to use in documenting barriers and programs and actions to achieve housing availability (RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)). These checklists include the following:

- Exhibit B1: Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B3: Supplemental barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing
- Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Documentation of the barriers to housing availability and the programs or actions needed to overcome these barriers must be in a public document and typically should be included as an appendix to the comprehensive plan housing element.

Barrier review checklists

Exhibit B1: Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	Yes	Hidden limitations such as parking location restrictions, upper story setbacks are confusing and limit actual development potential.	Update and remove unnecessary limitations on site development in CR zone.
Prohibiting some moderate density housing types, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Duplexes ○ Triplexes ○ Four/five/six-plexes ○ Townhomes ○ Cottage housing ○ Live-work units ○ Manufactured home parks 	Yes	Medium Density Residential (MDR) zoning district only permits duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and small townhomes, Low Density Residential (LDR) zoning district does not permit any of these housing types.	Consolidate LDR and MDR into new Community Residential (CR) zoning district and expand housing type allowances with middle housing update.
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	Minimum lot sizes of 6,500 sqft and 8,000 sqft in LDR and MDR respectively leave many existing legal lots of record nonconforming and increase difficulty of development through high land prices and	Reduce minimum lot size for CR zone to 5,000 sqft.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		square footage per unit requirements.	
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	LDR properties only currently allow a single dwelling unit and two ADUs, while MDR properties require 3,000 sqft of lot area per unit.	Create standards in CR zone to have a baseline of multiple units per parcel, with density increases for parcels above the minimum lot size.
Low maximum building heights	Yes	30' height restriction severely curtails ability to construct third floor.	Update maximum building height in CR zone to 35', and coordinate with fire and other departments to produce education materials on additional requirements for structures above 30'.
Large setback requirements	Yes	Large front yard setbacks and upper story setbacks restrict development footprints, and many types of housing forms.	Reduce front yard setbacks and expand allowed intrusions in setbacks with middle housing update.
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	High parking minimums, coupled with lack of nuance by unit type/size and flexibility of parking locations creates significant site area which must be dedicated to parking.	Reduce middle housing parking requirements to one per unit, or none if within proximity to transit per HB 1110.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
High impervious coverage limits	No	Building lot coverage and impervious coverage limits are high and unlikely to prevent development.	
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	No	No known issues	Guidance will be updated to provide better direction with implementation of middle housing regulations.
Other (for example: complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	No	N/A	
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No	Moderate density zones do not require CUPs for housing development.	
Design review	Yes	Design review has been changed to a fully administrative process, but standards are still ambiguous.	Update residential design review regulations to be compliant with HB 1293 for clear and objective design standards.
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees ¹	No	Fee information is openly available on the City's online permit webpage and	

¹ For example: guidance resources are unclear or difficult to find, no digital permit tracking system, staff do not provide fee estimates or permitting time estimates are unavailable or inaccurate.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		staff with available to discuss any questions from the public.	
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	Impact and connection fees do not reflect proportionate impacts of different scales of residential development.	Update fire, parks and transportation impact fees to comply with SB 5258, and ensure internal and external utility districts are updating connection fees for compliance as well.
Processing times and staffing challenges	No	Timelines have been updated comply with SB 5290, and all permitting is conduct online through the digital permit portal.	
SEPA process	No	Flexible exemption thresholds have been updated to be SEPA exempt for most projects up 200 housing units.	
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	Yes	Most desirable development sites in LDR and MDR zones have already been short platted and developed at lower densities in the last few decades.	Reduce minimum lot size for CR zoned parcels.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Environmental constraints	Yes	Many of the large undeveloped parcels within the LDR and MDR zoning contain streams, wetlands, steep slopes or other significant critical areas that limit site development potential.	?

Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	Yes (HDR, NCC, RCC, RC, MUO, RCM)	Hidden limitations such as parking location restrictions, upper story setbacks are confusing and limit actual development potential.	Remove unnecessary regulations such as upper story setbacks, and additional separation from lower density zones.
High minimum lot sizes	No	Minimum lot sizes are not exceptionally high, though the per unit density is a restrictive factor.	
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	Many zones in question require 2,000 sqft of lot area or more.	Consolidate unnecessary zone redundancy and increase density allowances for these zones.
Low maximum building heights	Yes	Low building height maximums of three to four stories limit development potential, even before factoring in other constraining factors.	Increase heights to at least four to five stories with bonuses for affordable housing and ground floor commercial.
Large setback requirements	Yes	Large front yard setbacks and upper story setbacks, and additional separation requirements from lower density zones restrict development footprints, and many types of housing forms.	Reduce front yard setbacks and remove additional upper story setbacks and separations from lower density zones.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	High parking minimums, coupled with lack of nuance by unit type/size and flexibility of parking locations creates significant site area which must be dedicated to parking.	Reduce parking requirements based on unit size, and proximity to transit.
High impervious coverage limits			
Lack of alignment between building and development codes	No	No known issues.	
Other (for example: ground floor retail requirements, open space requirements, complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	N/A		
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No		
Design review	Yes	Design review has been changed to a fully administrative process, but standards are still ambiguous.	Update residential design review regulations to be compliant with HB 1293 for clear and objective design standards.
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No	Fee information is openly available on the City's online permit webpage and staff with available to discuss any questions from the public.	
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	Impact and connection fees do not reflect proportionate	Update fire, parks and transportation impact fees to comply with SB 5258, and ensure internal

Appendix B: Adequate provisions checklists

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		impacts of different scales of residential development.	and external utility districts are updating connection fees for compliance as well.
Process times and staffing challenges	No	Staff has adopted code updates to comply with 5290 timelines.	
SEPA process	No	Flexible exemption thresholds have been updated to be SEPA exempt for most projects up 200 housing units.	
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	N/A	
Environmental constraints	Yes	Many undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels in zones allowing low-rise and mid-rise are constrained by various critical areas.	?

Exhibit B3: Supplementary barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities) ²	Yes	Minimum distance from transit requirement for emergency housing and PSH,, and minimum space distance between emergency housing, PSH and Transitional Housing facilities.	
Parking requirements	No	N/A	
On-site recreation and open space requirements	No	N/A	
Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone	No	N/A	
Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW 35A.21.314)	Yes	Currently limited to 45 occupants for emergency housing and shelters and 15-45 occupants for PSH and transitional housing.	
Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW 36.130.020)	Yes	Additional requirements for security and on-site services at emergency housing, PSH and transitional housing not	

² Note that RCW 35A.21.430 expressly states requirements on occupancy, spacing, and intensity of use may not prevent the siting of a sufficient number of permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, indoor emergency housing or indoor emergency shelters necessary to accommodate each code city's projected need for such housing and shelter under RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)(ii). The restrictions on these uses must be to protect public health and safety.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
		required for other housing types.	
Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters, emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing	No	Other criteria, such as good neighbor agreement are minor and have flexibility.	

Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
<p>Consistent with HB 1337 (2023)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must allow two ADUs on each lot in urban growth areas; ○ May not require the owner to occupy the property, and may not prohibit sale as independent units, but may restrict the use of ADUs as short term rentals; ○ Must allow an ADU of at least 1,000 square feet; ○ Must set parking requirements based on distance from transit and lot size; ○ May not charge more than 50% of the impact fees charged for the principal unit; ○ Must permit ADUs in structures detached from the principal unit; ○ May not restrict roof heights of ADUs to less than 24 feet, unless that limitation applies to the principal unit; ○ May not impose setback requirements, yard coverage limits, tree retention mandates, restrictions on entry door locations, aesthetic requirements, or requirements for design review for ADUs that are more restrictive than those for principal units; ○ Must allow an ADUs on any lot that meets the minimum lot size required for the principal unit; ○ Must allow detached ADUs to be sited at a lot line if the lot line abuts a public alley, unless the city or county routinely plows snow on the public alley; ○ Must allow conversions from existing structures, even if they violate current code requirements for setbacks or lot coverage; and ○ May not require public street improvements as a condition of permitting ADUs. 	Largely	Not consistent with impact fees, but consistent with all other criteria with Fall 2023 update.	Need transportation and park impact fees to be updated to comply.
Unclear development regulations	No	Have updated regulations and posted ADU guidance on City's permitting website.	
Large setback requirements	Yes	Frontage yard setback of 20' makes ADU development difficult for many sites.	Reduce front yard setback to 10'.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
Off-street parking requirements	No	Parking requirements consistent with maximum requirements per HB 1337	
Other (for example: burdensome design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements, open space requirements, etc.)	No	N/A	
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No	Fee information is openly available on the City's online permit webpage and staff with available to discuss any questions from the public.	
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees that are not proportionate to impact	Yes	Impact and connection fees do not reflect proportionate impacts of different scales of residential development.	Update fire, parks and transportation impact fees to comply with SB 5258, and ensure internal and external utility districts are updating connection fees for compliance as well.
Processing times and staffing challenges	No	Staff has adopted code updates to comply with 5290 timelines.	

Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status	Plans for implementation
Housing and related services sales tax (RCW 82.14.530)	No	
Affordable housing property tax levy (RCW 84.52.105)	No	Not planned at this time.
REET 2 (RCW 82.46.035) – GMA jurisdictions only and only available through 2025	No	
Affordable Housing Sales Tax Credit (RCW 82.14.540) – was only available to jurisdictions through July 2020	No	
Lodging Tax (RCW 67.28.150 and RCW 67.28.160) to repay general obligation bonds or revenue bonds	No	
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Tax (RCW 82.14.460) – jurisdictions with a population over 30,000	N/A	Population unlikely to exceed 30,000 for some time.
Donating surplus public lands for affordable housing projects (RCW 39.33.015)	No	No immediate plans for adoption of policy to donate surplus public lands for affordable housing.
Impact fee waivers for affordable housing projects (RCW 82.02.060)	No	There are currently fee reductions, but not waivers for affordable housing projects.
Application fee waivers or other benefits for affordable housing projects (RCW 36.70A.540)	Yes	There are currently permit reductions for affordable housing projects.
Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) with affordable housing requirement (RCW 84.14)	Yes	8 and 12 year MFTEs are offered in limited areas of the City with caps on the maximum number of units that can received MFTEs, and various eligibility criteria. Expansion of the MFTE program with other multifamily updates in another area of the

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status	Plans for implementation
		City would likely be needed to increase housing growth in those areas.
General funds (including levy lid lifts to increase funds available)	No	

* Some tools may be unavailable for certain jurisdictions. For example, only GMA jurisdictions can use REET 2, or the surrounding county may have already implemented the housing and related services sales tax. See MRSC’s summary of [Affordable Housing Funding Sources](#) for more details and the Association of Washington Cities (AWC)/MRSC booklet on [Homelessness & housing toolkit for cities](#) (2022).