

Langley Multi-Family Form-Based Code Update

Community Comment Matrix and Responses

This matrix summarizes many important community concerns regarding multi-family development in Langley. The Multi Family Form Based Code (MF FBC) zoning can help with some of these concerns, but others are outside its jurisdiction and must be handled through comprehensive plan policy, development agreements, utility and services pricing, land banks, and other support networks. To submit additional comments, please email planning@langleywa.org. To see the current draft and other supporting information, see [https://www.langleywa.org/departments/community_planning_and_building_department/multi_family_\(mf\)_infill_zoning_code.php](https://www.langleywa.org/departments/community_planning_and_building_department/multi_family_(mf)_infill_zoning_code.php). Thanks!

Color Key

	Addressed through the Multi-Family Form-Based Code zoning regulations
	Addressed through other policy or ordinance
	Not addressed through this process or general comment

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Parking	General support for 1 parking space per dwelling unit. Particularly if allow on-pavement parking in residential zones, at least on one side. As long as they are still walkable and bikeable.	Should permit on-street parking in the streets that are wide enough, so that guests can park, and so that cars are encouraged to go the speed limit.	18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	City Council	26-Oct
Setbacks	General support for buildings getting closer to the street, if there is a way to mitigate the street noise. And to have parking behind the building.	Suggesting 10 to 12', to give room for a nice little garden and privacy. Gives more room to be able to put parking behind the building, so that it is friendlier to the pedestrians.	18.13.050B	City Council	26-Oct
Heights	General support for 3 stories with some conditions attached.	Consider tying extra story if affordable units are permitted.	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	City Council	26-Oct
Height	Do basements and underground parking count as a story?	No. We usually do not count daylight basements if they are not facing the street.	18.13.050E	City Council	26-Oct
Height	Where are you measuring stories from?	We usually measure the stories from the sidewalk from the front of the building, if measuring in feet. If measuring in stories, from the top of the slab or the top of the floor joist.	18.13.050E	City Council	26-Oct
Design	How does this tie into the line we had in the budget for design guidelines?	This morphed into the form-based code. Design guidelines are not currently particularly instructive. Form-based codes are good at replacing design guidelines with clear regulations. Normally design guidelines are not clear and objective. The DRB nor the applicant know what to predict. Too much is left up to the whim of the DRB. Try to embed all crucial design issues, except for architectural styles, colors, and roof pitches. Get you where you want to go, in a clear and objective way.	All	Christy Korrow, Council 1	26-Oct
Affordability	Assume that the City gets a crack at it, through the DRB, to address affordability?	The goal is to get a code that everyone is comfortable enough with, people can just pull a permit. Only development applications that request variances are required to go through a full public process.	All	Peter Morton, Council 5	26-Oct
Predictability	Would like two things: 1. Speed for the developer; 2. Reduction of risk. A compliant proposal that goes directly to permit is highly desirable. So development by right is what the Council should desire.	This is the best way to achieve affordability. Because of the time cost of money, developing a clear and predictable approval process is crucial to delivering more housing.	All	Peter Morton, Council 5	26-Oct
Height	Should we consider bonus height, reduced setbacks, reduced lot sizes, if permanently affordable.	Or an extra story if the units in that extra story are affordable. The goal is that have a mixture of affordable units and market rate units in the same building.	18.13.050E	Thomas Gill, Council 3	26-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Height	Could we say you can go to 3 stories if you are multifamily or 4 stories if permanently affordable?	If a portion of the units are affordable. Its unlikely the entire thing will be done to an affordable standard without subsidy.	18.13.050E	Dominique Emersons, Council 2	26-Oct
Views	Important to circle back to core values: Is it more important to preserve someone's partial view, or to increase a pathway to affordability?	It is very difficult to assure view protection without a view corridor ordinance.	Possible view corridor ordinance?	Christy Korrow, Council 1	26-Oct
Views	If we are saying that it would be possible for someone to put 3 stories on an RS7200 lot on the south side of 6th St, I could see how that would compromise the views.	Because of the existing development patterns there, it was not considered very likely for these to redevelop. Likely to redevelop: 1. Have sewer; 2. Are undeveloped or underdeveloped; 3. Do not have critical areas. There are few lots in Langley that have all three. The 3 stories would only apply to multifamily, not to single family.	All	Craig Cyr, Council 4	26-Oct
Applicability	If we implement this, are we changing the RM area? And are we saying that it applies only to RS7200, RS5000, and RM?	Yes. At this time, we are not suggesting any changes to the map for the underlying zoning. And the overlay is only proposed for those three districts.	18.13.030	Dominique Emersons, Council 2	26-Oct
Height	Can the maximum also apply to single family homes, so that they can add ADUs and tiny homes, since they won't be taking up all the space with shorter houses. 35' for all zones, and if people want to do multifamily, give them an extra story.	The way that it is being proposed is that it an overlay that only applies to these three zoning districts, in the Multifamily Form-Based Code Overlay. Just be aware that it will cause a commotion if make permanent changes to single family districts. The majority of the community has been very supportive of increasing affordability. Keep the processes separate, and then when people get comfortable, it's easy to make that text amendment.	18.13.050E	Thomas Gill, Council 3	26-Oct
Height	Would you consider allowing a multi family go higher? And would ADUs be different?	We usually do not differentiate between the primary residence and the ADU.	18.13.050E	Dominique Emersons, Council 2	26-Oct
Height	I have no objection going to 3 stories. The population pressure is anticipated to be significant. If we don't accommodate that without some intensification, we will encourage growth outside of Langley instead of inside. We may eventually end up absorbing development that is out of keeping.		18.13.050E	Peter Morton	26-Oct
Affordability	Will increasing the number of floors materially increase affordability?	Definitely. And we can delicately control the massing of the buildings so that they are in keeping with local character.	18.13.050	Christy Korrow, Council 1	26-Oct
Height	If we were to change the code to be by stories, could there be specific language to have maximum story height?	Yes. We normally specify maximum stories, and that floor to ceiling height may not exceed 'x'. And the first story may be taller. Then we will regulate mezzanines, that if they are larger than y%, they are counted as a story. Can ensure that we don't expose ourselves to unintended consequences.	18.13.050E	Craig Cyr, Council 4	26-Oct
Applicability	Why did you eliminate the RS15000?	It was part of the grant, recognizing that RS15000 was less likely to be a place where people would embrace multifamily infill, and the sewer would not be able to service.		Dominique Emersons, Council 2	26-Oct
Height	Do our rules today limit us to two stories, effectively?	Yes. And it also actively discourages the preservation of specimen trees, because of the reduced options. 1 space per unit instead of 2 per unit as the required minimum and smaller minimum setbacks help.	18.13.050E	Peter Morton	26-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Views	Views (buildings, trees, shore), access to sunlight, and parking are primary concerns about going higher. Should have 35' at a minimum.	Unless you invest a lot of money in view plane mapping, view preservation is a very subjective matter. It is almost impossible to litigate, so protection of viewshed becomes hard to defend. On parking, if go over 3 stories, usually have to come up with a parking alternative, since will not be able to accomodate onsite.		Dominique Emersons, Council 2	26-Oct
Height	What are the downsides of three stories? Do we really need to be scared of it? If the proportions are encouraged to be in keeping with local character. I am open to three stories.		18.13.050E	Christy Korrow, Council 1	26-Oct
Heights	Height restrictions in Langley are not in keeping with local character. A 3 or 4-story home on a smaller footprint can help with affordability. If it is not on my property, I do not have a right to the view. However, behind 6th Street or Edgecliff, there is not a view. So this is a valid place to raise height limits, especially if use lower buildings as a buffer.	When you have height measured in feet rather than stories, allows little flexibility for the designer to do something creative. If the max is 25', and a developer crams 3 stories in, will have reduced daylighting, reduced airflow, squatty proportions on fenestration (the openings in the building, the doors and windows). So we usually discourage clients from using feet, and instead govern by number of stories.	18.13.050E	Thomas Gill, Council 3	26-Oct
Height	I am very much in favor of the proposed Multifamily Infill zoning change. While it is not a silver bullet to affordability, increased density will allow for more smaller units that fit well within the character of Langley. The reduced parking is in line with actual parking needs and further reduces unnecessary costs. Reducing the setback will add to the village feel while providing more flexibility. In R5000 the 60% coverage is only slightly (5%) above the coverage currently allowed for a duplex(40%) plus a DADU(15% bonus). All in all this is an excellent proposal. The only minor modification that I would propose is to add five feet to overall height to make it easier to build three stories, as well as allow for three stories of modular stacked housing.	Height may be the overall greatest cause of concern, so this gentle densification could help increase affordability.	18.13.050E	JR Fulton	26-Oct
Affordability	How would additional height take form, if we want to incentivize more naturally occurring affordable housing?	The form is essential to ensure infill and redevelopment are in keeping with Langley character. The form-based code will carefully shape the form, through setbacks, maximum lot width, heights, and parking placement.	18.13.050	City Council	26-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Lower price barrier for entry into the housing market.			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	That we can limit the areas where this kind of infill is allowed, using environmental concerns and the fact that we have no way of controlling affordability (not to developers, but to the people)		18.13.030	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Provide diverse range of housing types to take advantage of cost efficiencies.		18.13.050 Table 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Allow for smaller housing to be developed economically		18.13.050 Table 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Minimal impact on neighborhood		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Feels like an attractive approach to increased housing options		18.13.050 Table 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Cost efficiencies could occur as a result		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	One parking place per unit is in line with the actual parking that is seen on multifamily projects. It also serves to reduce cost as well as provide for more landscaping as opposed to empty unused asphalt parking lots.		18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Lowering parking requirements		18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Reducing setbacks		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Shouldn't make large changes to what is already enabled		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Okay with three stories in careful locations near the town center		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Lower parking requirements and reduced setbacks will help with affordability without affecting the character of development.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3; 18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	There are no silver bullets for affordable housing, but this will make it significantly easier		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	The analysis and proposal are excellent and can result in lower cost housing. One minor change would be to add 5' to height to make it easier to do three stories.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	A better village feel with reduced setbacks. Also improves "eyes on the street" for greater safety.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Lower price barrier for entry into the housing market.		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Maralie Johnson approves reducing setbacks if it contributes to more affordable housing.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Craig: Fundamentally hopeful, but curious about the actual impacts on density.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Shelly hopes for a happy balance, but it isn't affordable its just more of the same. We need housing for young families with children.		18.13.050 Table 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	JR Fulton is extremely hopeful that it will be an improvement for affordability even if there are only 17 lots close to downtown.		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Happy balance - we need more housing but we need affordable units for young families with children		All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your hopes for this code?	Daren is very hopeful and really wants to see more options for affordability and even middle market options.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Focus on certain building types may preclude affordable options.	What might mitigate: As discussed at PAB, an additional five feet in height would add to affordability	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3, 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Impact on surrounding neighborhood	What might mitigate: For less costly and more affordable housing add 5' to the overall height in multifamily infill	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3, 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Concern about TOO much parking	What might mitigate: Does our city really need to have lot coverage of 70%	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3; 18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Inappropriate buildings (dumb design)	What might mitigate: No affordable housing written into this code	All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	There are sporadic properties where these could be built so I am concerned it might appear 'splotchy' throughout the area.	What might mitigate: More of the same, expensive housing	All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	The price of land and materials costs will make it very challenging to keep costs and prices down.	What might mitigate: No more pressure on our bluffs		Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	If parking requirements are relaxed, there may be more cars parked on the streets	What might mitigate: Multifamily flats that minimize the number of sidewalks, with a double loaded corridor or other formats that aid affordability	18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	People react to reduced parking without understanding the appropriateness on one parking space per unit.	What might mitigate: City could also consider reduced participation fees and/or 10 year property tax exemption to foster more affordable housing.	18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Hope that we don't see more apartment style developments here		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3, 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Concerned that we do not preclude building types that are affordable		18.13.050 Table 5	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	The available places to build are limited so concerned that infill does not feel too splotchy.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	concern that owners of large lots, not in center of town will not allow this in their neighborhoods as we need more affordable options throughout Langley			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	where this use is permitted needs to be clearly outlined.		18.13.030	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	applies to both 5000 or 7200 so applies across the City		18.13.030	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Land prices and construction costs will still limit the ability to deliver affordability			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Peter Morton: Fundamentally in favor but when I consider my own situation I'm not sure I would be interested in a multifamily setting.			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Peter is also concerned about acoustical privacy with adjacency.	What might mitigate: Insulation or separation could help but also offset studs - construction technology.		Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Rhonda: 70% lot coverage is not environmentally prudent in a place where we need to recharge our aquifer.		18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Janis Machala: Having lived in Kirkland I'm concerned it will preserve the integrity of the village look and feel. Too tall or too much lot coverage and not preserving vegetation.	What might mitigate: Limit the area for Multi-family infill to a smaller area. All 5,000 and 7,200 are planned to be marked for this. That's a bit too much and will look like a hodge podge around the city as we go forward	18.13.030; 18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	No guarantee to be less expensive for the people, although it will be a boon for the developers			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	[Craig] How does multi-family infill support moving away from fossil fuels?		18.13.040	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Janis Machala: Adequate parking was not provided in Kirkland.	What might mitigate: At least on space per household should be provided. More transit is also more viable with more households.	18.13.050C; 18.13.050J	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	maximum lot coverage is a concern. 70% for RM	What might mitigate: Limit where this applies to just in the downtown area, RS5000, not RS7200 on west side of the City	18.13.030; 18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	max lot coverage is 50% for RS5000/RS7200	What might mitigate: Unlikely that all 17 lots would be developed as MF.	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	building costs are excessive and this is one way to make it more affordable. Soft costs - engineering and utility costs are too \$\$ and don't reflect smaller units	What might mitigate: Susan - less intense development the further away from downtown core	All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Ross Chapin is concerned about development costs remaining a barrier to affordability. No silver bullet to affordability.	What might mitigate: One developer owns 5 of the 17 lots identified for multi-family infill in the downtown core area. Wouldn't it be prudent to bring him into the conversation to see what his hopes and plans are.	All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Peter - we need to consider the demand that could occur due to changing work patterns, climate migration and similar patterns	What might mitigate: Getting the word out to the general public who doesn't follow city planning in order to elicit more comments from other residents who are not developer types.	All	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Janis - concerned about tear downs not just the vacant lots.			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	impact of higher density in close proximity to the bluff		18.13.010; 18.13.030A; 18.13.060A.1.b.i	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
Q: What are your greatest concerns? What might reduce these concerns?	Rhonda: After participating and listening to this session, I am more concerned than ever that affordable housing will not be a benefit of this new infill code. A developer attended the meeting and has plans for a housing development on 5th St. I had the sense listening to him that there was no concern whatsoever about affordability. Its all about maximizing profit. (I hope I am wrong.)			Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Density	Can you talk about the density of the illustration on the RS 7200 site plan in the Multi Family Form Based Assessment PDF? Concerned that it may be to intense for Langley character.	<p>This is not a 7,200 SF lot, but rather 142' x 120' so it is 17,050 SF, or 0.39 acres. Several of the lots in this RS 7200 zoning district are bigger than 7200 SF, but this is the largest. Width and heights of the buildings in the illustration are what the regulations today allow.</p> <p>Langley has already written regulations for tiny houses and affordable housing. However, it is not currently delivering the levels of affordability that the community needs. Langley is very proactive about fostering affordability, so if a developer can deliver 10 units on this 0.39 acre lot instead of 1 unit, it becomes much more affordable. Lot size is already embedded in the zoning.</p> <p>This lot is also within walking distance to downtown, which would further increase affordability by reducing transportation costs, as well as contributing to environmental resilience by reducing greenhouse gasses because residents could walk or bike to daily needs. This number of units would not fit on any other lot in this zoning district. Current zoning allows a maximum of 15 DUA, plus various density bonuses. This illustration shows 26 DUA, but in keeping with local character.</p> <p>This Multi Family Form Based Code will attempt to delete density caps, and instead control the urban form with more predictable measures of setbacks, height, lot coverage, and parking, to keep the village character while fostering affordability and environmental stewardship.</p>	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Greg Easton, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Density	The 3rd Street Cottages is the kind of feel some of us prefer, which is 8 units on 31,000 SF site, or 11 DUA.	This typology is already enabled by existing zoning, but does not deliver the slightly higher gentle density that the comp plan calls for or the Growth Management Act encourages. A slightly higher gentle density encourages affordable in many ways, including the cost savings of shared party walls, less land, less horizontal infrastructure, shared stormwater management, and more compact home sizes. Along with many environmental benefits that come with compact development that can be found on www.CodeScore.org .	18.13.050 Table 5	Greg Easton, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Density	Another case that we don't show is the traditional garden style apartments is usually the most affordable housing available.	Since this suburban building type is out of character with Langley, existing policy discourages this format.		Greg Easton, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Density	If we do not look at higher density options, we will not achieve affordable housing nor the environmental and racial equity outcomes we prefer. Affordability cannot be addressed with our current zoning. Building costs on this island will never make even tiny homes affordable: trades, building material costs, utility connections, and infrastructure just won't let affordability happen without density. Unless the City issues a bond or a grant to build permanently affordable housing, only higher density can deliver affordability.	That's right. While the illustrations in the assessment do not show any increases per height, increasing from two stories to three stories near the town center would assist with these three points. But the illustrations do show more units than what is allowed today, which is one dwelling unit plus an ancillary dwelling unit (ADU).	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Casey Gloster, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Density	Also increases in density would allow us to effectively address the challenges of lower density water runoff for more dispersed development patterns, and would help us with both stormwater management and protecting clean water.	Good points. The illustrations also allow critical area preservation with tighter setbacks, so that new buildings can avoid existing trees, cliffs, and other natural features.	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Casey Gloster, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Density	Habitat for Humanity's two duplexes on one lot under construction now is very palatable.	This grant requires us to permit at a minimum 3 units per lot. Depending on lot size, could do a sliding scale. If enabling the Fifth Street Commons, it is 16 DUA, but the highest zoning districts enables 15 DUA.	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Maralie Johnson, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Height	Tough for us that the City of Langley is just one square mile, so we should be clear that we are not going to be the solution for the County's affordable housing. It'd be helpful to look at the areas where we can go to three stories, closer to downtown. We are somewhat standardized in our appearance now, so important to honor that character.	That certainly could be considered in keeping with local character.	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Burt Beusch, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Critical Areas and Clean Water	What is the allowed lot coverage? Need to be cognizant about the need for clean water, protecting critical areas, and fending off urban sprawl. Beware that the RS7200 above Edgecliff Drive is unstable in places.	<p>Current zoning enables 40% lot coverage, however any proposed development over 5,000 SF has to manage stormwater on the site with engineered solutions and rain gardens. The analysis recommends RS7200 only minimally increases to 50%. In terms of the climate change discussion, land use planning can account for 50% of greenhouse gas emissions, depending on whether it is auto-centric with larger lots. Also have growth management to contend with.</p> <p>Climate change is significantly increased with lower units allowed on lots, since it disperses development across more land, requiring more people to walk to the majority of their daily needs. There are 39 parcels within these zoning districts that are buildable, once critical areas are accounted for, which reduce buildable areas. Of those, 17 lots are easily walkable to downtown.</p> <p>Could say that the area subject to the overlay is bounded by 6th and Cascade and Coles Road. This would ensure trip reductions instead of trip generation. Increasing affordability by reducing a car. And further protects the cliffs. Downside is that there are very few lots, so affordability likely would not be materially changed.</p>	18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3	Rhonda Salerno, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Process	To comply with the grant requirements, by when does this have to be adopted?	Must be adopted by April, 2021. Goal is a draft by Decmeber 2020. Initial community outreach by posters, city website and email was in September. Community engagement by working sessions and workshops scheduled for October. Drafting in November / December. Public comment on draft 1 in January.	All	Rhonda Salerno, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct
Objectives	Define walkability?	Having the majority of daily needs within a 5-minute walk within a pedestrian-friendly environment. This is usually a quarter of a mile, but may be longer depending on topography and climate.		Casey Gloster, Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Summary		<p>Robust public engagement is important, made challenging by the pandemic.</p> <p>Concern between balancing increase of density to foster affordability and climate action while not getting out of character for Langley. It's a fine balance. As we move through drafting the code, the community will have to help the code writers find that balance. Some support for going from two stories to three stories.</p> <p>Some support for increasing lot coverage, although DOT stormwater requirements provide limits.</p> <p>Primary goals: eradicate systemic racism, increase affordability, and foster environment stewardship.</p>	All	Planning Advisory Board	7-Oct