

## 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](mailto: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
<b>Comments to Draft Two accepted through April 16, 2021</b>					
Affordability	The Innovative Permanently Affordable Housing projects in Langley are defined as 120% or less of Area Medium Income. Market rental rates are likely affordable by this definition, so concerned that could get an extra story on a building without doing much differently. Maybe we should reference something more general than 18.04, and make different thresholds for ownership or rental. City of Seattle has as low as 65% AMI for rental, but 115 or 120% AMI for ownerships.	Really great point and something we've been discussing. The City of Langley in partnership with the County needs to do a local market assessment for affordable housing and which tranches are the most needed at this time. Shouldn't be something that we guess at, which is why we are pointed to 18.04, which is the location that we feel needs to be updated since it effects many parts of the code.	<b>18.13.050.E.1</b>	Greg Easton	4/7/21
Affordability	Agree that we do not have enough affordability data at this time.	Agree, we wouldn't be professionally comfortable with taking a best guess without a market study.	<b>18.13.050.E.1</b>	Dominique Emersons	4/7/21
Affordability	Even 120% AMI is probably too low for rental prices on the Island. But likely this is not the forum.	Could introduce a new chapter that addresses target markets, that is just "Reserved" for now, but that can add the information at a later date. Could amend definitions again and put in an affordable housing definition, that references the "Reserved" chapter.	<b>18.13.050.E.1</b>	Thomas Gill	4/7/21
Affordability	Cost of living adjustment is a perpetual phenomon that will go upward. While we may be keeping track of it, we may not be making the City more accessible.	RS 7200 is just one part of town, but the intention is that it applies across the City, provided it is served with sewer.	<b>18.13.050.E.1</b>	Peter Morton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	I am unclear how we lost the possibility of three stories, knowing that the third floor is the cheapest you can ever build. Secondly if limited to 2 stories, it is impossible to build the three story under the 25'-30' roof. This has come out of the blue.	At the Community Meeting, heard people advocating for heights that reflect the character of Langley. The two zones that are proposed at 2 stories are purely residential zones. RN and MB are proposed at 3 stories. Both have a bonus of 1 story if 70% of the net floor area of the increased story is allocated to affordable housing.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	JR Fulton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Apartments are the most affordable rentals. When you limit apartments or eliminate them you are significantly affecting workforce housing. I had hoped one of the goals was to build affordable unsubsidized housing.	In multifamily house, which is permitted in every zone, can do up to 6 units. Because of decreasing setbacks and increasing lot coverage, get more developable land.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	JR Fulton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Outside of downtown, there isn't much character or views to protect. Trying to increase affordability. The best way to do that, south of 6th St or south of Edgecliff, best way to provide affordability is increasing height. We've had conversations about 4 and 5 story buildings 50' from the street, with 2 to 3 story buildings in front of it. We are in a crisis for housing.	This is somewhat debated locally. Can't establish different heights for different parts of the City within the same zone, without an overlay. Parcels in Langley aren't large enough for a super large setback and still make room for parking.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Thomas Gill	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	In favor of increase heights, above what is proposed in this draft.	PUD code gives more height and more density.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Dominique Emersons	4/7/21
Parking	Hidden parking is important for everyone, so this is important to us.	Noted.	<b>18.13.050.C</b>	Dominique Emersons	4/7/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Affordability and Heights	Prefer the lower heights as proposed. The PUD is a possibility for higher heights.	Need 5 acres for the PUD code, but this code applies to any sewer-served individual lots in any of the four specified zoning districts.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Rhonda Salerno	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	My concern is that by reducing this to 2 stories, have taken out 1/3 of naturally occurring affordability available in 3 stories by right. Without 3 and 4 stories, we won't see workforce housing, but just by making more of the same of what we already have now. In the previous version, we were doing more for eradicating systemic racism. I was ready to put it forward to the Turner Center for an innovation prize, but in this draft, we have removed this. Builders don't want to cram people into basements and attics. Simple structures reduce costs. Let them cram in 3 stories in 30'.	Cramming in as many stories as you can is the antithesis of sustainability, because reduces daylighting, cross ventilation, dignity. However, only have to have 17.5% of the entire building(s) affordable to get the 4th story, because it's 70% of the 4th story, or 70% of 25% = 17.5%.	<b>18.13.050.E.1.a</b>	JR Fulton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Allowing an extra story if meets the requirements may be helpful.	Noted.	<b>18.13.050.E.1.a</b>	Greg Easton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	The fact that Council can make the height determination makes me nervous. Prefer to give Council option a and option b to consider.	Noted.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Peter Morton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	I'd like to know if JR has more to say.	Noted.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Maralie Johnson	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Three options: 3 stories allowable from 6th St to the Water, to allow greater heights in downtown. I own two properties downtown, and was hoping to provide as close to affordability as I can.	Discussed regulating plan.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	JR Fulton	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Daylighted basements don't count toward height.	Daylighted basements are counted on the sidewalk of the addressed street.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Thomas Gill	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	A part of me doesn't want to build up, but realistically, we need to move in that direction while preserving what is the main attraction of Langley. Right now can sit in front of the Dog House or the Commons, and still be in the sun. Outside of 6th Street, south of Edgecliff, and west of Debrun would all support greater heights, provided protections for shadowing. Support an idea of a height overlay to support this.	Could use a tool to take height out of all the preliminary tables, and introduce a regulating plan that just regulates height for this section, in a clear and discrete way. Could protect the character and tourism economy of downtown. But would be cautious about introducing tall buildings in single family neighborhood districts. However, if you substantially change the character of the zone, it is a rezoning event, and potentially spot zoning, depending on how it's applied. Otherwise, could require people rezone to RM, and it be a rezoning event. The increased heights do not guarantee that you'd get any affordable housing. It could be just all expensive zoning. Have to have this complete by end of June to get the last 1/3 of the grant. Could take the height limitations out of the zoning districts in Tables 1-4, and instead will introduce a regulating plan of a height map: 3-story max for downtown; recommendations for where is ideal to densify within a half-mile of downtown to increase walkability, as well as the bus line. Any other final edits accepted through April 16. Likely April 27 before a final draft.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Dominique Emersons	4/7/21
Affordability and Heights	Rezoning and PUD are both possibilities. This is step toward affordability.	Noted.	<b>18.13.050.E</b>	Dominique Emersons	4/7/21
Generally	Earlier mentioned a local market assessment regarding affordability, so want to know more about this.	Rhonda will follow up.	<b>18.13.050.E.1.b</b>	Deana Duncan	4/7/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Deviations	Would like to see some sort of language that allows the process to come back to the PAB for changes to the code detail may happen, that stays within the intent, particularly for the Administrative Waiver Criteria. Could consider a relief type "Other" and limit the relief types to 10% maximum.	Will be able to amend this, just as can to the rest of the code, per the process established in the Langley Municipal Code. Trying to create as much certainty as possible for developers and property owners. So it's a tradeoff between flexibility and predictability. But this is an infill code instead of a PUD, and can apply to a single parcel beside an existing single family detached or small business, so have to be more careful about giving waivers. The current draft recommends discrete waivers, and suggest deferring larger waivers until the code has been tested, and then can amend it then. This code in itself is a huge leap from what is allowed today, from single family.	18.13.060.F	Ross Chapin	4/7/21
Streetscape	Many requirements treat many places like a single type of neighborhood. Avoid the sidewalk to nowhere			Ross Chapin	1/20/21
Height	Very concerned about the 14' maximum. Do we need to reconsider the 4 stories at 14' per story?	We'll work on reducing height on upper stories. "First floor shall not exceed 10' and upper floors shall not exceed 9'."		Ross & Casey Gloster	1/20/21
Density	Is it comfortable having a 4-plex in RS7200? Absolutely. The small group agreed.  Not a Langley resident but very interested. Concerned about what the density will look like. Hope it doesn't lose the village character.  Concerned about any difference in development on private streets Consider the possibility of TIF resources. Beginning stages of being involved. Will have further questions later.			JR  Vivian  Tom Felvey Tom Felvey Sandra	  1/20/21  1/20/21 1/20/21
clarification	incentivising affordable housing - what is definition and how much is required for additional? In return for extra floor is there a required number of units.	Write new language about x% of the units you can get on the 4th floor must be affordable. Define what is affordability here, Chapter 18.04: requirements for reporting, etc.		Greg E	1/20/21
clarification	on street parking can count as part of parking requirement. Is that true in all cases? How much must be onsite and how may be on street? Does it depend on availability on the street or does it depend on characteristics of the site and development.  8 parking for 8 cottages and one guest stall. We're always short on parking. it is an important issue to discuss.  if portion can be met with on street parking - depends block X block. addition of on street parking may cause conflicts.  looking into the future will it always be that way. Small town in middle of large rural county, people need cars on whidbey. parking issue is an integral part of this code amendments  EV charging stations as a requirement or incentive for having EV charging station  Good point re. EV charging station Need to rethink one car per DU. some cars are smaller now. when thinking about parking are we thinking about it all the same. Large truck v small smart car.			Greg E  Mira Steinbrecher  Greg E  Mira Steinbrecher  Joann Quintana  Rose	  1/20/21  1/20/21  1/20/21  1/20/21 1/20/21
clarification	what is definition of AMI? County v census tract. typically County wide summer swell - more folks. Thoughts about more parking areas eg church parking stalls Adding more units, more cars, more visitors.  as we add more safe walkways it will remove parking stalls. The only way for me to get downtown from third st requires me			Rose Greg Yana Viniko  Mira Steinbrecher	 1/20/21 1/20/21 1/20/21  1/20/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
	are we thinking about creating more pedestrian/safe sidewalks for folks? hard for the city to get funds for sidewalks. We can get it for roads but not sidewalks.			Yana Viniko Rose	1/20/21 1/20/21
	EV charging stations are important part of city infrastructure. bond money for LIP will be used to create extruded curb on 6th st. will do some traffic calming			Craig Cyr Craig Cyr	1/20/21 1/20/21
	shared car use program - viability in Langley because folks are driving less and could be a good program			Joann Quintana	1/20/21
	how does this affect the Habitat for Humanity property.?	It's really up to the landowner. As far as the zoning goes, it would apply. Because it was already platted, they are trying to utilize what was already approved.		Joann Quintana	1/20/21
	RS7200 could this go to 4 stories for affordable housing units?	yes		Mira Steinbrecher	1/20/21
	Island Transit is rethinking routes and transportation modes, so it will be interesting to see new ways we could move around the Island. Will be surveying each County resident about how you would like to move around the County.			Craig Cyr	1/20/21
	Are boarding houses or "apodiments" allowed?	Boarding houses are already permitted by right, with a maximum of 5(?) bedrooms.		Yana Viniko	1/20/21
	apodament - small personal living space and shared larger spaces. may not be able to be done				1/20/21
	could be used for wide range of persons/demographics. not just young but older folks as well.				1/20/21
	how to create a housing solution that provides for affordability for a wide range of folks				1/20/21
	What is the difference between duplex v SFD with ADU?				1/20/21
	duplex v SFD with ADU - what is the distinction? could this be condoized.				1/20/21
	limiting factor might be utility services.				1/20/21
	If this code is by right, does that mean that it does not have to go through public process?	Write standards that are clear, predictable, and reliable, then not legally defensible.			1/20/21
	If possible, it would be great to point to some of the developments in the region that are affordable that we would be emulating.			Joann Quintana	1/20/21
Height	Some concern about going to 4 stories.	Others felt the need for affordability for the service sector for people to be able to live where they work. This is a hard question to answer, and there are arguments to be had on both side.		Mira Steinbrecher; Yana Viniko; Sandra	1/20/21
Height AND Affordability	Appreciate that Langley is esthetically focused. We are also focused on social issues. We are not always honest, because our esthetic values often overpower our desire for affordability. If we can't go to 4 stories, we will not get affordability. We cannot make housing cheaply. We need to be more creative.	Langley's Design Guidelines are beautifully aspirational, but there is nothing clear and objective about them. Even through they are advisory and not mandatory, should still be clear and objective. And adds cost, both in administration and application.		Casey Gloster	1/20/21
Affordability	What about tax breaks for creating more affordable housing, especially since this is incentivizing growing the tax base?	Here in the City, we are very limited to have room to incentivize. We've discussed doing incentives through Utilities, but impacts their viability. Starting to have conversation with Island County, realizing that we have to do this at the County level. Because of being a population under 5,000, we are ineligible for many of the incentives available for affordable housing funds like multi-family tax exemptions.		Yana Viniko	1/20/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Affordability	The cost of construction for materials and labor make it tough to build new housing for people who work in Langley. It isn't about just lowering developer's profits.			Ross Chapin	1/20/21
Affordability	Can we look at owner-built multi-family for families coming together to build their own?			Rose	1/20/21
Applicability	I am evaluating development of multi-family housing on a NB – Neighborhood Business zoned vacant lot (S7345-00-03004-0) on 2nd Street in Langley. Under the current zoning code the project is limited to two stories, two parking spaces per dwelling, and 20 foot setbacks, which is very restrictive and prevents the increased housing density Langley seeks. For a multi-family residential land use, on a NB zoned parcel, it would be consistent with the spirit of the currently proposed changes to also allow increased height, reduced parking, and reduced setbacks. Thanks for your consideration and I look forward to next steps in the multi-family code update process.	Consider adding NB to RM.		Charlie and Tyra Walsh	11/16/20
Parking	<b>I believe that the proposed overlay is some of the innovative work coming out of any small municipalities that I have seen in recent years!</b> In addition to recommended edits submitted on January 13, clarifications requests:  18.050.J. 2. States <b>"Required parking may be fulfilled in the following locations: c. On Street Parking along lot lines.</b> On-street parking spaces are available for public and not reserved." Confirm that portion of required total development parking (one space/unit) can be on street, if parking is not identified as private. Is this a percentage of total available on-street perimeter parking or 100%, which may be counted for required parking?	It is intended that some of the required parking (1 per unit) may be located in the parking lane associated with the parcel. If parking does not exist, this flexibility obviously would not be available.	<b>18.050.J.2</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Parking	18.13.040. C. 2 Please define term <b>"on street parking lane"</b> ? Is this parallel parking? Could it be diagonal? Or is this something else?	This is the parking lane associated with the parcel. We will add a definition for clarity. It could be parallel or diagonal if that exists. However, since this is a public R.O.W., it may not always be available for the development as the text notes.	<b>18.13.040.C.2</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Frontage Requirements	18.13.050 Table 7 <b>Frontage Standards diagrams could show all MFBCO requirements including 5' sidewalk and 4' tree buffer</b> , which I believe are all intended to be in City right of way adjacent to front property line. Revising this diagram will also help the public to understand the significant street buffering required even with reduced front setback.	Frontage standards apply to the private parcel rather than the right-of-way - this is everything between the front of the building and the property line. As such, it is misleading, in our opinion, to include the R.O.W. in the illustration.	<b>18.13.050 Table 7 Frontage Standards</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Accessory Structures	Table 3. RM Standards D.4. Please <b>clarify what does "accessory structures and accessory dwelling units are not subject to the requirements of this section" means?</b> Does this mean an ADU does not require a parking space or that any accessory building/ADU does not count toward impervious coverage? I believe that your intent may be that any ADU is part lot coverage/unit count and requires parking and that accessory buildings are part of lot coverage.	Chapter 18 has existing regulations for accessory structure and ADUs within each zone. To avoid duplication, those regulations are not replaced by the overlay. The existing ADU regulations are quite progressive and do not need to be replaced. ADUs will count toward lot coverage and require parking as designated by the underlying zone.	<b>Table 3. RM Standards D.4.</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Driveway Setbacks	Building diagrams for Duplex, Triplex, Townhouse, Cottage Court, Multifamily House where front access parking is necessary, currently shows driveways with significant setbacks from side property line. For maximum flexibility, smarter layout and more useable outside spaces, <b>these large buffers are unnecessary and are already covered by 18.050.J.3.f which requires a fence or planted buffer. Consider correcting diagram.</b>	Illustrations for building type site plans are illustrative only to indicate the dimensions regulated in the table below.	<b>18.13.050 Table 7 Frontage Standards</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Design Review Board	Will all buildings in MFBCO MR <b>require Design Review Board Approval</b> which is in underlying MR?	No buildings will require DRB according to 18.13.060 D	<b>18.13.060</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Lot Coverage	Where underlying zoning is R5000 such as between 1st to 4th and Anthes to DeBruyn <b>can R7200 lots utilize the 60% coverage and Multifamily House of R5000?</b>	The lot coverage is controlled by the underlying zoning. This scope does not involve rezoning or remapping.	<b>18.13.050 Table 2</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Meters	18.13.050.6 <b>Confirm whether electrical meters and gas meters</b> are considered electrical equipment.	They are. However all utilities that qualify as green building components are covered by 18.22.250-270.	<b>18.13.050.6</b>	JR Fulton	1/8/21
Affordability	<b>Chapter 18.13, Multifamily Overlay (MFBCO) will significantly help to make workforce housing in Langley more affordable and <u>should be approved.</u></b>  <i>Bravo, Langley PAB should be commended for its leadership in creating innovative housing reform like the MFBCO!</i>  <b>Most significant proposed MFBCO affordability standards include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•appropriately reducing required parking to one vehicle per unit</li> <li>•increasing lot coverage</li> <li>•reducing front setback to street and allowing porches in setback for greater village character</li> <li>•allowing uncompromised three-story residential construction for most multi-family housing types</li> </ul> <b>PROPOSED CHANGES TO MFBCO-Affordability</b> and in some cases Climate Impact can be further enhanced through the following proposed simple changes to the MFBCO (prioritized numerically):  what do you think about integrating MF in SFD neighborhoods? Brigid's question to the group. Integrating MF is kind of an unexpected thing? Needs to be planned for carefully. concern with how that will work in each case.  This code is considering the integration well ex. setbacks. i think it's good to have a mix of units. setbacks and parking  integration is good. not much land in the city and this is an intelligent way to do it. Depends on good conversations with the neighbors. how do you integrate affordable housing into a neighborhood so it fits. Setbacks and parking reductions are good. But needs to be done in a measured way. We need it. will depend lot by lot. and in some locations it can work but when you start going beyond SFD neighborhoods scale then you might have issues. height will be an issue. the notion of incentivizing an extra storey looks good but may cause conflict. town homes that are too tall might be an issue.	Noted!	<b>All</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Applicability	1. Table 4. <b>Allow the MULTI-FAMILY HOUSE TYPE in all R7200 or minimally within one mile of downtown.</b> There is no reason R7200 should be more constrained than R5000. R7200 lots predominate downtown Langley and already require 10% less coverage than R5000. This seems somewhat arbitrary to exclude this much needed housing type from R7200 in downtown Langley.	This is a possibility and should be discussed in the public meeting.	<b>18.13.050 Table 4</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21
Encroachments	2. 18.050.7.a.i Encroachments: <b>Minor façade elements allowable in both side and rear setbacks should include Mini Split heat pump mechanical systems.</b> These small (5 square feet, 18" deep) fossil fuel free, most cost and energy efficient systems available should not require shifting the building further from the side/rear setback to accommodate. Zoning should promote smart climate sensitive solutions. 18.050.6. Encroachments: See 7.a.i above. <b>Screening of small mechanical equipment should not be required unless on street façades.</b>	They are covered by 18.22.255. According to 18.13.050 F.6. equipment is only required to be screened "from street view."	<b>18.050.7.a.i Encroachments</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21
Parking Setback	3. Tables 1, 2, and 3: <b>Eliminate 32' parking setback (12' +20'), allow traditional "Langley style" parking in front of and adjacent units.</b> Parking adjacent the right of way is allowed in current R5000 and R7200 properties and is quite common in Langley.	In permitting greater density, consideration for pedestrian safety, and the village character is of primary consideration. Removing parking from direct connection to the sidewalk and the street is critical for health, safety, and welfare.	<b>18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21
Frontage Requirements	4. Cottage Court Housing type: <b>Delete the "front door on street requirement" for Cottage Housing only.</b> Cottage communities generally face each other on the common space. Require a more significant public street community entry in lieu of the front doors on street.	Per footnote 1 only the cottages facing the street must have doors facing the street. Increasing density should not be permitted without contributing to the public realm of the village.	<b>Table 5 Cottage Court</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21
Frontage Requirements	5. Table 7 Frontage Standards footnote 1. <b>Eliminate the requirement for 8' of additional setback if residential unit has zero step front entry</b> and threshold is less than 8" above the sidewalk. Ramps are not included in any proposed frontage standards. For ADA access to 8" rise, a minimum 8' long ramp with handrails is required and 14' preferred. Getting thru the front door is perhaps the most basic of ADA requirements.	The additional setback is required to provide the privacy necessary for the comfortable occupation of spaces facing the street.	<b>Table 7</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21
Affordability	6. Table 1, 2 and 3. Footnote 1: <b>Allow Duplexes to be three stories max.</b> but not cottage courts. This will allow greater potential density and reduce construction costs per square foot, both leading to more affordability.	This results in a large structure and a significant jump in mass for the resulting number of units. It's a tradeoff that should be discussed.	<b>18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	JR Fulton	1/13/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
General	I'd glad to see a wide range of housing options becoming possible through this code! It's taken a lot to digest this code. Details are scattered in the document. For example, the graphic on page 3 shows porches extending into the setback, but doesn't call out any limits; Table 6 on page 13 gives this info. It takes a lot of searching. Some of the graphics are misleading. Codes should be readily understandable. Many of the requirements has me guessing their intention. The code seems to be written for an urban neighborhood with relatively similar standards, not a rural village like Langley with a full urban to rural transect across various neighborhoods.	The code flows in a linear fashion: The underlying zone controls building setbacks and lot coverage and permits specific building types. The next scale of detail is the building type which controls mass, height, and open space, finally the detail is in the frontage, which is controlled by building type. And within the frontage section one can find the encroachments.		Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Sidewalks	<p>If a sidewalk does not exist, the applicant must construct it for the length of the front lot line.</p> <p>So, sidewalks in every case. Because new MF projects will be sparse, this will lead to a patchwork of sidewalk segments in the city. That's OK if they only serve the project, but sidewalks work best when they are part of a continuous network, not fragmented pieces.</p> <p>This points out the need for a comprehensive sidewalk/walkway plan and a plan to achieve it (outside this code of course!) Related to this, there are sites where 5-foot concrete sidewalks are appropriate (First, Second, Third, Sixth Street, Park Avenue) and other streets perhaps not (Fourth, Fifth Street, Furman, Decker, Northview). The "city" is not urban everywhere. This suggests the need for a street/walkway transect with a gradient of street/walkway types and sections.</p> <p>On streets closer to the center and on primary streets, a curbed street edge with planting strip and concrete sidewalk makes sense. Quieter, less urban streets might have no curbs and concrete or crushed-granite sidewalks, or a shared street with no sidewalk at all. If I'm not mistaken, the city has designated "shared streets" where cars share a slow street with pedestrians who have the right-of-way.</p>		<b>18.13.040 Streetscape Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Street Trees	<p>"Streets must have a landscaped planting strip with street trees between the sidewalk and the street. The planting strip must be a minimum of four feet in width."</p> <p>In the Seattle Street Tree Standards, there are NO planting strips less than 5-feet wide. Most are 5- to 8-feet.  <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Trees/PlantingAndCare/YardTrees/2_011_street_tree_list.pdf">http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Trees/PlantingAndCare/YardTrees/2_011_street_tree_list.pdf</a></p> <p>Another street section option that may be appropriate is to have the sidewalk adjacent to the parking and a wider landscape section joined with the yard setback.</p> <p>Or third option might have street parking in pockets, with a landscape strip where there is no parking. In the parking pockets, the sidewalk would be adjacent to the parking, with the required landscape strip inside of that (as in upper First Street).</p>		<b>18.13.040 Streetscape Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Placement	Structures must be set back from lot boundaries as specified in Table 1 – Table 3. The word "must" suggests a "built-to line": as in, buildings shall be built at the setback line. I don't think this is implied, but it seems unclear on first reading. Alternative working might be: "Structures shall comply with lot boundary requirements as specified in ..."		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Parking Placement	Same issue with the word "must".		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Development Standards	There is no "D." heading. It must relate to the following tables.		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Lot Coverage	<p>Lot Coverage – 50% max. How is "lot coverage" defined? Buildings: to the foundation, or eaves? Driveways and parking? decks, sidewalks, play areas?</p> <p>Where does stormwater management engineering tie in?</p>		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards; Table 1. RS 7200 Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Front Setback	<p>Front setback – 12 ft. min.</p> <p>Does this apply to porches? From the diagram, it appears not.</p> <p>In searching further in the code (11 pages ahead on page 14), Table 7 Frontage Standards D Depth – 6 ft. min. shows a porch in front of the building façade. A "minimum" depth implies a porch may be closer to the property line. If so, is there a limit?</p> <p>What if the building façade is farther back than the minimum building setback? Then what is the allowed depth?</p>		<b>various</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Height	<p>Height – 3 stories max. (Cottage courts and duplexes limited to 2 stories max.)</p> <p>More information 9 pages ahead on page 11 (E. Building Height) expands on this. Must search for it, though! (more comments in Section H below).</p>		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Height	<p>Accessory Structure – D Rear setback – Height: 2 stories max</p> <p>In E. Building Height (page 11) we find that as story can be 14-feet high; so an accessory structure can be 28-feet high at the rear line. true?</p> <p>It would be helpful if graphics illustrated to the limits. The current graphic shows a one-story garage and two-story primary building.</p>		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Setbacks	<p>Parking Setbacks – F Front street setback – A + 20 ft. min.</p> <p>So parking must be set back 32' setback from front property line. Given that the street may be 16- to 19-feet in front of the front property line, then parking will be 32+19 = 51-feet from the street. This seems very excessive.</p>		<b>18.13.50 Development Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Bulk Standards	<p>Table 2 RS5000 Standards Shows a cottage court as an example. What do graphic RS5000 Standards look like with townhouses, triplexes and MF?</p> <p>Is there a way to show the volumetric envelop?</p> <p>Graphic for front setback is not clear – the buildings are behind the allowable, while the porches are within the allowable.</p>		<b>Table 2 RS5000 Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Bulk Standards	<p>Table 2 RM Standards</p> <p>Example does not clearly show extent of buildable volume.</p>		<b>Table 2 RM Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Type Requirements	<p>D. Building Type Requirements 4. "Accessory structures and ADUs are not subject to the requirements of this section."</p> <p>... Meaning they don't count in the lot coverage? And not limited to two-stories? And can be located within lot setbacks?</p>		<b>18.13.50.D</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Type Requirements	<p><b>What is a multifamily courtyard?</b> How is this different than a MF house? Why limit to 8 units? Why not 6 or 12?</p> <p>Example of Fifth Street Commons: 16 units in courtyard arrangement. Would this not be allowed?</p>		<b>Table 4. Building Types per District</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<p><b>Table 5. Building Standards Townhouse:</b> Graphic of accessory building on a lots without an alley appears to be 2-feet , not 5-feet. (same on Duplex and Triplex diagrams)</p>		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<p><b>Table 5. Building Standards Triplex:</b> Private Open Space appears to not be adjacent all units. i.e. – a second or third story without ground access. Does it have to be designated private for that dwelling?</p>		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<p><b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court:</b> Does this part of the code provide an alternative zoning track to the current Cottage Housing Ordinance? Or override it?</p>		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<p><b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court: The word "cottage" is misleading.</b> In common usage it means "a modest one-story house". Here, it can be two-stories high, 30x36-feet with a 20-foot secondary wing.</p>		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court: Main Entrance D – Facing primary frontage.</b> On one hand, a main entrance on the street will activate the street. On the other hand, the courtyard is the center of a cluster of neighbors, so an entry on the courtyard will activate the community. There is a tension the two — imagine you're at a dinner table where you're required to sit facing away from the table. You would feel like an outcast. More study needs to be done around front-side /back-side issues. I have many pocket neighborhood examples showing ways to resolve this.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court: Private open space.</b> This is shown on both the front and back of units (including against the parking). Related issues as with primary entrance.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court: Units per building – 1.</b> Why prohibit an attached unit? I have examples showing what I think that have an appropriate scale and character.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court Buildings per site – 3 min, 9 max:</b> Where 'g' come from? The "scale of sociability" suggests between 3-10 units offer a sense of social coherence. This could go to 12 in my experience. When a site is larger, the total unit count can go up, while the cluster size stays the same (multiple small clusters). Again, I have many examples to illustrate.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Cottage Court Building Size – B Depth – 30 ft. max.</b> What is the reasoning behind this depth? I have many examples with relatively narrow width (~24-feet) by 35-45-foot depth that are very appropriate.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Multifamily Courtyard: Units — Units per site – 8 max.</b> Where did 8 come from? Why not 12? Or 8 per cluster? What about when the site can hold more? Fifth Street Commons as 16 units in 4 buildings. It works very well.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Multifamily Courtyard: Units — Buildings per site – 3 min.</b> Where did 3 come from? Why not 2?		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Standards	<b>Table 5. Building Standards Multifamily Courtyard: Main Entrance — C Facing primary frontage.</b> The same issue as was brought up in Cottage Courtyard above – the tension between engaging the street having a sense of community around the courtyard.		<b>Table 5. Building Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Height	1. Building height may be increased to four stories if the additional units meet the requirements of affordable housing ... 3. Stores are measured from the finished floor to finished ceiling. 4. Stories are limited to 14 feet height. So: Four stories @ 14-feet each plus 1-foot floor depth = 59 feet. Has this had design testing on sample lots? With modeling? What is the impact on solar shading of nearby properties? Even with three-story buildings.		<b>18.13.050.E. Building Height</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Building Height	7. Below ground stories do not count toward building height provided they do not extend more than 4 feet above the sidewalk grade at the primary frontage.  So, "below ground stories" not counted in the story count? If not, can the total number > 4 stories?		<b>18.13.050.E. Building Height</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Frontage Requirements	3. The primary building entry must face a street.  This makes sense for individual buildings with a single primary relationship to the street. It doesn't always make sense for a courtyard cluster (for reasons given above).		<b>18.13.050.F. Frontage Requirements</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Frontage Requirements	6. "... These facilities may not encroach into any setback."  Minisplit heat pumps are becoming very common. They typically have a relatively small and very quiet condensing unit mounted on the exterior of a building, often near the ground that can easily be screened. I see no reason why these should not be allowed within the setback.		<b>18.13.050.F. Frontage Requirements</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Frontage Requirements	7. Encroachments b. i. Major façade elements may encroach into the frontage type as spec'd in Table 6. / ii. Major façade elements include bay windows, bow windows, balconies, stoops, porches and terraces.  These "major façade elements" are not mentioned in Table 6, Frontage Types Surface – Planted outside porch/stoop/terrace  What is a "surface"? Landscaping? Where does planting outside a stoop refer to? Typically, stoops land on a walk or sidewalk. "P" – I take this to mean "optional", include or not at applicant's choice. Are surface requirements needed?		<b>18.13.050.F. Frontage Requirements</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Frontage Standards	Porch C – porch height above grade 1 A zero-step entry is permitted if the front setback is increased by 8 feet.  Makes sense. That said, further study may be needed to examine varying conditions, especially with an increasingly aging population.	The additional setback is required to provide the privacy necessary for the comfortable occupation of spaces facing the street.	<b>18.13.050. Table 7 Frontage Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Frontage Standards	Terrace D – Depth – 10 ft. min.  Is a "terrace" a ground-based outdoor space? Why is the depth different than a porch?	Terraces, or decks, tend to be larger since they are cheaper.	<b>18.13.050. Table 7 Frontage Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Open Space Requirements	Total Required Open Space ... shall be at least 400 SF per dwelling unit.  In the Cottage Court diagram (page 9) the requirements for private open space are 96 SF min. per unit, and shared open space are 200 SF min. per unit. These are not consistent.	The additional space can be allocated at the discretion of the designer. 400 is required, and there are additional minimums for public and private, but they don't explicitly equal 400.	<b>18.13.050.H. Open Space Requirements</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Open Space Requirements	1. Private Open Space ... shall make up no more than 50% of the total required open space. / a. The duplex building type is exempt ...  Triplexes are not exempt?	Multiple units are expected to have shared open space for socialibility.	<b>18.13.050.H. Open Space Requirements</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Parking	d. ... off-street parking / i. ... must be located near the rear lot line.  This doesn't always make best design sense. Can show examples. Consider omitting this requirement.	In permitting greater density, consideration for pedestrian safety, and the village character is of primary consideration. Removing parking from direct connection to the sidewalk and the street is critical for health, safety, and welfare.	<b>18.13.050.J. Parking Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Parking	ii. for mid-block lots, parking may be accessed from the primary frontage.  Is there any other option? Is this redundant redundant?	-> No. If it's a corner lot it may be accessed from a side street.	<b>18.13.050.J. Parking Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
Parking	f. Parking lots must be screened ... by a wood fence ... no less than 4 feet in height ...  Understandable. And inconsistent with general code for fences (42-inches maximum)	This overlay supercedes other portions of the code it contradicts according to 18.13.020.	<b>18.13.050.J. Parking Standards</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Administration	A. 1. Pre-App conference  b. The applicant shall present the following information ...  The required information is not enough for the staff to provide meaningful full review and comments. There is more information necessary than unit type and height.	Pre-application conference is to assess if the project is applicable prior to investing too much time and money in the process. The standard Type I site plan review follows.	<b>18.12.060 Process and Administration</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
Administration	D. Design Review  Checking: "not applicable"?	Correct – not applicable. Design issues are embedded in the overlay.	<b>18.12.060 Process and Administration</b>	Ross Chapin	1/19/21
<b>Comments in Advance of the Draft Code</b>					
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.	<b>18.13.050C; 18.13.050J</b>	City Council	10/26/20
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.	<b>18.13.050B</b>	City Council	10/26/20
Heights	General support for 3 stories with some conditions attached.	Consider tying extra story if affordable units are permitted.	<b>18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	City Council	10/26/20
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.	<b>18.13.050E</b>	City Council	10/26/20
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.	<b>18.13.050E</b>	City Council	10/26/20
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.	<b>All</b>	Christy Korrow, Council 1	10/26/20
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.	<b>All</b>	Peter Morton, Council 5	10/26/20
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.	<b>All</b>	Peter Morton, Council 5	10/26/20

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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	10/26/20
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 accommodate onsite.		Dominique Emersons, Council 2	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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	10/26/20
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
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

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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
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

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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 'spotty' 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 sidewalls, 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 spotty.		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?	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

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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.		<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	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 much and will look like a hodge podge around the city as we go forward	<b>18.13.030;</b> <b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	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?		<b>18.13.040</b>	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.	<b>18.13.050C;</b> <b>18.13.050J</b>	Community Workshop	13-Oct thru 27-Oct
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	<b>18.13.030;</b> <b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	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.	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	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	<b>All</b>	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.	<b>All</b>	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.	<b>All</b>	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?	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		<b>18.13.010; 18.13.030A; 18.13.060A.1.b.i</b>	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
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</p>	<b>18.13.050 Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Greg Easton, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20
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 <a href="http://www.CodeScore.org">www.CodeScore.org</a> .	<b>18.13.050 Table 5</b>	Greg Easton, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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	10/7/20
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).	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Casey Gloster, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20
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.	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Casey Gloster, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20
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.	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Maralie Johnson, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20
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.	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Burt Beusch, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20
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.	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.  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.  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.	<b>18.13.050</b> <b>Tables 1, 2, 3</b>	Rhonda Salerno, Planning Advisory Board	10/7/20

Topic	Comment	Response	Code Section	Commenter	Date
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	10/7/20
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	10/7/20
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.</p> <p>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	10/7/20