

King County Department of Development and Environmental Services

900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest Renton, WA 98055-1219



REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: June 27, 1997

TO: Building Services Division Staff

Lynn Baugh Chris Ricketts Pam Dhanapal Terry Brunner

Ken Dinsmore

Land Use Services Division Staff

Mark Carey Lisa Pringle Marilyn Cox Gordon Thomson

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director Michael Sinsky, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Sophia Byrd, Gordon Thomson, Mark Carey, Harold Vadergriff, Pam Dhanapal, Bill Turner

Use of a "Park" trailer as a temporary dwelling per K.C.C. 21A.32.170?
 (Bill Turner)

K.C.C. 21A.32.170 provides for a temporary "mobile home" for medical hardships. Further, K.C.C. 21A.06.755 defines mobile home in specific terms distinct from "recreational vehicles" (K.C.C. 21A.06.960). The definition of recreational vehicles includes park trailers. As a practical matter, there appears to be little difference between a mobile home and a park trailer. Park trailers, in general, appear to be smaller, and as such there may be certain "life\safety" issues which would make them inappropriate for long term accessory use. However, as a temporary dwelling unit, park trailers appear to be ideal.

The committee determined that a code amendment is necessary to delete the reference to "park trailer" in the recreational vehicle definition, and to create a new definition of park trailer consistent with RCW 43.22.335(1). The committee also determined that a public rule is needed to address the suitability of park trailers as temporary dwelling units for medical hardships.

Regulatory Review Committee Minutes June 27, 1997 Page 2

2. Density requirement if Residential Density Incentives are used (K.C.C. 21A.34) (Mark Carey)

K.C.C. 21A.34 allows for an increase in residential density in the R-4 through R-48 zones when public benefits (i.e. affordable housing, open space, trails, and parks, and preservation of historic sites and structures) are incorporated into proposed developments. Further, the R-1 through R-8 zones allow apartments only subject to the residential density incentive provisions. The issue before the committee was whether apartments could be developed without increasing the density allowed by R.D.I. if the benefits were incorporated into the development? A related issue was whether there is a proportional relationship between the amount of land dedicated to open space and the number of apartments allowed?

The committee determined that it is optional on the part of the developer to accept increased density. The R.D.I. provisions are written to confer a benefit on both parties (developer and the public). If a developer does not wish to receive the benefit, there is nothing in the chapter to compel they accept it. However, there is clearly a proportional relationship between the amount of land dedicated to a benefit and the number of units allowed, established by the table in K.C.C. 21A.34.040. For each benefit unit provided by the developer, the public allows a specific number of additional dwelling units to be constructed.

Because of the complexity of this issue, the committee determined that a formal interpretation is necessary.

3. Time limit for temporary sales offices (K.C.C. 21A.32.180) (Pam Dhanapal)

K.C.C. 21A.32.180 allows one temporary real estate office in conjunction with any new residential development for a period of one year. The time limit presents a problem for many larger developments which may not have completed sales of all of the homes. In some case, build out may not have occurred. It was noted that the former zoning code allowed temporary sales offices with no time limit (K.C.C. 21.46.110).

The committee determined that a code amendment is necessary to extend or eliminate the time limit. In the meantime, the reason for one year limit will be researched.

Regulatory Review Committee Minutes June 27, 1997 Page 3

4. Private secondary access as an alley for setback purposes (K.C.C. 21A.12.150)(Pam Dhanapal)

The committee determined that there is no practical difference between so-called secondary access (undefined in the zoning code and King County Road Standards) and an alley (defined in K.C.C. 21A.06. 055). Such access may therefore be considered an alley for determining setbacks.

SB:sm s:\projects\rrc\minutes.doc

cc: Bill Turner, Code Enforcement
Harold Vandergriff, Building Services Division
Priscilla Kaufmann, Code Development Planner