

# Phase Two Development Regulations Update

## Staff Report

---

### Overview

The City of Sammamish is in the process of developing updates to the City's development regulations. The project's public engagement process has included: a review of the code topics identified in Appendix A with a stakeholder advisory group over five meetings; an online survey; two meetings with the City Council; and nine meetings with the Planning Commission leading up to the public hearing on July 15, 2021. The code topics summarized in Appendix A were used to guide discussion with the community as draft code was developed.

### Project Background

The development regulations within the [Sammamish Municipal Code \(SMC\)](#) were first adopted upon the City's incorporation in 1999 under Ordinance O99-29, which largely mirrored those of King County. Since adoption, there have been many independent changes made to different sections of the code, but to date, there has not been an effort to comprehensively unify those changes and the various code chapters that constitute the City's development rules.

This piecemeal approach has resulted in development regulations that are at times hard to follow, have old citations, are outdated, are inconsistent, or in limited instances are missing language. Additionally, although some minor changes have been made to discreet sections of the code, and to meet compliance with State mandates, the code did not change significantly until 2018. As the code remained static, the development industry changed, resulting in a community that was concerned by larger homes being built on smaller lots and by approval of projects that technically met City codes yet generated outcomes that were not consistent with the expectations or desires of the City's residents.

In the fall of 2018, to address public concern related to development outcomes, the City Council adopted Interim Development Regulations and directed staff to begin the legislative review process to consider permanent updates to the City's development regulations. This process would be Phase One of the Development Regulations update. The City Council adopted the Phase One code amendments on [May 7, 2019](#), with the passing of Ordinance O2019-482. Phase One changes were generally organized by topic (e.g. density rounding, setbacks, fences, building height, etc...) and largely followed the initial code changes set forth in the adopted Interim Development Regulations. Upon completion of Phase One, the City Council directed staff to begin scoping for Phase Two.

### Phase Two Project Scope

The Phase Two Development Regulations Update project scope consists of four key tasks: public engagement, Phase II Development Regulations Update, the development of a Unified Development Code (UDC), and scoping for the Phase Three Development Regulations Update.

The UDC will consolidate the City's development regulations into one user-friendly and clearly organized Title of the Sammamish Municipal Code. It will facilitate a streamlined and coordinated development review process resulting in more predictable and improved development outcomes within the City.

### Phase Two Project History

On [August 11, 2020](#), the City Council approved a contract with Framework to develop Phase Two updates to the City's development regulations. The contract scope included addressing the following items/topics:

- Code conflicts/code problems developed by staff resulting from code application.
- Problems identified in Phase One that were not included with Phase One work.
- Problems that were identified as needing cleanup following the implementation of Phase One.
- Problems identified by the Community Advisory Group.
- 2020 docket items that are best addressed with Phase Two as opposed to being docketed individually.

At a City Council Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission on [October 6, 2020](#), staff presented a finalized scope of work that identified eight general topic areas to be addressed by code updates. Those areas were:

1. Code Enforcement and Penalties
2. Residential Neighborhood Design
3. Protection and Integration of Natural Features
4. Standards for Non-Residential Uses in Residential Zones
5. Infrastructure Coordination and Design
6. Single Family Site and Building Design
7. Construction Management
8. Code Organization and Administration.

As part of the public engagement plan, the City of Sammamish established a 13-member Community Advisory Group (CAG) consisting of residents, developers, and design professionals to provide input and feedback on the Phase Two Development Regulations Updates. The project team conducted 1-on-1 interviews with each CAG member prior to group meetings. Four meetings were held with the CAG on the following dates:

- Community Advisory Group Meeting 09/15/2020 - [Video](#)
- Community Advisory Group Meeting 10/14/2020 - [Video](#)
- Community Advisory Group Meeting 12/15/2020 - [Video](#)
- Community Advisory Group Meeting 01/26/2021 - [Video](#)

Over the course of those four meetings, the CAG and the project team developed a detailed list of issues and problem statements. The list summarized the topics that will be addressed with updates to specific sections of the SMC and drafted preferred solutions for each of the identified issues and problem statements. The Issues and Solutions Table can be found in Appendix A.

In addition to seeking community engagement through the CAG, the staff project team conducted a survey hosted on [Development Regulations Updates Phase II Connect Sammamish Page](#). The survey results helped to identify key issues that the community believed need to be addressed in the City's development regulations. These issues were consolidated and included in Appendix A. Once the Issues and Solutions Table was finalized, the project team held weekly work sessions to begin developing and drafting code language.

On [March 4, 2021](#), staff provided the Planning Commission with an overview of the Phase II Development Regulations Update project. The presentation included a detailed project history that described the work completed in the Phase I Development Regulations Update project and described the scope of work and project plan for Phase II. Staff also began walking the Planning Commission through individual low-priority items and received policy direction and feedback. Low-priority issues are those which solutions are most easily identified and required minimal guidance from the Planning Commission. Medium-priority issues are those that concept solutions have been identified, but required additional discussion and input from the Planning Commission around potential solutions. High-priority items are those that required the most additional brainstorming and discussion with the Planning Commission to identify the best potential solutions.

On [March 18, 2021](#), the Planning Commission completed providing policy direction and feedback on the low-priority items. On [April 1, 2021](#), the Planning Commission provided policy direction and feedback on the high-priority items. On [May 6, 2021](#), the Planning Commission provided policy direction and feedback on the medium-priority items.

After receiving the Planning Commission's policy direction and feedback, the project team revised the Preferred Solutions in the Issues and Solutions Table and incorporated them into draft code language for the high and medium-priority topics which were reviewed by the Planning Commission on [June 3, 2021](#).

On [June 17, 2021](#), the project team provided a presentation on the Planned Unit Development section as well as an outline of the UDC. It is important to note that the only new code language incorporated as part of the UDC will be the changes developed with the Planning Commission and City Council that address the Issues and Solutions Table in Appendix A; all other code language incorporated into the UDC will not be edited or updated in any way other than moving it from its current section of the SMC into the single title of the UDC.

On [July 1, 2021](#), the project team provided a presentation on the work completed to date by the Planning Commission which led to a full draft of development regulation code amendments, additions, and the Unified Development Code Outline.

The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on [July 15, 2021](#). The Planning Commission recommended to the City Council the proposed draft of the development regulations, amendments, additions, and the Unified Development Code outline. Additionally, the Planning Commission recommended further study to refine the definition of Reasonable Use Exceptions and recommended that the draft Planned Unit Development section be removed from Phase II and be created as a separate work task for the Planning Commission for later review and approval.

Between the Planning Commission's Public Hearing and the City Council Work Session on September 14, 2021, the project team have been incorporating feedback from the hearing and staff input into the current draft for the council to review which can be seen as Exhibit 3 of the September 14, 2021, agenda packet. The project team have:

- Integrated the proposed civic standards with the existing code section on non-residential uses in residential zones (SMC 21A.30.240). Modified proposed standards based on public hearing input including from the Issaquah and Lake Washington School Districts.
- Reduced the proposed parking lot buffer to 30 feet for non-residential uses in residential zones
- Deleted the proposed Planned Unit Development code as recommended by the Planning Commission. Planned unit development code will be considered as part of scoping for Phase Three
- Updated for clarity: Sections updated for clarity do not change the underlying standards or how the code applies to development.
- Added a definition of "neighborhood"
- Reduced the minimum arterial landscape buffer to 25' in the R-1 through R-8 zones and 10 feet in the R-12 and R-18 zones.

The City Council is set to begin review of this topic on September 14, 2021, with a goal of formal adoption of the UDC by the end of December 2021 and effective date of January 1, 2022.

The current City Council meeting schedule is as follows:

City Council Work Session 9/14/2021  
City Council Work Session 10/19/2021  
City Council Work Session 11/16/2021  
City Council Public Hearing 12/7/2021  
City Council Public Hearing 12/21/202

## Development Regulations Update – Code Topic Guide

The following are highlights of the Phase Two Development Regulations updates:

- **Neighborhood Design Principles + Standards (21.30 – NEW format for UDC)**
  - Design Principles (21.30.200.A): The design principles are intended to show the intent of the neighborhood design standards and support implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. Applicants will be required to submit statements identifying how their project furthers the neighborhood design principles. However, project decisions will be based on the design standards.
  - Protection and integration of natural features (21.30.300.A): Establishes standards for the preservation and integration of natural features when present on a site for development.
  - Connectivity and block size standards (21.30.200.B): Establishes a maximum block size, standards for street connectivity, and non-motorized connections such as trails.

- Criteria for the preservation of open space (21.30.200.C): Establishes types of open space that may be preserved and criteria for allowing smaller parcel sizes in exchange for high-value open space.
- Parcels and sites (21.30.300.D): Require applicants to consider the application of site planning standards when creating new parcels for development.
- Parking (21.30.300.E): Requires parking to be right-sized for anticipated demand and applicants must submit a parking analysis for review.
- Arterial frontage standards (21.30.300.F): Limits the types of development and features that can front along an arterial street.
- Sustainable site planning and LID (21.30.300.F): Establishes baseline standards for sustainable site planning such as protecting native vegetation and integrating low-impact development features for stormwater management.
- **Planned Unit Development Standards (21.30.400)**
  - Permitted use in the R-1 through R-8 zones (21.30.400.B)
  - Regulatory Modifications (21.30.40.C)
    - Allows modifications to dimensional standards (except building height), street design, density, and parking requirements.
    - Does not allow modifications to neighborhood design standards, critical area regulations, building codes, clearing and grading, land uses (except in limited instances), tree standards, or the adequacy of public facilities.
  - Residential Uses and Density (21.30.400.D): Maintains the same residential uses allowed in the underlying zoning district and allows a maximum of 85% single-family detached units. Provides a square footage allocation rather than a strict limit on the number of units if the applicable approval criteria are met.
  - Requires a concept plan review with staff, a neighborhood meeting and open house (21.30.400)
  - Modifications to Planned Unit Developments (21.300.400.G.4): Major modifications require a new application and public notice.
  - Decision Criteria (21.30.400.F): Applicants must demonstrate compliance with the decision criteria including that “The planned development is a superior design compared to the regulations for the underlying zone and furthers the goals of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.”
- **Site Planning Standards (21A.25.030)**
  - Floor to Area (FAR) limit for site development (21A.25.030.A): This standard requires larger parcels for larger homes.
    - Dynamic setbacks adopted in Phase One are proposed to be retained.
    - Includes incentives for duplexes, accessory dwelling units, and detached rear garages (to reduce bulk and scale of buildings)
  - Modification to building height calculations to improve development on sloped sites using modules. (21A.25.100)
  - Driveway width limit (21A.25.030): Proportional to the lot frontage at the street with a minimum and maximum.
  - Front yard parking setback (21A.25.030): To reduce the visual and physical impact of front yard parking on the street.

- **Enhanced requirements for the adequacy of public facilities (21A.60)**
  - Strengthened requirements for sewer connections for plats and substantial alterations where sewer is available (21A.60.020)
  - Strengthened standards related to streets and access (12.30.200.B)
  - New standards related to the design of streets and connections (21.30.200.B)
- **Pre-Construction Meeting Requirement (16.20.222)**
  - Requirement for a construction management plan.
  - Standard permit conditions established by the City.
- **Town Center Project Review Updates**
  - Modified Unified Zone Development Permit (UZDP) review from a Type II to a Type III process (20.05.020).
- **Clearing and Grading Permit Requirements and Exemptions (16.15.050)**
  - Clearing and grading must be associated with an approved use except for hazardous trees, noxious weeds, and invasive species.
  - Modified permit thresholds and exemptions.
  - Exemptions only permitted on properties with an approved land use.
- **Reasonable Use Exceptions – Process update and criteria (21A.50.070)**
  - Modified the reasonable use process to require Hearing Examiner review.
  - New reasonable use criteria for review with a maximum home size if built within a critical area and/or buffer of 2,000 sq ft.
- **Standards for civic uses in residential zones (21A.67)**
  - New public or private schools are a Type II Process (20.05.020).
  - Standards related to buffers, lighting, noise, and vehicle access.
- **Increased fines for construction-related violations (23.100.10)**
- **Require a critical area affidavit and letter with clearing and grading permits to verify the presence or absence of critical areas (16.15.070)**
- **Clarified permit requirements for accessory structures (20.05.020)**
- **Modified public notice requirement (20.050.060).**
- **Site plans must be recorded with a notice on the title when critical areas are present (21A.50.132)**
- **Projects are required to go through Project Guidance (20.05.030)**
- **Unified Development Code (See attached outlines)**
  - Includes existing titles 13, 14A, 16, 19A, 20, 21, 21A, 21B.
  - New code organization and formatting including an updated numbering system.
  - Consolidate tables and footnotes.
  - New graphics to illustrate code standards.
  - Unified development code complete draft will be completed by September.

# Appendix A

## Issues and Solutions Table

**OVERVIEW:** This document is a summary of the topics that will be addressed with updates to specific code sections. The list has been formed with input from City staff and a Community Advisory Group assembled for this project and through consultation with the Planning Commission and City Council in the fall of 2020.

**PRIORITY CATEGORIES:** All of the topics identified in the table below will be addressed in the code updates. However, some topics are more complex and warrant more discussion while others are more straightforward and can be carried forward with the development of draft code.

LOW=Solutions are identified and team has begun drafting code

MEDIUM=Concept solutions have been identified; requires additional discussion with Planning Commission about potential solutions

HIGH=Requires additional internal brainstorming and analysis by staff followed by further discussion with Planning Commission about potential solutions

#	PROBLEM STATEMENT	PRIORITY	PREFERRED SOLUTION
1	<p>1. Infrastructure has not kept pace with growth, particularly around older subdivisions.</p> <p>2. The code has no requirements for sewer connections and allows septic in geologically hazardous and steep slope areas, where this type of infrastructure (especially drainfields) may be a risk to surrounding properties.</p> <p>3. Developers are not accountable for contributions to infrastructure outside of their development. There is a disconnect between the water district and the City.</p>	HIGH	<p>1. Strengthen requirements for sewer connections with a clear preference for new connections. Require all new projects or those that exceed 50% of assessed value of improvements to request information on sewer availability from Sammamish Plateau Water. (21A.60.030)</p> <p>2. Require homes connect to the sewer system within two years of it being available within 250' or if the septic system fails. (21A.60.030)</p> <p>3. Prohibit septic in geologically hazardous areas and steep slopes. (21A.60.030)</p> <p>4. Strengthen requirements for connection to a public water system and provide a clear preference for public connections. Connections to private systems only allowed when public connections are determined to be infeasible due to physical constraints, distance to the facility, or costs (21A.60.040)</p> <p>5. Require all plats to connect to the public sewer system. (21A.60)</p> <p>6. Develop baseline LID requirements through sustainable site planning techniques and shift the LID incentives to the new Planned Unit Development Standards. (21A.85)</p> <p>7. In Tamarack and Inglewood require drainage review for any new residential units including an ADU. (13.20.020)</p> <p>8. Address stormwater infiltration and impacts on Critical Aquifer Recharge areas as part of the project guidance process including a context analysis and conceptual site plan.(20.05)</p> <p>9. As part of the project guidance process applicants shall be required to account for septic systems (when public sewer is determined to be infeasible) when submitting a conceptual site plan and context analysis. (20.050)</p>
2	<p>Definitions do not cover all terms referenced in the City's code, which can make harder to understand and require more interpretation.</p>	LOW	<p>1. Define all terms referenced in code, but not in the definitions section, and ensure existing definitions are clear. Resolve conflicting definitions in the following code sections. (16.20.025) (16.25.190) (21A.15)(19A.040) (23.150.10)</p>
3	<p>Existing use and development standard tables and calculations are confusing and require extensive cross-referencing both for potential developers and City staff.</p>	MEDIUM	<p>1. As part of the Unified Development Code provide links in the standards table to the supplemental standards and remove the cross references. (21A.25.30)</p> <p>2. Clarify numerical requirements by simplifying the language. (21A.25.070)</p> <p>3. Verify all cross references for accuracy and eliminate redundancy.</p>



City of Sammamish

4	<p>1. There are no fundamental criteria for the design of subdivisions in the Development Code that would establish a baseline standard for new subdivision development.</p> <p>2. New subdivisions do not fit the wooded rural character of Sammamish, do not use landscaping effectively to create a good fit with the surrounding neighborhood, and do not give residents a sense of privacy.</p> <p>3. New development often does not provide an adequate buffer from arterial streets; with inconsistent landscaping, fences and retaining walls that dominate the street frontage.</p> <p>4. Non-arterial streets in new subdivisions have on-street parking areas that are often underutilized and creates the perception of excess width.</p>	HIGH	<p>1. Develop a set of standards for new residential neighborhoods (i.e. subdivisions) that offers consistency in site design, street layout, supplemental street standards, arterial frontage standards, open space integration, preservation of natural features, and connections to surrounding lots. (21A.15 NEW)</p> <p>2. Develop new Planned Unit Development Standards that provide incentives in exchange for improved design and public benefits. Include criteria regarding open space preservation and design. Incentives may include density or floor to areas ratio bonuses, allowances and incentives for more diverse housing types, and flexibility with street standards. (21A.15 NEW)</p> <p>3. Develop criteria for the preservation of open space beyond the minimum required. (21A.30.140)</p> <p>4. Lower the combined height of fences and retaining walls or rockeries and require step backs with planted rea between multiple rockeries or retaining walls and between a retaining wall, rockery, or berm and fencing. (21A.30.190). Incorporate the standards in the Town Center Code (21B.30.180)</p>
5	<p>Schools, most of which are in residential zones, are required to adhere to the same standards as single-family homes, although they are a different building type and use.</p>	MEDIUM	<p>1. Develop new standards for civic uses in residential zones to ensure neighborhood compatibility particularly as it relates to the transition between uses with a focus on Schools. (Update 21A.30.240)</p>
6	<p>Reasonable use exceptions should be better defined as the current rules have resulted in excessively large homes being permitted on highly constrained lots in critical areas and buffers.</p>	MEDIUM	<p>1. Revise the Reasonable Use process to require review by the Hearing Examiner that will include a public hearing. The Director will provide a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner on reasonable use applications and the public will have the opportunity to provide input during the review process including a public hearing. (20.05.020)</p> <p>2. Supplement Reasonable Use exception criteria to include additional analysis regarding what is "reasonable". (21A.50.070)</p>
7	<p>There are no "required" baseline Low Impact Development standards. Existing standards should have clear incentives that are coordinated with future PUD standards.</p>	MEDIUM	<p>1. Develop "required" baseline standards for LID with a focus on sustainable site planning. (21A.85)</p> <p>2. Incorporate the LID incentives into new Planned Unit Development standards. (21A.30.140)</p>
8	<p>1. Projects advance beyond the conceptual design stage before applicants have discussed code City and can result in costly redesigns.</p> <p>2. Administrative process and requirements are not clear and specific. General requirements for application materials don't provide the necessary information to review projects.</p> <p>3. Process/permitting timeframes are defined in different locations.</p>	LOW	<p>1. Project guidance should be required for all development applications except minor construction and include a context analysis and a conceptual site plan. (20.05)</p> <p>2. Create a more specific set of application requirements for different site conditions and project types that requires applicants provide staff more of the necessary information to review projects. (20.05.040)</p> <p>3. Retain minimum application requirements (20.05.040) and supplement code to give the Director more discretion to request additional materials and information or specifications on any submitted plans to address different scenarios.</p> <p>4. Allow the director the ability to waive fees where the permit fee may be a barrier to an action that has public benefits such as removal of invasive species. (20.05)</p> <p>5. Modify 120-day review time to be from the time the application is deemed complete. Consider adding different review times for different project types based on actual median review times of past projects. (20.05.050)</p>
9	<p>Compliance and enforcement of existing code regulations is challenging given the current code provisions.</p>	LOW	<p>1. Require financial guarantees with performance agreements for tree protection, erosion control, and clearing limits. Consider adding "stop work" requirements when approved plan is not followed with precision. (16.20)(23.80)</p>

10	<p>1. The height, bulk, and scale of new homes can be overwhelming from the street.</p> <p>2. Development standards do not adequately reflect site conditions and limitations.</p> <p>3. Baseline standards for new homes allow for too much home in a small area.</p>	HIGH	<p>1. Establish a base Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) limit so that the size of a home is proportional to the size of the parcel to allow for more flexibility with site planning to improve parking design, landscaping, low-impact development, tree preservation, and consideration of other site planning challenges. (21A.25.030)</p> <p>2. Regulate building height by segment to minimize excessive height on steep slopes and require structures to step up the hillside to minimize bulk and scale. (21A.25.030)</p> <p>3. Limit the width of driveways based on the width of the lot, require parking and garages to be setback from the home and use the side yard or alleys. (21A.25.030)</p> <p>4. Allow for flexible side yard setbacks to allow for parking and access when the garage is located to the side or rear of the home. (21A.25.030)</p>
11	The code's development regulations lack visuals to help make code requirements more understandable	LOW	<p>1. Graphics will be used to illustrate new code standards as part of Phase Two and for existing standards as part of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Several graphics have already been produced as part of the code audit that will be used in the code such as for the new arterial frontage types, landscaping standards, and residential design (subdivision) standards. Graphics should not only demonstrate what is intended or allowed with a codified design standard or criteria, but should also demonstrate what is not intended or allowed.</p>
12	Staff requires more flexibility and should be empowered in review and enforcement.	HIGH	<p>1. Increase the types of construction violations that are subject to immediate fines and stop work orders as necessary. New construction violations include improper erosion control measures, obstructing private streets and shared driveways, impacting critical areas, and developing in conflict with approved plans. (23.100)</p>
13	Standards for subdivision development on slopes and in sensitive areas are the same as those for unconstrained properties. Native vegetation and wildlife habitat are cleared from a majority of larger sites in development.	HIGH	<p>1. As part of the new residential design standards (subdivision) there will be a focus on standards for steep slopes to make sure the development fits in rather than manipulates slopes and other natural features. Retaining trees and understory vegetation will be requirements where feasible. (21A.XX NEW) (16.15)</p> <p>2. Require early and advanced tree vigor enhancement for trees to be retained on sites under development permit review. (21A.37.270) (21A.37.280)</p>
14	There is no mechanism to enforce development standards when projects are complete or near completion.	LOW	<p>1. Add fines for doing work in conflict with an approved permit and do not sign off on final inspection when projects conflict with approved plans. (23.100)</p> <p>2. Develop reporting requirements for qualified professionals working for the applicant to verify compliance with approved plans and permit conditions at appropriate point in the project. (16.20.300)</p>
15	There are no requirements for construction management other than traffic management during development.	MEDIUM	<p>1. Develop a standard set of permit conditions related to construction that becomes part of the permit approval and are posted to the City's website. Also provide the option to add conditions as appropriate based on the conditions of the site and approved plans to mitigate potential impacts. Require as-built plans that are certified by a qualified professional to verify compliance with approved permits. (16.20)</p> <p>2. Require a pre-construction meeting with planning and building officials to discuss staging and construction management. Adjust the fee schedule as necessary to increase cost recovery. (16.20)</p> <p>3. Require applicants to sign an affidavit prior to construction verifying that erosion control fencing will be installed properly and maintained for duration of the project or face a fine of \$1,000 per square foot of impacted area. (23.100)(16.20)</p>

City of Sammamish

16	Developers are willing to pay fines for violating code provisions or construction management requirements	LOW	1. Enhance the City's ability to issue stop work orders when construction is occurring that is not in compliance with approved plans and permits. When a field correction is not permitted, applicants must apply for a permit amendment and cease work until it is approved. (23.100.10)(16.20)
17	Landscaping and maintenance of plantings can interfere with utilities.	LOW	1. In the new residential design standards include standards that the design shall minimize the need for tree removal related to utility easements. Where tree removal is necessary consider low-impact native plantings to avoid only mowed grass corridors. (21A.XX NEW) (21A.30) (21A.37.230)
18	Maintenance of landscaping in the right-of-way can be a burden on the City.	LOW	1. For new projects, focus on native vegetation that is drought tolerant, provides habitat functions, and is low maintenance. (21A.XX NEW)(21A.35) 2. Require property owners to maintain the public right-of-way in front of their homes (i.e. sidewalk buffer strip) and allow for native plant or edible gardens. (21A.35) 3. Grant the City the ability to take over landscape areas, open space tracts, or critical areas tracts that are not being maintained where there is a demonstrated public benefit such as new public open space, reforestation, habitat restoration, stormwater management, or other benefits.(21.A.35) 4. Provide incentives for homeowners associations to replant landscape areas with a focus on native, drought tolerant plantings with habitat benefits. Incentives may include waiving permit fees, technical assistance, and volunteer programs. (21A.35)
19	Proposal modifications that constitute a substantial change and would require a new application are not defined.	LOW	1. Provide a specific description of substantial change to review requirements and would require a new application. (20.05)
20	Noticing requirements are not well organized and could be clearer.	LOW	1. Modernize the City's permit noticing requirements to reflect new methods of outreach such as website postings. (20.05)
21	Decisions on new development may not further the comprehensive plan.	LOW	1. As an application submittal item, require the applicant to submit a narrative/summary demonstrating how the project aligns with the Comprehensive Plan policies for larger scale projects. (20.05)
22	Residential parking requirements sometimes conflict, are sometimes unclear, and can lead to parking that is poorly designed or dominates the street frontage of new homes.	LOW	1. Require a parking summary as part of new subdivisions that demonstrate the parking is right sized for the anticipated demand including both on- and off-street parking so that streets are not oversized. (20.05)(21A.XX NEW)
23	Refund provisions and timelines are unclear, and do not specify which permit fees are eligible.	LOW	1. The Director will maintain a policy on permit refunds and make it accessible to the public. (20.05)
24	There is no established process for modifications to a conditional use or requirements for certain expansions to non-conforming uses	LOW	1. Add language to recognize existing uses that are considered as "de-facto" conditional uses (pre-dating incorporation) but have not gone through the conditional use process. Require an audit of uses and allow minor improvements without going through the full conditional use process. If major improvements are proposed then full conditional use review will be required. (21A.100.150)(21.A.110.040)
25	School capacity and concurrency in the code should be valid and all cross-references should lead to a single section.	LOW	Addressed as part of parallel effort on school impact fees and concurrency.
26	The code does not clearly lay out standards short-term rentals as a non-residential use that tend to be located in residential zones.	LOW	Address as part of the Phase Three scoping process following additional input and direction from the City Council.
25	Development categories defined in the code are not consistent with those listed in decision types.	LOW	1. Include Unified Development Plans (UZDP) as a Type 3 decision. Remove Urban Planned Development as a Type 3 from Code (we do not have this action type - King County remnant). (20.05.020) (21B.95.030)



City of Sammamish

28	Signage regulation have not been evaluated for compliance with Reed v. Town of Gilbert - 135 S. Ct. 2218 (2015)	LOW	1. Sammamish did complete an update to and significant simplification of the City's Sign Code in 2017 under Ordinance O2017-436 and was further amended in 2018 under Ordinance O2018-462 to address Electronic Reader Boards/Changing Message Signs
26	Current code does not adequately differentiate between accessory uses for which a building permit is required.	LOW	1. Require a permit for any accessory structure that has electricity and/or plumbing with the same setback standards as accessory dwelling units. Any accessory structure over 200' square feet must meet setbacks and requires a permit. (20.050)(21A.25.030)
27	Infrastructure and environmental challenges in Inglewood and Tamarack are not adequately addressed in the code.	HIGH	1. Develop maintenance standards for critical areas and steep slopes and stormwater/drainage requirements after development is complete. (21A.50.220) 2. When a project is located in the historic Tamarack Plat code regulations in SMC 21A.50.220 apply due to a concentration of critical areas in the area. (21A.50.220) 3. Develop maintenance standards for critical areas and steep slopes and stormwater/drainage requirements after development is complete. (21A.50.220)
28	Permits are required for regular maintenance of landscaping and/or infrastructure in critical areas	LOW	1. Allow for regular maintenance of ditches, culverts, drainage features (e.g. French drains), shoulders and paths within these exceptions, and for lawn and landscape maintenance in critical areas and buffers including invasive plant and weed removal, thinning or removal of volunteer plants or runners etc. (16.15.050)
29	There are no limits on clearing without a permit outside of critical areas.	HIGH	1. Limit the land area that can be cleared without a permit (including shrubs and groundcovers) and reference the tree removal section in 21A.37.240. Limit clearing on lands that do not have an active use or development permit approval. Lower the tree diameter that is allowed to be removed without a permit. (16.15.050)
30	City policy and code do not adequately protect steep slopes.	HIGH	1. Increase the limits on clearing and grading for individual lots such that it is not permitted until associated with an approved development permit for the the construction one or more dwellings. (21A.50.220(3)(c)) 2. Incorporate standards from the Erosion Hazards near Sensitive Waterbodies into the general section on Erosion Hazards that limit disturbance, require monitoring, and address drainage. (21A.50.225(3-4)) 3. Require a critical areas report as part of all request for clearing and grading permits to verify whether there are any critical areas on the site. (16.15.070) 4. Eliminate the exemption for the cutting and removal of any coniferous tree of less than eight inches DBH or any deciduous tree of less than 12 inches and make it expressly prohibited to remove understory vegetation beyond normal maintenance without obtaining a grading permit. (16.15.050)
31	Critical areas and natural vegetation are not adequately protected during development.	MEDIUM	1. Require site plans for single-family homes be recorded. (21A.50.180). 2. Place limits on original permit requirements for Critical Areas, when recorded and required prior to permit issuance. 2. Record notice on title before any permit approvals per code to inform the public of the presence of Critical Areas, buffers, any mitigation, and limitations on actions. 3. Trees/driplines, clearing limits, and landscaping should be recorded with the site plan to monitor retention and protection. (21A.50.180)
34	Ensure recent amendments under Phase 1 are clear, use proper grammar and word choice, consistent application of terms and definitions and accurate cross-references	LOW	1. Ensure recent amendments under Phase 1 are clear, use proper grammar and word choice, consistent application of terms and definitions and accurate cross-references as part of the Unified Development Code.