

Department of Development and Environmental Services 900 Oakesdale Avenue SW Renton, WA 98055-1219 (206) 296-6600

REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: November 5, 1999

TO: Building Services Division Staff Lynn Baugh Nathan Brown Pam Dhanapal Ken Dinsmore Chris Ricketts Land Use Services Division Staff Mark Carey Lisa Pringle Greg Borba Lanny Henoch Gordon Thomson

Caroline Whalen, Deputy Director Kevin Wright, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

<u>Present</u>: Tim Barnes (PA), Nathan Brown, Sophia Byrd, Lanny Henoch, Nancy Hopkins, John Rae, Gordon Thomson, Susan Marlin (Recorder)

<u>Issue</u>:

 In a single family detached residence containing an accessory dwelling unit, does K.C.C. 21A.06.350 require a physical separation between the primary unit and the accessory unit? Or does the term "separate" simply mean "separate" in the sense of assigning a designation to an area with or without physical separations adjacent to or within close proximity of each other? (Nathan Brown/John Rae)

Discussion:

The Committee discussed the intent of the Zoning Code in the definition of K.C.C. 21A.06.350 Dwelling unit, accessory: "a separate, complete dwelling unit attached to or contained within the structure of the primary dwelling; or contained within a separate structure that is accessory to the primary dwelling unit on the premises." If the intent is to require a physical separated area, then the Uniform Building Code (UBC) should not carry an exception that a separation is not required between an "accessory dwelling unit." The UBC requires that walls and floors separating dwelling units in the same building shall not be of less than one-hour fire-resistive construction.

Regulatory Review Committee Minutes Meeting Date: November 5, 1999 Page 2

Nathan will do some additional research into the approach of other jurisdictions and the intent of the State Building Code Council and the International Council of Building Officials.

Conclusion:

The ICBO handbook provides for the use of a "modified" onehour separation for accessory dwelling units. This is the approach adopted by Snohomish County. Nathan will present this option to Building Services Division managers and staff and determine if it will work for King County. If this approach is acceptable, DDES will propose to add the ICBO handbook language as an amendment to the Building Code.

<u>Issue</u>:

2. Does P-suffix condition VS-P28 (number 1 from the Vashon Town Plan which states, "Buildings fronting on streets, parking lots and pedestrian ways shall meet the following criteria...") apply when the building is separated from the existing street by a parking lot? If it does apply to a parking lot, how do we apply the building design criteria 1.A. through 1.F. to a parking lot? Further, how do we apply 1.D. which requires a building wall that faces a pedestrian street to have windows etc., when it is set back over 75 feet from that street? (Nancy Hopkins)

<u>Discussion</u>:

The Committee discussed the intent of the Vashon Town Plan and how to interpret the criteria in regards to a hardware/lumber store building fronting on a designated primary pedestrian street.

Conclusion:

The Committee concluded that the sentence in question does not require buildings to front on streets, parking lots or pedestrian ways, but when they do front on these elements the criteria apply. Also, the criteria are not employed for parking lots or pedestrian ways - only for buildings if they front on streets, parking lots or pedestrian ways.

SB:sm

cc: Tim Barnes, Prosecuting Attorney's Office Nancy Hopkins, Site Review Planner