

1. Density:

(a) “Housing Density safe harbor” should vary by urban area population. Suggest the following ranges:

- (i) <2500;
- (ii) 2,500-10,000 but not growing (eg, .1% in x time frame);
- (iii) 2,500-10,000 and growing;
- (iv) 10,000-25,000;
- (v) 25,000-100,000;
- (vi) 100,000 +

(b) The density safe harbor should be a **PROJECTED AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY** for the city, at buildout, in 20 years, but excluding exception land, which would be treated according to a different safe harbor (see #3, below). This density number could be used by the city to compute the overall land need (based on population, household size, buildable land inventory, etc).

(c) For each population range (above), to use the safe harbor the city must also **ALLOW** (zone for) the opportunity for a higher average density than the projected average. Thus, there is a second “number” associated with each safe harbor in (b).

(d) In addition, for each population range (above), to use the safe harbor the city must also agree to set a **MINIMUM ALLOWED DENSITY**, ie, a third “number”.

(e) for example, see the chart below:

Density Safe Harbors*					
Proj Pop	Growth Rate	Min	Proj Ave	Opportunity	
<2500	Any	3	4	6	
2,500-10,000	<1%	3	4	6	
2,500-10,000	>1%	4	6	8	
10,000-25,000	Any	4	6	8	
25,000-100,000	Any	6	8	10	
>100,000	Any	8	10	12	

The numbers filled in here are illustrated. The work group should decide whether they can agree to these or other numbers, based on the research and other factors. The safe harbor should be “conservative”, ie, the department recommends it should encourage a **HIGHER** density than is demonstrated by “the past” in the city.

(f) An alternative scheme for a density safe harbor would be based on a **PERCENTAGE INCREASE** over the existing density for **DEVELPED** and in the city. This number should also vary by urban area size, as described above. The department does not favor this method over the method above because it “rewards” cities that have developed with a low density over time.

2. Housing Mix:

The housing mix safe harbor should be three-tiered: one % for Detached Single Family, Large Lot, another % for attached SF including manufactured housing, townhouses, and a third % for multi family. This should vary according to population, but for simplicity, I display it below based on projected average density for #1 above, in part because if a city uses the safe harbor in #1 above, DLCD proposes the city must also use the housing mix safe harbor illustrated below.

Housing Mix Safe Harbors	Sq Ft	Proj Ave Density			
		4	6	8	10
Detached Single Family, Large Lot	>5,000	60%	50%	40%	30%
Small Lot SF, Dup, Attached and MHP	<5,000	20%	25%	30%	35%
Multiple Family		20%	25%	30%	35%

The numbers filled in here are illustrated. The work group should decide whether they can agree to these or other numbers, based on the research and other factors. The safe harbor should be “conservative”, ie, the department recommends it should encourage a higher density mix tilted toward more “affordable housing types than might be demonstrated by “past” research.

3. Exception Areas: The department proposes that the workgroup consider an “exception area” safe harbor regarding the projected “buildout” or infill of exception areas taken into the UGB. The safe harbor should be two-tiered, as follows:

(a) For exception lands that are already parcelized and developed in a pattern of 3-acre lots or smaller: project buildout at 2 units/acre

(b) For exception lands that are already parcelized and developed in a pattern of greater than 3-acre: project buildout at 3 units/acre

The numbers shaded above are not based on research; this is research we have yet to complete.

4. Location analysis safe harbor – distance from existing UGB

Locational Safe Harbors	Proj Ave Density			
	4	6	8	10
Exception Area distance from UGB for UGB	0.25 mi	0.5 mi	0.75 mi	1 mi
Exception areas 1/4 mi+ from UGB with intervening agricultural land can be disregarded				