

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

		Boston, MA	Chicago, IL	Oakland, CA	San Diego, CA
General Code	Last Major Update		2004	1998, now being updated	2003
	Website	http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/zo	http://w14.cityofchicago.org:8080/z	http://bpc.iserver.net/codes/oakland	http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/Website
Multi-Family Zoning Designations (R =	Zones	Boston uses "Type-FAR-Max Height" system (ex H-3-65). H (apartment) and R (general) zones allow MF	RT (Res-townhouse) and RM (Res-multifamily) zones area similar to Seattle MF with FARs from 1.05 to 6.6	R-36, R-40, R-50, R-60, R-70, R-80 and R-90 zones are similar to Seattle MF (R / # = Resid/ height limit?)	RT (Res-townhouse) and RM (Res-multifamily) zones area similar to Seattle MF
Zoning Approach	Building Block	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	FAR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Quality Point System	No	No	No	No
	Schedule/Performance	No	No	Minimal	No
	Other				
Design Standards	Modulation	No	No	No	Encouraged through setback
	Variable Setback	Front (based on neighbors)	Front (based on neighbors) Side (based on height)	Front (based on neighbors)	Complex Front and Side setbacks
	Lot Coverage	No	No	No	Yes
	Design Review	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
	Special Lot Features	No	No	Alt front setback on steep slope	Alt setback/FAR on steep slope
	Other	Transition zoning for lots straddling or adjacent to residential/business boundaries	Min interior separations for courtyards, window standards to prevent blank walls, FAR bonus for fewer units	Conditional permitted density bonuses, maximum nonresidential FAR, required courtyards in some cases	Special townhouse regs, FAR bonus for underground parking, max paving, maximum 3rd story lot coverage, garage doors regs, sun access envelope
Growth Plans	Targeted Growth Areas	No	No	No	No
	Neighborhood Specificity	Very High, 35+ neighborhoods	No	Minimal	20 planned districts
	Centers or Villages	No	No	No	Urban village overlay zone
	Special Districts	No	9 neighborhood overlay districts	14 "Combining" Zones	13 Overlays
Affordable Housing	Inclusionary	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Bonuses	No	FAR Bonus (downtown only)	Density bonus	Density bonus
	Other		Land write-down program, TIF and Low-Income Housing Trust Fund	Impact fees, 25% of TIF set aside, Considering min densities in MF, inclusionary	Impact fees
Key Development Standards	Open Space	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Density limits/minimums	Limits (low density zones only)	Limits, but SROs have separate standards	Limits, but SROs & efficiencies have separate standards	Limits
	Parking Requirements	Min (by FAR w/ exceptions)	Minimums, by parking zone	Minimums	Minimums with reductions
	Arch Features/Materials	No	Min window area only	No	No
	Size or Mix of Units	No	Min average unit size & max number of efficiencies	Reduced density requirements for efficiencies	No
	Goals/Intents	No	Yes, brief	Yes, brief	Yes, brief
Other Housing	Congregate/ SRO	Not addressed	Allowed in RT4.5 and higher	Allowed	Not Addressed
	Accessory buildings	Allowed	Allowed in all zones	Allowed	Allowed
Contact Person Listed		Jeff Hampton, Senior Zoning Planner, Jeffrey.Hampton.bra@cityofboston.gov, (617)918-4308	(312) 744-3508 general	Neil Gray, Strategic Planning, (510) 238-3878 / zoning general number:(510) 238-3912	Neighborhood Code Compliance Department general (619) 236-5500

		Boston, MA	Chicago, IL	Oakland, CA	San Diego, CA
--	--	------------	-------------	-------------	---------------

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

		San Jose, CA	Denver, CO	Milwaukee, WI	Portland, OR
General Code I	Last Major Update		2002	2002	
	Website	http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning	http://www.denvergov.com/dephor	http://www.city.milwaukee.gov/disc	http://www.portlandonline.com/planning
Multi-Family Zoning Designations (R =	Zones	RT (Res-townhouse) and RM (Res-multifamily) zones are similar to Seattle MF, but only go up to 1 unit/ 200 sq. ft.	R-2, R-2-A, R-2-B, R-3, R-3-X, R-4, and R-4-X are comparable to Seattle MF	Zones are separated by use and intensity. 4 zones (RT1-RT4) allow some two family. 7 zones (RM1-RM7) allow multi-family	R3, R2, R1, RH (Residential High-density), and RX (Central Residential) are comparable to Seattle MF
Zoning Approach	Building Block	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Low and Mid-rise Zones)
	FAR	No	Yes (Mid & High-rise zones)	No	Yes (Mid and High-rise Zones)
	Quality Point System	No	No	No	No
	Schedule/Performance	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	No
	Other		Bulk planes		Amenity bonuses
Design Standards	Modulation	Through design review only	No	No	No
	Variable Setback	Front (based on neighbors) and Side (based on height)	Variable side setback for small lots & rear garages	No	Side (based on area of façade)
	Lot Coverage	No	No	Yes	No
	Design Review	Yes, currently updating	Yes (staff review in R-4-X only)	No	Yes
	Special Lot Features	No	No	No	No
	Other		Required alley car entrances, max garage door size, limited sunlight regs, mountain view preservation regulations	30% of front façade must be exactly at setback	Alternative development options for townhouses and attached units, commercial allowed as conditional uses in most places, TDRs
Growth Plans	Targeted Growth Areas	No	No	"Smart Growth Law" of 1999	In intent only
	Neighborhood Specificity	No	No	12 area plans	High, 27 Plan districts
	Centers or Villages	No	No	No	No
	Special Districts	Downtown district only	10 Overlay Districts	4 Development Incentive Zones	15 overlay zones
Affordable Housing	Inclusionary	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Bonuses	No	No	No	No
	Other			Note: Milwaukee does not have the similar affordability issues	
Key Development Standards	Open Space	No	Yes (except high-rise)		Yes
	Density limits/minimums	Limits	No	Unit density limits. Min façade, stories & height in others	Minimums and Maximums
	Parking Requirements	Min w/ reductions, off-site ok	Minimums (by parking class)	Minimums	Min car and bike w/ exceptions
	Arch Features/Materials	Yes, through design guidelines	Fences only	15% max metal on façade	No
	Size or Mix of Units	Separate SRO regs	Minimum size in some zones	Room sizes regs, not unit size	No
	Goals/Intents	Yes, brief	Very Basic	Yes	Yes, good descriptions
Other Housing	Congregate/ SRO	Allowed	"rooming house" regulations	"rooming houses" regulations	Allowed in some zones
	Accessory buildings	Allowed	Allowed, but complicated	Not Addressed	Allowed in some zones
Contact Person Listed		Dionne Early (mid- and high-rise design guidelines) at (408) 535-7870	Theresa Lucero, Project Manager, Zoning.CodeUpdate@ci.denver.co.us	Department of City Development, Development Center 414-286-2507	Bureau of Planning general number: 503-823-6868

		San Jose, CA	Denver, CO	Milwaukee, WI	Portland, OR
--	--	--------------	------------	---------------	--------------

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

		St. Paul, MN	Fort Collins, CO	Pittsburgh, PA (Partial Review)	Tacoma, WA (Partial Review)
General Code	Last Major Update		1997	1979	Now being updated
	Website	http://www.stpaul.gov/code/#viii	http://www.colocode.com/ftcollins/	http://library8.municode.com/gatew	http://www.ci.tacoma.wa.us/citycler
Multi-Family Zoning Designations (R =	Zones	RT1, RT2, RM1, RM2, RM3, TN1, TN2, & TN3 are comparable to Seattle MF but don't get as dense.	Conservation District (N-C-M) is only zone comparable to Seattle MF zones (max 4units/building); numerous mixed use zones	Separate zones for use and intensity. R2, R3 & RM "use" zones and L, M, H & VH "intensities" allow multi-family.	R-3, R-4, R-4-L, & R-5 zones are comparable to Seattle MF
Zoning Approach	Building Block	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	FAR	No	Yes	No	No
	Quality Point System	No	No	No	No
	Schedule/Performance	No	No	Only for non-res in res zone	No
	Other	Traditional Neighborhood (TN)			
Design Standards	Modulation	No	Yes	No	
	Variable Setback	Front (based on neighbors) All (based on height in high-rise)	No	Yes	
	Lot Coverage	Yes (except TN)	No	No	
	Design Review	Yes (TN zones only)	No		No
	Special Lot Features	No	No		
	Other	Bonus for underground parking	Basic neighborhood compatibility, solar access, solar orientation, and color standards. Max "inorganic material" coverage.		Mass reduction, roofline, windows, façade & pedestrian standards for mixed use & commercial
Growth Plans	Targeted Growth Areas	TN zones to be high growth	Yes, Urban Growth Boundary		
	Neighborhood Specificity	Low	No		
	Centers or Villages	No	No		
	Special Districts	4 districts and 4 river overlays	5 special districts & water buffer		
Affordable Housing	Inclusionary	No	No	No	No
	Bonuses	No	No	No	No
	Other	Low Income Housing Tax Credit	Development fee waiver, priority processing, sales tax rebate for materials used, others		Ten year property tax exemption in target areas
Key Development Standards	Open Space	No	Yes		
	Density limits/minimums	Min & Max in TN, Min lot size/unit in other residential	Min unit density, max pop density		
	Parking Requirements	Min & Max in TN, Min in others	Minimum car and bike parking		
	Arch Features/Materials	Yes (TN zones only)	Fence material		
	Size or Mix of Units	No	Min 2 types of housing for big projects.		
	Goals/Intents	Intent statement for each zone	Yes, good descriptions		
Other Housing	Congregate/ SRO	Not allowed	"boarding and rooming house"		
	Accessory buildings	With neighbors approval only	Not Addressed		
Contact Person Listed		Department of Planning and Economic Development, 651-266-6700	Neighborhood, Building and Zoning Services, 970-221-6760, Advance Planning: 970-221-6376	Neighborhood Planning Section: 412-255-2223, Zoning Administrator: 412-255-2241	Public Works Department, Building & Land Use Services Division: 591-5404, jcolburn@cityoftacoma.org

		St. Paul, MN	Fort Collins, CO	Pittsburgh, PA (Partial Review)	Tacoma, WA (Partial Review)
--	--	--------------	------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

		Palo Alto, CA (Partial Review)	New York City (Partial Review)	Albuquerque, NM (Partial Review)
General Code	Last Major Update	1978, now being updated		
	Website	http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/plann	http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/s	http://www.amlegal.com/albuquerque
Multi-Family Zoning Designations (R =	Zones	R-36, R-40, R-50, R-60, R-70, R-80 and R-90 zones are comparable to Seattle MF	14 zones from R3A to R10 allow multi-family housing, but limit on density and heights is higher than Seattle.	R-T, R-LT, R-2, R-3 and MH allow multifamily, but much lower limit on height and density than Seattle.
Zoning Approach	Building Block	Yes	Yes	Yes
	FAR	Yes	Yes	No
	Quality Point System	No	No	No
	Schedule/Performance	No	Minimal	No
	Other			
Design Standards	Modulation			
	Variable Setback	Different setback above first story		
	Lot Coverage	Yes		
	Design Review	Yes (in overlay district)		
	Special Lot Features			
	Other	TDRs		
Growth Plans	Targeted Growth Areas			
	Neighborhood Specificity			
	Centers or Villages			
	Special Districts			
Affordable Housing	Inclusionary	Yes	No	No
	Bonuses	Density bonus if exceeds 10%	Density bonus in limited areas	Density bonus
	Other		Bonus for buying and preserving existing affordable housing	Fee waiver, fast-tracking, more lenient variance process
Key Development Standards	Open Space	Yes		
	Density limits/minimums	Limits		
	Parking Requirements	Minimums (by zone & use)		
	Arch Features/Materials			
	Size or Mix of Units			
	Goals/Intents			
Other Housing	Congregate/ SRO			
	Accessory buildings			
Contact Person Listed		Planning Division at (650) 329-2603, or by e-mail at zoneupdate@cityofpaloalto.org	Department of City Planning: (212) 720-3300, Zoning Information Desk: (212) 720-3291	Deborah Nason, Public Information Officer, (505) 924-3860, dnason@cabq.gov

		Palo Alto, CA (Partial Review)	New York City (Partial Review)	Albuquerque, NM (Partial Review)
--	--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

	Boston, MA	Chicago, IL	Oakland, CA	San Diego, CA
Design Review		17-13-0500 & 0600 Planned Unit Developments		
Source			Chapter 17.136 DESIGN REVIEW PROCEDURE	
		Large commercial, residential and industrial uses as per 17-13-0500, along waterways, abnormal situations such as air rights	generally developments of 3 or more units where building is at least 75% residential, special design review for 1 & 2 unit developments	
Who's regulated				
Process				
Process Steps			pre-application conference, review by staff or commission, optional hearing	
Length of Process			60 days or approved	
Permit Decision type			approve, disapprove, condition	
Appealable			only in special circumstances	
Review Body		Staff (Zoning Administrator and Commissioner of Planning and Development), Plan Commission & City Council		
Staff vs Board?			depends on level of review	
Staff Expertise				
Board Make Up		18 member Commission, appointed by the Mayor	7 appointments by mayor, not representational requirements	
Design Criteria				
Discretionary?			High	
Design Content?		Yes, see Sec. 17-8-0900;	High	
Fees				
Fees		Planning & Development - Zoning & Land Use Section 312-744-0930	Ed Monasie, 510.238.7733 CEDA Planning & Zoning 510.238.3911 Called 11/30	
Contact				

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

	San Jose, CA	Denver, CO	Milwaukee, WI	Portland, OR
Design Review		http://www.denvergov.com/Urban_Design/template113207.asp		
Source				
Who's regulated		Overlay zones, specifically high density such as R-4X		
Process		Pre-submittal conference, Schematic Design Phase Review, & Design Development Phase Review		
Process Steps				Many levels of review
Length of Process		?		5-8 wks minor, 8-12 wks major
Permit Decision type		approval, disapproval and conditional approval at each stage		approve, approve with conditions, disapprove
Appealable		Yes		Yes
Review Body				
Staff vs Board?		Staff		Depending on level of review
Staff Expertise		?		mix of architects, landscape architects & planners
Board Make Up				mix of professions
Design Criteria				Depending of type of review
Discretionary?		Depends on applicant option		
Design Content?		Yes		Yes
Fees		?		\$653-\$22,431
Contact		Community Planning and Development, 720-865-2915		Jeff Joslin - 503-823-7705, jjoslin@ci.portland.us

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

		St. Paul, MN	Fort Collins, CO	Pittsburgh, PA (Partial Review)	Tacoma, WA (Partial Review)
--	--	--------------	------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------

Design Review

Source

Who's regulated

Process

Process Steps

Length of Process

Permit Decision type

Appealable

Review Body

Staff vs Board?

Staff Expertise

Board Make Up

Design Criteria

Discretionary?

Design Content?

Fees

Fees

Contact

Multi-family Zoning Codes Comparison

	Palo Alto, CA (Partial Review)	New York City (Partial Review)	Albuquerque, NM (Partial Review)	Bellevue, WA
Design Review				Part 20.30F Design Review, http://www.cityofbellevue.org/bellcode/Bluc2030F.html
Source				
Who's regulated				
Process				
Process Steps				
Length of Process				
Permit Decision type				
Appealable				
Review Body				
Staff vs Board?				Staff?
Staff Expertise				
Board Make Up				
Design Criteria				
Discretionary?				
Design Content?				
Fees				
Fees				
Contact				Land Use/Zoning, PH: 425-452-6864 (ask for urban design team)