

City of Yakima: Adequate provisions checklists

This appendix provides checklists to use in documenting barriers and programs and actions to achieve housing availability (RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d)). These checklists include the following:

- Exhibit B1: Moderate density housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or mid-Rise multifamily housing barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B3: Supplemental barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing
- Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist
- Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Documentation of the barriers to housing availability and the programs or actions needed to overcome these barriers must be in a public document and typically should be included as an appendix to the comprehensive plan housing element.

Barrier review checklists

Exhibit B1: Moderate density housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	No	This has not come up as a concern.	
Prohibiting some moderate density housing types, such as: ○ Duplexes ○ Triplexes ○ Four/five/six-plexes ○ Townhomes ○ Cottage housing ○ Live-work units ○ Manufactured home parks	Yes	No clear mention of triplex, or multiplex. All Zones: Manufactured/mobile home parks found under YMC 15.04.150 . Permit process for Manufacturing Home Parks is not clearly defined in the code.	Consider adding triplex or multiplexes in the code. Add middle housing standards per HB 1110. Clarify a permit process for manufactured/mobile homes parks in the code.
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	For single-family the minimum lot size is 6,000 sf and duplexes the minimum lot size is 7,000 sf. The minimum lot size requirement for duplexes is too high. GMA allows all single family residentials to include duplexes. Therefore, a different lot size is not needed. Minimum lot size for SF, duplex and zero lot line in zones other than R zones is too high and will prohibit moderate density housing. Mixed use and multi-family housing is allowed in B-1, B-2, SCC, LCC, GC, CBD, and RD under Table 4-1. Zero lot line is defined as one common wall only: <i>“Zero lot line” means the location of a dwelling on a lot in such a manner that one of the sides of the dwelling rests directly on a side lot line.</i> This limits development to two units only. Townhomes and rowhouses should allow zero lot line on both sides for middle units.	Reduce the minimum lot size requirement for duplexes to match the detached SF dwelling size of 6000 sf. in SR, R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones. Consider reducing lot size from 6000 sq-ft in B-1, B-2, SCC, LCC, GC, CBD, and RD zones to support various housing types with moderate density (e.g. duplex, multifamily) that are allowed in Table 4-1. Consider updating the zero lot line definition to allow zero lot line (townhomes) on both sides. Add townhome as a permitted use under attached single family home.

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		Cottage housing Cottage housing requires minimum 400 sf of common open space per dwelling, and 200 sf for private open space. This makes the lot (development) size requirements too high. The code requires 10,000 sf development size.	Cottage housing The city can consider reducing the development size from 10,000 sf to smaller to fit a minimum of four units under cottage housing. Also add this requirement under YMC 15.05 Table 5-2.
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	Density similarity between zones in Table 4-1 (YMC 15.04.030) and YMC 15.03.020 C.2: YMC 15.04.030 - Table 4-1 Same densities in R-2 and R-3 Zones 8-12 DU/NRA 13+ DU/NRA Reads that lower density (0-7 DU/NRA) is allowed in R2, R3, B-1 and B-2. YMC 15.03.020 - C2 and D2 R-2 Zone - Density "up to twelve dwelling units per net residential acre R-3 zone - Requires "more than twelve dwelling units per net residential acre" in R-3 Lot coverage - R1, R2 - 60% in Table 5-1 (YMC 15.05.030). This is low for duplex, attached SF, cottage housing and other middle housing types in R-2 zone.	Update code to match density between sections. Update code as follows: - R-3 - 13 units of more for R3. - R-2 - 8-12 DU/NRA - Remove 0-7 density references from R-2 and R-3 zones - Allocate minimum density for each zone or regulate thought lot coverage under non-residential zones Increase lot coverage for R2 zone for developments that <i>is consistent with</i> 12 units per acre <i>max</i> density.
Low maximum building heights	Partially	Max building height is 35 feet for residential R-1, R-2 zones, which is typically the tallest max height for such moderate density zones.	Consider increasing height limits for R-3 and commercial zones

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		50 ft height limit for R-3 zone can be limiting for higher and moderate density structures.	
Large setback requirements	Yes	Minimum setbacks for residential districts are: - 20 ft from the front property line - 5 ft in general, or 10 ft from the side property line abutting right-of-way - 20 ft for rear setbacks A front and rear setback combination that takes up 40 feet is high and prohibitive of moderate density housing developments.	Consider reducing the front and/or rear setbacks to keep the total within 25 - 30 ft.
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	Currently require 2 parking spaces per unit for most residential uses, with multifamily development 10 or more units at 1.5 space per DU, and less than 10 units at 2 space per DU. Two parking spaces per unit is a barrier for moderate density, relatively small multifamily developments. It is likely not a barrier for single family lots in SR and R-1 zones. Overall, this is non-compliance with SB 5184 parking requirements.	Yakima will need to update its development regulations to comply with this new law SB 5184 by January 2027. Update parking standards for compliance with the following requirements: ○ ADU - 0 if under 1200 sq-ft ○ Detached SF - 1 ○ Duplex - 0.5 ○ Studio - 0.5 ○ 3 bedroom apartment - 0.5
High impervious coverage limits	No	60% lot coverage for SR, R-1 and R-2, 80% for R-3.	
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	Yes	Building code: The City has adopted 2021 Washington State Building Code. Triplexes and Fourplexes are moderate density housing. Code is silent about permit fee for this type of housing. Multifamily under six units, single-family homes, duplexes, and townhomes fall under the Master Plan documents. This has impacts on moderate	Building code: HB 2071 (2024) has the State Building Council looking to update and include middle housing under the Washington State Residential Code, which would better align building codes and allowed residential uses. The City can adopt state building code changes or make changes themselves.

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		density housing that is of similar size and only has one or two more units than a duplex under the residential code. Reference to townhouses is only found in the building code, but not in the zoning code.	Add townhouses in the allowed use category in the zoning code.
Other (for example: complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	Partially	No tree retention requirements in the code on private properties except for shoreline areas under YMC 17.05.030. Yakima does not have separate design standards in addition to existing development standards.	
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No	Permitted use is located under YMC 15.04.030, Table 4-1 and the permit type under YMC 15.04.020. The decision type table does not differentiate between specific residential uses; it appears to apply equally to all residential uses except for single family uses in B-1 and B-2 zones where type 3 permit is required for compatibility.	
Design review	No		
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees ¹	No		

¹ For example: guidance resources are unclear or difficult to find, no digital permit tracking system, staff do not provide fee estimates or permitting time estimates are unavailable or inaccurate.

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	Anecdotally, fees are a challenge for private landowners. Not sure about larger developers. Utility connection fees may be challenging for properties that are far from services in the UGA and also in some areas of SR zone.	Consider incentives to reduce fees for affordable or multifamily housing. Continue long-range utility planning in UGAs Seek infrastructure investments for underserved areas. Seek water/sewer investments.
Processing times and staffing challenges	Yes	A short-staffed planning and building department have lesser capacity and can take longer to process permit applications. Online building application forms are available.	Can consider full online application submittal.
SEPA process	Yes	SEPA review processes can add time and expense that may not be necessary with other strong development regulations in place. YMC 6.88 adopts State SEPA rules.	Consider establishing SEPA threshold exemptions consistent with WAC 197-11-800 (1)(c) to encourage development (up to 30/60 units in the UGA and up to 20/25 units elsewhere for single family/multifamily).
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	Not a barrier.	
Environmental constraints	Yes	CAO Permitting challenges (setbacks and buffer adjustments, RUEs are timely and expensive).	TBD

Exhibit B2: Low-Rise or mid-Rise multifamily housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Unclear development regulations	No	Not a concern from permit application perspective.	
High minimum lot sizes	No	No minimum lot size requirement for multi-family dwellings. They are regulated by density, 0-7 DU/NRA in R1, R2, R3 and B1 zones. These zones also allow 8-12 and 13+ DU/NRA. Not a barrier for lot size.	
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Potentially	See discussion in Table B1.	See recommendations in Table B1
Low maximum building heights	Yes	Max building height is 35 feet for residential R-2 zone, which is typically the tallest max height for low-rise buildings. R-3 zone with 50 ft height limit can be limiting for mid-rise buildings. B-1 and B-2 zones with 35 ft height limit is not consistent with mixed-use mid-rise building types. Mixed use buildings are only allowed in these two zones.	Increase building height for R-3, B-1 and B-2 zones.
Large setback requirements	Yes	See discussion in Table B1	See recommendations in Table B1
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	The code currently requires 1.5 to 2 parking spaces per unit for low-rise and mid-rise multifamily housing. It requires 1.5 space per DU for multifamily development 10 or more units; and 2 space per DU for less than multifamily development with less than 10 units.	Yakima needs to update its development regulations to comply with this new law SB 5184 by January 2027. Update parking standards for compliance with the following requirements: ○ Studio - 0.5 ○ 3 bedroom apartment - 0.5

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		Two parking spaces per unit is a barrier for low to mid-rise housing.	
High impervious coverage limits	No	60% lot coverage for R-1 and R-2, 80% for R-3.	
Lack of alignment between building and development codes	No	Garden apartments meet what is allowed in the building code and if height is increased to four stories, that still matches stick wood construction type allowance.	
Other (for example: ground floor retail requirements, open space requirements, complex design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements)	No		
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Conditional use permit process	No	Permitted use is located under YMC 15.04.030, Table 4-1 and the permit type under YMC 15.04.020. The decision type table does not differentiate between specific residential uses; it appears to apply equally to all residential uses except for single family uses in B-1 and B-2 zones where type 3 permit is required for compatibility.	
Design review	No		
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No		
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Possibly.	Potentially fees around utilities. Current fee structure has separate rates for single family vs multi family units. Yakima doesn't have impact fee.	If impact fee is instated, ensure they meet SB 5258 requirements.

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
		SB 5258 requires jurisdictions to have proportional impact fee schedules.	
Process times and staffing challenges	Yes	A short-staffed planning and building department have lesser capacity and can take longer to process permit applications. Online building application forms are available.	Can consider full online application submittal.
SEPA process	No	SEPA review processes can add time and expense that may not be necessary with other strong development regulations in place.	Consider establishing SEPA threshold exemptions consistent with WAC 197-11-800 (1)(c) to encourage development (up to 30/60 units in the UGA and up to 20/25 units elsewhere for single family/multifamily).
LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	Not a barrier for housing.	
Environmental constraints	Yes	CAO Permitting challenges (setbacks and buffer adjustments, RUEs are timely and expensive).	- Determine how to permit RUEs

Exhibit B3: Supplementary barrier review checklist for PSH and emergency housing

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities) ²	Unlikely	None mentioned in the code.	No code on EH; need to add PSH in code.
Parking requirements	Possibly	Vehicle resident safe parking program in YMC 6.92.060 includes residents living in parking. No separate parking requirement is identified.	
On-site recreation and open space requirements	No	None in YMC 6.92	
Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone	No	None mentioned in the code.	Update the code to allow office and accessory spaces.
Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW 35A.21.314)	No	None mentioned in the code.	
Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW 36.130.020)	No	Site plan requirement under YMC 6.92 . No site development is required.	
Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters, emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing	Yes	There are limited regulations around TH and PSH Temporary small houses are allowed under YMC 6.92.070	Add emergency and permanent supportive housing as separate use types in the code for clarity.

² Note that RCW 35A.21.430 expressly states requirements on occupancy, spacing, and intensity of use may not prevent the siting of a sufficient number of permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, indoor emergency housing or indoor emergency shelters necessary to accommodate each code city's projected need for such housing and shelter under RCW 36.70A.070(2)(a)(ii). The restrictions on these uses must be to protect public health and safety.

Exhibit B4: Accessory dwelling unit barrier review checklist

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS			
Consistent with HB 1337 (2023) - Must allow two ADUs on each lot in urban growth areas; - May not require the owner to occupy the property, and may not prohibit sale as independent units, but may restrict the use of ADUs as short term rentals; - Must allow an ADU of at least 1,000 square feet; - Must set parking requirements based on distance from transit and lot size; - May not charge more than 50% of the impact fees charged for the principal unit; - Must permit ADUs in structures detached from the principal unit; - May not restrict roof heights of ADUs to less than 24 feet, unless that limitation applies to the principal unit; - May not impose setback requirements, yard coverage limits, tree retention mandates, restrictions on entry door locations, aesthetic requirements, or requirements for design review for ADUs that are more restrictive than those for principal units; - Must allow an ADUs on any lot that meets the minimum lot size required for the principal unit; - Must allow detached ADUs to be sited at a lot line if the lot line abuts a public alley, unless the city or county routinely plows snow on the public alley; - Must allow conversions from existing structures, even if they violate current code requirements for setbacks or lot coverage; and - May not require public street improvements as a condition of permitting ADUs.	Yes	YMC 15.09.045 includes ADU regulations. The Code is not consistent as follows: - Only one ADU is allowed per single family; lot size is not specified - Silent on not requiring owner's occupancy - Silent on parking based on transit proximity - Does not seem to have owner occupancy requirements	Update code: - Allow two ADUs - Add lot size standards - Add parking near transit standards - Clarify non-owner occupancy
Unclear development regulations	No		
Large setback requirements	No		
Off-street parking requirements	Yes	1 space per ADU in YMC 15.06.045. Standards are not in compliance with HB 5184 for 0 parking under 1200 sq-ft	Update the code

Barrier	Likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barriers.
Other (for example: burdensome design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements, open space requirements, etc.)	No	Not a barrier	
PROCESS OBSTACLES			
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	Yes	Standards are not in compliance with HB 1337	Update the code
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees that are not proportionate to impact	Yes, potentially	Potentially utility connections. No impact fees in Yakima	
Processing times and staffing challenges	Yes	Identified as an on-going challenge. Work on-going to address.	Consider online administrative review - reduces processing time and staff power.

Exhibit B5: Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status	Plans for implementation
Housing and related services sales tax (RCW 82.14.530)	Implemented YMC 3.78.065	N/A
Affordable housing property tax levy (RCW 84.52.105)	Not applied	
REET 2 (RCW 82.46.035) – GMA jurisdictions only and only available through 2025	<i>Not applied and no longer available.</i>	N/A
Affordable Housing Sales Tax Credit (RCW 82.14.540) – was only available to jurisdictions through July 2020	<i>Not applied and no longer available.</i>	N/A
Lodging Tax (RCW 67.28.150 and RCW 67.28.160) to repay general obligation bonds or revenue bonds	<i>Used by the city to pay off the convention center. Not used for housing.</i>	N/A
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Tax (RCW 82.14.460) – jurisdictions with a population over 30,000	<i>Not applied</i>	
Donating surplus public lands for affordable housing projects (RCW 39.33.015)	<i>Not applied</i>	<i>The City could inventory public land and assess for suitability.</i>
Impact fee waivers for affordable housing projects (RCW 82.02.060)	<i>Not applicable, as City of Yakima does not have impact fees.</i>	N/A
Application fee waivers or other benefits for affordable housing projects (RCW 36.70A.540)	<i>Not applied</i>	
Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) with affordable housing requirement (RCW 84.14)	The City of Yakima established its MFTE program, called the Downtown Redevelopment Tax Incentive Program, in 2006. (11.63 YMC)	<i>Consider expanding MFTE to all multifamily zones in the city.</i>
General funds (including levy lid lifts to increase funds available)	<i>Not applied</i>	

* Some tools may be unavailable for certain jurisdictions. For example, only GMA jurisdictions can use REET 2, or the surrounding county may have already implemented the housing and related services sales tax. See MRSC's summary of [Affordable Housing Funding Sources](#) for more details and the Association of Washington Cities (AWC)/MRSC booklet on [Homelessness & housing toolkit for cities](#) (2022).