

## MINUTES

## MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

APRIL 21, 2009

**Mayor Ferguson** called the work session to order at 5:37 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room.

Council Present: Mayor Jeremy Ferguson, Council President Deborah Barnes, Councilors Greg Chaimov, Joe Loomis, and Susan Stone.

Staff Present: City Manager Mike Swanson, Resource and Economic Specialist Alex Campbell, Community Development and Public Works Director Kenny Asher, Planning Director Katie Mangle, Senior Planner Susan Shanks, Human Resources Director Cynthia Trosino

Media: Matt Graham

**Milwaukie Alderman 3<sup>rd</sup> District**

**Nick Kovak**, Alderman 3<sup>rd</sup> District in Milwaukee, Wisconsin was in town for the Green Cities Conference in Portland. They had a 15-member council. He thought Milwaukie was a beautiful city on a beautiful river. Milwaukee had a similar layout but needed to work on zoning around the river. Water was a big issue in his town and there were a lot of suburbs surrounding them that wanted water. He discussed transit and pedestrian connectivity.

**Councilor Barnes** asked how they dealt with wastewater issues.

**Mr. Kovak** replied they had a treatment facility at the port. He wished they were doing more bio-treatment with stormwater. They were starting to buy land for detention ponds. Their biggest water quality issues were agricultural runoff and invasive species.

**Mr. Swanson** gave an update on the Emmert case. The City was pursuing reimbursement of \$92,000 in legal fees. He recommended the Council go into executive session at the end of the regular session to discuss potential litigation regarding a letter from the County.

**Mr. Swanson** said in response to a request from Councilor Barnes he had drafted a letter regarding amendments to the Federal Fair Housing Act. It affirmed the City's commitment to the policy, which was valid in practice but burdened some communities more than others. It suggested an exemption when a community a community had accepted its share of housing. The City Attorney had suggested some amendments to the letter, and Mr. Swanson would prepare a final draft.

**Councilor Chaimov** asked if it would be appropriate to consider having a period of time indefinite, but then was triggered by an increase in the number of facilities somewhere else or a change in ratio.

**Mr. Swanson** was looking at something like that. The burden should not be on 1 or 2 communities with no set time limit.

**Councilor Barnes** thanked Mr. Swanson for working on this and said she talked with Martha Schrader's staff who said they would help on it. It was decision that had to be made at the federal level. She appreciated getting started on it.

**Councilor Loomis** did not like the term burdened by places. He hoped the intent would be that it was not fair to have everyone in the same area. They need to spread these places out so the residents can find jobs within walking distance. It should be addressed from that standpoint. It was not fair to the residents to call them a burden.

**Councilor Barnes** said it talking about residential treatment facilities, so there were no jobs to consider.

**Mr. Swanson** said Milwaukie had half of the facilities which was an exorbitant amount.

#### **Draft Response to North Main Village Transactions**

**Mr. Swanson** said it was in draft form, and he would need a couple of weeks to final the report.

**Mayor Ferguson** recessed the work session until Ms. Shanks arrived.

#### **Briefing on Proposed Street Improvement Requirements for Single-Family Residential Expansion**

**Ms. Mangle** and **Ms. Shanks** provided an overview of the proposal and summarized the alternatives or options. Currently projects triggered improvements based on value, and staff was proposing that the trigger be impact based. Single-family residence interior remodels and expansions of less than 200-square feet would not trigger improvements.

**Councilor Chaimov** asked if street improvements would be triggered if an owner finished a basement creating 3 new bedrooms.

**Ms. Shanks** replied it would not if the square footage was already there. She referred to the staff report page 10 for what would and would not trigger the code and the cut off and high end. They divided up expansions into square footage categories. 0-199 feet would not trigger; 200-499, 500-799 and 1500 and above would trigger the code. They looked at the low/high end to figure out the separate categories. There were 5 types of streets improvements so the categories would match street improvements. They needed to make sure there was enough right-of-way, road way widening, access improvement, curb/storm water improvements, and sidewalk improvements. If we were requiring incremental improvements it needed to be done in a specific order to match how a street is constructed.

**Councilor Loomis** asked if it would add 12% to the cost.

**Ms. Shanks** said it was hard to get an average and was hard to nail down a specific number.

**Councilor Stone** wanted to know how many of the remodels that had been done would trigger improvements.

**Ms. Shanks** replied the average was about 22 per year. Others would not trigger the code.

**Councilor Stone** did not want to discourage owners from improving their homes. She would hate improvements to be triggered in areas that did not need sidewalks.

**Ms. Shanks** said they were building in more design development improvements. Right now they did not have that flexibility. It built in more fees in lieu of construction (FILOC) parameters for design and for a more appropriate treatment when applicable.

**Councilor Stone** did not agree with FILOC and was tired of government not letting people have what they worked so hard for. It seemed like a tax and it was not a good time to do this. She wanted to encourage people to fix up their houses, and she liked uniformity and not a piecemeal street.

**Ms. Shanks** said there had been a FILOC since 2002 and the new code had more specific parameters for its use. There was more flexibility in making design decisions.

**Ms. Mangle** said development was required to pay its own way, and this was a common approach in building to a residential scale. The question was where was the line? Sidewalks and street improvements were needed. The proposal asserts that development should help pay because other funding sources are not there. The community had said over the years that development should pay for impacts.

**Councilor Stone** did not agree that small additions would make impacts on streets, and she did not agree with passing on the cost residents. She suggested an increase in square footage.

**Ms Shanks** said there were some alternatives on the square footage that Council could consider.

**Councilor Barnes** asked how the City would fund livability issues if development did not pay for itself.

**Ms. Shanks** replied there were limited options. There were limited funding sources available for these types of projects. Grants were limited because of match money requirements and not that many locations met eligibility requirements. If development did not pay then we were limited. The Street Maintenance fee was for surface improvements and did not include pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

**Ms. Shanks** provided photos of some of the needs in the community and a sidewalk inventory map. During the Transportation System Plan (TSP) process there were some from the street design group that advocated for no sidewalks and others that wanted them. The group agreed at the end that it was not so much a debate of pedestrian facility but design. The proposed code language built in those design types.

**Councilor Stone** said there were many neighborhoods in SW Portland that did not have sidewalks or curbs and looked lovely. Sidewalks were appropriate on streets heavily used by pedestrians and cars. We needed to rethink the yellow striping because it takes away from the look of the residential street.

**Councilor Loomis** thought staff did a good job in making the code fair, but improving a bad idea did not make it good. He was fundamentally against adding fees to single-family residences. New dwellings and adding additional units were different. It made it more difficult to revitalize when adding an extra 12%. The property owners might consider moving instead of remodeling. If this

was truly a community goal we needed to look at maintenance fees. He was more accepting of paying \$2 a month if he knew the City had a plan rather than writing a \$6,000 check. He would like to remove the whole thing. If we do this then we should add basements. If we identify school routes or bike and pedestrian routes to downtown we should concentrate there. He did not think it was an effective way to make that goal happen. It hindered revitalization. He thought Ms. Shanks did a good job revising the code, but it would not get the job done.

**Councilor Chaimov** was happy to approve as written but would be happier if staff could come up with alternatives that would convince Councilor Stone and Councilor Loomis to balance public improvements needed because of private development and the interests of not hindering people from improving their properties such as a higher number of square feet or adding dwelling units.

**Ms. Shanks** said cities have not been able to afford infrastructure. That had shifted when the subdivision expansion hit and cities had to build improvements into the cost of the project. It was common because there was no money to do infill.

**Councilor Stone** said to keep in mind when a developer did a major development they were making a lot of money and recouping fees that a private homeowner cannot until the property value assessment increased. This belonged in a commercial not residential realm.

**Ms. Shanks** reviewed alternatives and briefly touched on Planning Commission discussions.

**Councilor Barnes** said people wanted sidewalks and more children would be walking to school. This was a livability issue. We needed safe routes for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Jeff Klein**, Planning Commission Chair, had the same questions as Councilor Stone and Councilor Loomis. They did not want to discourage people from making improvements, but there was a usage that came about with that. This did not capture as many people but did provide better guidelines on what would happen. Sidewalk on one side of Logus Road made it much safer to walk. There were some residents that would not want them on Home Avenue or other streets. When looking at the first trigger, the right-of-way dedication was all that needed to be done. There was no out of pocket expense for that. The idea of \$2 registration fee was an interesting idea. There were a lot of streets in need.

**Councilor Loomis** did not disagree that there was a need, but he did not think it would work. It put the burden on certain citizens. If it was a community goal we needed to find a way to fund it.

**Mr. Klein** said if someone was doing a 200 square foot increase we needed to set a bar somewhere.

**Councilor Loomis** did not want Milwaukie to be a starter home capital.

**Ms. Mangle** asked if the objections were mostly about home expansions.

**Ms. Shanks** explained they went from value based to impact based because there were a lot of concerns raised about downtown and non-downtown. They thought it was fair to apply it across the board and then determined triggers. There was data showing bigger homes had greater impacts. Staff wanted to apply the approach citywide.

**Councilor Stone** said comparing residences to downtown was like comparing apples to oranges. There were tax incentives in the downtown. They were looking at an offset for taxes for 10 years. The single-family residence owners just had to wait until the value caught up. There were a lot of streets that did not need sidewalks. We do not need more concrete on the planet. Logus Road was a neat project. Sidewalks do not make streets safer. She knew of a mother killed walking with her child down a sidewalk; she thought she was safe. Streets were safer with traffic calming. People in general wanted livability. Some people liked sidewalks and other did not. She did not think you needed sidewalks to make the City more beautiful. This does not belong in the single-family residence realm at all. It belonged in commercial. She did not want to deter people from improving their properties.

**Mr. Klein** said people either loved or hated sidewalks. Some that did not like sidewalks did not like the bulbouts and the fact that it slows them down, which was the point. It was to slow traffic down and allow pedestrian access.

**Ms. Mangle** said one thing to keep in mind was that it was not just about sidewalks. Many places in the City did not have right-of-way. It was not writing a check but was a contribution to the public. Not having a right-of-way access increased the cost of the project.

**Ms. Shanks** said staff agreed with points raised. They recognized the code was not a full solution but was about what happened when development occurred. There was a benefit to properties especially in terms of safety. It was about the whole street. She discussed conflict points.

**Mr. Swanson** said they could go back and look at a highway user fee, which was alternative. He heard talk about consensus. He did not hear an interest in assessing residential. They can take it back and look at other alternatives and try to cost it and get some idea of what that might be per car or house and come back with a number and another alternative.

**Councilor Stone** asked what was the constitutionality.

**Ms. Mangle** would address that with the City Attorney.

#### **City Manager Employment Agreement**

**Ms. Trosino** distributed the agreement.

**City Attorney Monahan** explained there were two modifications. Mr. Swanson asked to eliminate one of the proposed benefits. He fully appreciated the comments and concerns and was making a commitment to take vacation time under the terms. He wanted to take that provision out of an extension agreement. The other change was that it be retroactive to March 1, 2009.

**Mayor Ferguson** adjourned the work session at 6:57 p.m.



Pat DuVal, City Recorder

# WORK SESSION

**REVISED  
AGENDA**

**WORK SESSION  
MILWAUKIE CITY COUNCIL**

**APRIL 21, 2009**

**MILWAUKIE CITY HALL**

Second Floor Conference Room  
10722 SE Main Street

A light dinner will be served.

***WORK SESSION – 5:30 p.m.***

Discussion Items:

	<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenter</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1.	5:30 p.m.	Urban Renewal Background Briefing	Alex Campbell/Tashman Johnson Team	1
2.	6:20 p.m.	Briefing on Proposed Street Improvement Requirements for Single-Family Residential Expansion	Susan Shanks	4
3.	6:45 p.m.	Adjourn		

Executive Session: The Milwaukie City Council may go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2). All discussions are confidential and those present may disclose nothing from the Session. Representatives of the news media are allowed to attend Executive Sessions as provided by ORS 192.660(3) but must not disclose any information discussed. No Executive Session may be held for the purpose of taking any final action or making any final decision. Executive Sessions are closed to the public.

**Public Notice**

- The Council may vote in work session on non-legislative issues.
- The time listed for each discussion item is approximate. The actual time at which each item is considered may change due to the length of time devoted to the one previous to it.
- For assistance/service per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) please dial TDD (503) 786-7555.
- The Council requests that all pagers and cell phones be either set on silent mode or turned off during the meeting.



**To:** Mayor and City Council

**Through:** Mike Swanson, City Manager &  
Kenneth Asher, Community Development & Public Works Director

**From:** Alex Campbell, Resource & Economic Development Specialist

**Subject:** Urban Renewal Background Briefing

**Date:** April 8 for April 21, 2009 Work Session

**Action Requested**

None.

**History of Prior Actions and Discussions**

**Feb. 2009:** Council approved urban renewal study contract with Tashman Johnson.

**Oct. 2008:** Council directed staff to develop an urban renewal work plan.

**June 2008:** Council directed staff to look into urban renewal to support critical public infrastructure investments in downtown.

**Dec. 2007:** Council directed staff to consider steps to re-balance the relative financial burden of downtown PAR/streetscape improvements.

**Background**

The City's contract with Tashman Johnson is for feasibility-level analysis urban renewal potential in Milwaukie. Contractor work elements include:

- Development of revenue projections for Tax Increment Financing ("TIF").

- Review and input on possible urban renewal projects, with the understanding that a central element of any plan must be a tool to better balance public and private contributions to the costs of streetscape improvements (Public Area Requirements) in downtown.
- Support of City’s public education efforts.

Currently, the consultant team is working primarily on the first stage of work: collecting data, conducting interviews with property owners, reviewing development pro formas, and taking other steps to evaluate the economic development/new investment potential in and around downtown. This information will provide the basis for the first iteration of a development and revenue model.

In scoping and contract discussions with Tashman Johnson, the consultant team recommended a briefing for City Council early in their work process. Urban renewal and the tax implications of adopting a “TIF” structure are complex and often misunderstood. Therefore, staff felt that a presentation by a specialist could be very helpful for both the Council and the public audience.

Jeff Tashman, principal of Tashman Johnson, will present on the mechanics of urban renewal in Oregon and how urban renewal might function in Milwaukie. Mr. Tashman is a leading expert on urban renewal in Oregon. A similar presentation has been scheduled for Planning Commission on April 28.

Staff expects to return to Council with the key findings of the feasibility study this summer. The key technical information gathered in this phase will provide a starting point for a fact-based conversation about what urban renewal can and cannot achieve, and whether City Council wishes to proceed with drafting an Urban Renewal plan.

### **Concurrence**

Planning Department staff are contributing to the feasibility study effort and helping inform the consultant team about City plans and policies. The Community Services Director provided input on stakeholder outreach.

### **Fiscal Impact**

No action requested.

### **Work Load Impacts**

No action requested.

### **Alternatives**

No action requested.



**To: Mayor and City Council**

**Through: Mike Swanson, City Manager  
Kenneth Asher, Community Development and Public Works Director  
Katie Mangle, Planning Director**

**From: Susan P. Shanks, Senior Planner**

**Subject: Briefing on Proposed Street Improvement Requirements for Single-Family Residential Expansions**

**Date: April 14, 2009 for April 21, 2009 Work Session**

### **Action Requested**

No action is requested at this time. This is a briefing on how the proposed transportation code amendments address single-family residential expansions.

### **History of Prior Actions and Discussions**

- **March 2009** – Staff briefed Council on the proposed transportation code amendments to Titles 17 and 19. Planning Commission recommended adoption of these amendments at their March 10, 2009 meeting.
- **October 2008** – Staff briefed Council on the status of the Transportation Code Amendment / Public Area Requirements (TCA/PAR) project and discussed the organizational and policy changes being proposed to the City's transportation regulations. Council agreed with staff's preliminary proposal to: (1) replace the City's dollar value-based approach with an impacts-based approach for determining transportation improvements, (2) treat downtown and non-downtown projects the same with respect to applicability, impact evaluation, proportionality analysis, and the fee in lieu of construction option, and (3) retain downtown's street design standards as identified in the Downtown Milwaukie and Riverfront Plan for Public Area Requirements.

- **April 2008** – Council approved a contract with Angelo Planning Group to assist staff with the TCA/PAR Project.
- **January 2008** – In the decision on Mr. Parecki's appeal of the Planning Director's interpretation of the City's PAR code section, Council directed staff to consider amending this code section so that it could be applied in a manner that was constitutional, consistent, and balanced without need of the Planning Director's formal interpretation. The TCA/PAR project amends the PAR code section so that it is constitutional, consistent, and balanced.
- **October 2007** – During the Transportation System Plan (TSP) Council briefings, staff indicated that next steps would include updating the City's transportation regulations and street design standards to accurately reflect and implement the goals and policies contained in the TSP. The TCA/PAR project implements key TSP policy recommendations related to street design, street safety, and multi-modal transportation facilities.
- **March 2007** – Staff briefed Council on the City's fee in lieu of construction (FILOC) practices and sought direction regarding FILOC program improvements. The TCA/PAR project refines the FILOC program per Council's direction.

### **Background**

The proposed approach to exact incremental improvements from single-family residential (SFR) expansions is an attempt to balance the need for street improvements with reasonable and proportional exactions when warranted by impacts to the City's transportation system. Planning Commission recommends this approach for the following reasons:

- **Incomplete streets are undesirable and inadequate.** The recently adopted 2007 Transportation System Plan documents the need and the community's desire to complete the City's streets. Many local streets in residential neighborhoods have paved travel lanes but no pedestrian or bicycle improvements. Approximately 70% of the City's streets are without sidewalks. Moreover, a number of streets have less than 20 feet of asphalt, which is the minimum width necessary to adequately and safely support two-way auto travel.
- **Proposed policy continues existing policy.** The City's current policy requires both non-SFR and SFR development projects to contribute to the completion of the City's streets. The City has been exacting street improvements from non-SFR development projects since 1994 and from SFR development projects, including interior remodels and expansions, since 2002.
- **Residential expansions impact the street system.** An increase in building size generally results in an increase in trips regardless of use. For example, a bigger restaurant generally produces more trips than a smaller one. Similarly, a larger home generally produces more trips than a smaller one and, therefore, has more

impacts on the transportation system.<sup>1</sup> This is supported by the vehicle trip generation data in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual. The ITE Manual is the industry-accepted source for trip generation data in the United States.

- **Alternative funding sources are insufficient.** Requiring SFR expansions to contribute to the completion of the City's residential streets is one of the only means by which the City can facilitate the completion of these streets without increasing taxes or creating local reimbursement districts.

Some grant funding is available for sidewalk construction (e.g., federal CDBG and State Bike/Ped program). However, these grants are competitive, funding is limited, and they are only available for the highest priority pedestrian routes or streets within CDBG-eligible neighborhoods. Additionally, most grants require a matching contribution from the City. This means that, in addition to the challenges of competing for a limited pool of grant money, the City must provide a local match in order to be eligible for most grants. Since the City does not have a reliable or adequate local match funding source, the City is often not in a position to compete for grants.

The City's fee in lieu of construction (FILOC) program is one of the only local match funding sources the City has at its disposal. The FILOC program collects funds from property owners and developers when their development projects trigger street improvements and the Engineering Director determines that it is unfeasible or unsafe to build the required improvements. Since its adoption by City Council in 2002, the City has collected a fee in lieu of construction of required street improvements from both residential and commercial property owners. Some of these fees were used as the City's local grant match for the Lake Road and Logus Road street improvement projects.

- **Private property owners are responsible for helping to create the street system.** Neither the City nor the public at large owns the land under the streets upon which we all travel. Individual property owners technically own the land under the street that directly abuts or fronts their property. In this regard, every property owner has contributed to and is responsible for a small piece of the street network, which is a significant public resource upon which we all rely. This is one of the reasons why the City can require property owners to maintain the sidewalks along their property frontages. This is also one of the reasons why Planning Commission is recommending that SFR development projects that impact the street system improve, not just maintain, their street frontages. This is in keeping with City policy and the prevailing street development tradition of having individual property owners contribute to the creation and maintenance of the public street system.

---

<sup>1</sup> The City evaluates a project's impacts to the system by using the average trip generation figures contained in the ITE Manual. The City uses an average trip generation figure instead of the actual number of trips made by a specific family or business because actual numbers of trips change very easily over time, even from day to day, and can be misleading. Families of similar sizes, for example, can vary in the numbers of trips they make for a myriad of reasons including, but not limited to, their travel preferences, travel options, shopping preferences, work location, physical health, and number of children.

- **Average cost of street improvements relative to home expansion cost.** As required by Oregon statute, the City relies on construction costs provided by the International Code Council for calculating development project costs and assessing building permit fees. Per the International Code Council, the square foot construction cost for constructing or expanding a single-family home is approximately \$102,<sup>2</sup> which means that a 200-square-foot expansion would cost roughly \$20,400. The approximate cost to build one of the five proposed street improvements along a home's frontage is between \$3,000 and \$5,000. The proposed incremental exaction approach would, on average, add roughly 12% to the cost of a home expansion. See Attachment 1 for a report on the number and sizes of home expansions that occurred between July 2006 and June 2008 and how the proposed new code would apply.

As discussed at the City Council work session on March 17, 2009, the Planning Commission is recommending that development projects with impacts to the City's transportation system contribute to the completion of the City's streets in a way that is both reasonable and proportional. Impacts to the transportation system are measured in trips from vehicles, bicyclists, pedestrians, and other modes of transportation. Impacts typically occur when a development project proposes to expand an existing building, add more dwelling units, or increase the number of lots, as these types of actions typically result in an increase in the number of trips.

An impacts-based approach to requiring street improvements is fairly standard practice for all cities, regardless of size. However, the proposal to apply this approach to single-family residential expansions in an incremental fashion was specifically developed in response to Milwaukie's unique set of circumstances, namely: (1) the community's desire to complete the City's streets, (2) the large number of incomplete streets, the majority of which are located in residential neighborhoods, and (3) the lack of alternative street improvement funding sources. Initially, Planning Commission evaluated whether or not this approach should even be applied to SFR expansions. Once it was decided that it should—since SFR expansions have impacts like any other commercial, industrial, or institutional building expansion—the question then became how best to apply an impacts-based approach to these types of projects. Planning Commission directed staff to craft the SFR expansion section so that it was clear, objective, and reasonable and, after extensive discussion and debate, ultimately supported incremental street improvements in response to incremental home expansions.

As proposed, smaller home expansions would potentially be required to construct fewer street improvements and larger home expansions would potentially be required to construct more street improvements. The following types of projects would not be required to construct any street improvements:

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the City's Building Official, this is a very conservative cost figure and does not represent actual construction costs. The actual cost per square foot to construct or expand a single-family home is generally higher and is more likely to be around \$120 per square foot than \$100 per square foot.

- Home expansions adding less than 200 square feet.
- Remodeling and maintenance projects that add no additional floor area.
- Finishing existing basements.

### **Concurrence**

Planning Commission recommended adoption of the proposed amendments at a March 10, 2009 public hearing. After extensive discussion and debate regarding how an impacts-based approach to requiring street improvements should apply to SFR expansions, the Commission unanimously supported the proposed incremental exactions approach for SFR expansions. Their deliberations included a review of the City's current and past policies, including the policy direction contained in the recently adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP).

The recently adopted TSP had broad public participation and support. It documents the need and the community's desire to complete the City's streets to better support all modes of travel. Requiring SFR expansions to contribute to the completion of the City's residential streets is one of the only means by which the City can facilitate the completion of these streets and work toward meeting the goals and objectives of the TSP.

The proposed code amendments were referred to and discussed with the leadership of the City's neighborhood district associations, local residential developers, and the regional home builder's association. No comments were received either in support of or against the proposed incremental exaction approach for SFR expansions. However, comments were received in support of an impacts-based approach to requiring street improvements.

The City Attorney has advised staff that the proposed incremental exaction approach for SFR expansions meets all applicable legal standards and is defensible.

Planning, Engineering, Building, and Community Development staff developed the project's scope of work and have actively worked together to develop the proposed transportation code amendments.

### **Fiscal Impact**

No action requested. Requiring property owners to contribute to the completion of the City's street when their projects impact the transportation system reduces the burden on other property owners and tax payers who are not increasing their impacts to the City's street system.

**Work Load Impacts**

No action requested. Continued work towards completion of the TCA/PAR project is within existing planning staff work plans.

**Alternatives**

No action requested.

**Attachments**

1. Single-Family Residential Expansions 2006 - 2008

ATTACHMENT 1

Single-Family Residential Expansions 2006 - 2008

City of Milwaukie Building Permits July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2008	
Number of Square Feet Added	Permit Value
72	\$10,000.00
90	\$8,721.00
90	\$8,721.00
98	\$9,218.00
112	\$14,500.00
165	\$15,673.00
209	\$19,659.00
225	\$80,000.00
240	\$25,000.00
240	\$20,000.00
250	\$26,012.00
262	\$35,000.00
266	\$25,267.00
300	\$28,218.00
330	\$31,347.00
352	\$40,000.00
358	\$40,000.00
358	\$34,960.00
368	\$50,000.00
370	\$350,000.00
432	\$3,500.00
440	\$41,386.00
440	\$50,000.00
463	\$43,980.00
464	\$82,387.00
483	\$45,430.00
500	\$48,450.00
544	\$60,000.00
616	\$57,940.00
696	\$66,753.00
710	\$39,922.00
720	\$67,000.00
920	\$86,535.00
1031	\$96,976.00
1066	\$111,597.00
1100	\$103,936.00
1173	\$110,332.00
1328	\$160,000.00
1332	\$126,000.00
1488	\$100,000.00
1907	\$206,577.00
1920	\$102,320.00
1954	\$145,434.00
2428	\$176,738.00

Sample Application of New Code		
<p>The table below applies the proposed new code to the 44 single-family home expansion building permits received between July 2006 and June 2008 by placing each home expansion project into one of the six proposed square footage categories.</p>		
Square Footage Category	Number of Home Expansion Permits	Number of Potential Street Improvements Required
0 - 199 sqft	6	0
200 - 449 sqft	17	1
450 - 799 sqft	9	2
800 - 1149 sqft	4	3
1150 - 1499 sqft	4	4
Over 1500 sqft	4	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>NA</b>
<p>The list below represents the five individual street improvements in the order in which they would be triggered by a home expansion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Right-of-way dedication</li> <li>* Roadway (i.e. pavement) widening</li> <li>* Access (i.e driveway) improvements</li> <li>* Curb and storm drainage improvements</li> <li>* Sidewalk construction</li> </ul> <p>The rightmost column in the table above indicates how many of these five individual street improvements may be required.</p>		