

Appendix I

Comparison of Hillside Development Code Requirements Versus Standard Municipal Code Requirements

	Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development	Other MMC Sections (Primarily Title 16 – Development Code)	Key Difference	Potential Issue
<u>Wall and Fences</u>	<p>Chapter 16.24 – Provides flexible height considerations on steep slopes to reduce visual impact.</p> <p>Retaining walls up to 6 feet</p> <p>Retaining walls, not exceeding six feet in height, may be allowed to reduce grading, preserve natural features, or increase soil stabilization.</p> <p>Within the required front yard setback, individual retaining walls shall not exceed three feet in height.</p>	<p>Fixed, numeric maximum wall/fence heights regardless of slope:</p> <p>Regular Walls and Fences:</p> <p>Front: 3 feet</p> <p>Rear: 6 feet</p> <p>Unique Requirements:</p> <p>Setback exemption for retaining walls up to 4 feet.</p> <p>Setback exemption for retaining walls up to 6 feet.</p> <p>Retaining walls over 6 feet are subject to setback requirements of the zone.</p>	Hillside standards are more flexible	Different approaches

Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development	Other MMC Sections (Primarily Title 16 – Development Code)	Key Difference	Potential Issue
	Less attention to slope or visual prominence.		
<p>Chapter 16.24 – Emphasizes:</p> <p>Natural materials or earth-tone finishes</p> <p>Walls that blend with hillside contours</p> <p>Open or permeable fencing, where possible, to minimize visual massing.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.18 – Emphasizes:</p> <p>Uniform materials (wood, masonry, metal)</p> <p>Fences and walls as functional or decorative elements</p> <p>Less consideration of hillside blending</p>	<p>Hillside walls/fences are treated as landscape elements integrated into the terrain, rather than purely functional barriers.</p>	<p>Different approaches</p>
<p>Chapter 16.24 – Frequently requires stepped/terraced retaining walls for large slopes to reduce visual impact and improve slope stability.</p> <p>Encourages natural slope transition rather than one continuous high wall.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.18 – Retaining walls are generally governed by engineering criteria and standard maximum heights.</p> <p>Step-backs are only required when necessary for safety or code compliance, not for aesthetics.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.24 integrates step-back requirements for both engineering and aesthetic reasons, while other sections focus mainly on engineering.</p>	<p>In non-hillside areas, you can have potentially a very tall wall. Perhaps this is an update outside of this project?</p>
<p>Chapter 16.24 – Restricts wall/fence placement to minimize impact on:</p>	<p>Chapter 16.18 – Placement is primarily along property lines or as required for safety.</p>	<p>Hillside standards incorporate public visual impacts into</p>	<p>Different approaches</p>

Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development	Other MMC Sections (Primarily Title 16 – Development Code)	Key Difference	Potential Issue
<p>Ridgelines Public viewpoints Scenic corridors</p>	<p>Visibility from public areas is not a primary factor unless in specific overlay districts.</p>	<p>placement decisions; General code does not.</p>	
<p>Chapter 16.24 – Walls and fences are coordinated with slope preservation, grading limits, and landscaping.</p> <p>May require planting on or around walls to reduce erosion or visual contrast.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.18 – Landscaping is regulated separately.</p> <p>Walls and fences are treated independently.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.24 treats walls/fences as integrated with the site design and natural landforms.</p>	<p>Lack of landscaping screening element outside of Hillside – Perhaps a future citywide update</p>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p>	<p>Chapter 16.24 – Emphasizes preservation of existing vegetation and minimal grading, which may make strict numeric requirements infeasible on steep slopes.</p>	<p>Chapter 16.28 – requires certain percentages of landscape coverage and a minimum number of trees per lot.</p>	<p>Example: A hillside area lot may have only 50% buildable area due to slope constraints.</p> <p>Meeting 16.28 minimum plantings could require removing native scrub or graded slopes, conflicting with 16.24’s</p>

Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development	Other MMC Sections (Primarily Title 16 – Development Code)	Key Difference	Potential Issue
Chapter 16.24 – Favors low-maintenance, naturalized landscapes, often relying on drought-tolerant native plants that may not need irrigation.	Other Chapters – Requires installation of irrigation systems to meet ongoing plant survival and water-use efficiency.	Irrigation is potentially optional at Hillside Development areas.	preservation goals. Mandatory irrigation infrastructure may disturb slopes or natural soil conditions, conflicting with hillside preservation goals.
Chapter 16.24 – Encourages native or context-sensitive species that stabilize soil and blend with hillside character.	Chapter 16.28 – Allows for a wide variety of ornamental or non-native plants for visual and screening purposes.	Conflict between requirements, although native would supersede ornamental planting requirements through a Fuel Modification planting plan	Code conflict - A developer may plant non-native trees to meet Chapter 16.28 shade or screening standards, but Chapter 16.24 discourages these because they may not survive on slopes or could increase erosion risk.
Chapter 16.24 – Emphasizes minimizing visibility from public	Chapter 16.28 – Often prioritizes visual screening of structures (e.g.,	Largely the same goals, executed in different ways	Installing dense screening trees to meet

Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development	Other MMC Sections (Primarily Title 16 – Development Code)	Key Difference	Potential Issue
viewpoints and preserving natural ridgelines.	parking lots, utility areas).		Chapter 16.28 requirements could obscure ridgeline views or create unnatural mounding , which 16.24 discourages.
Chapter 16.24 – Performance-based, qualitative standards (“blend with surroundings,” “minimize grading”) that may not meet numeric targets.	Other chapters use numeric metrics (trees per lot, coverage percentage, planter size).	Enforcement ambiguity arises: a hillside project may meet hillside objectives but fail a strict numeric review , or vice versa.	Conflicting standards
Chapter 16.24 – Requires minimization of grading , slope protection, and soil stabilization.	Chapter 16.28 – Assumes landscaping occurs on graded , stable sites.	Installing required planters/ irrigation could require cutting into natural slopes , directly conflicting with hillside preservation goals.	Conflicting standards