

NORWOOD VILLAGE SPECIAL MEETING

MINUTES

MEETING	07.07.2026 Board Meeting
DATE & LOCATION	Eastside Church
BOARD MEMBERS VOTING	
BOARD MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE	
OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE	Roll Call Sheet
SCRIBE	Mckenna Krueger

Agenda:

1. Middle Housing
 - a. Basics
 - i. WA state required cities to redefine their single-family zoning
 - ii. Now allows up to 4 homes and an ADU
 - iii. All Woodridge is subject to this.
 - b. ADUs and DADUs
 - i. The City has loosened restrictions to allow for ADUs and DADUs
 - ii. These may now also be converted into condos and sold to a separate owner
 - c. NV's Declaration
 - i. NV is protected from these based on our Declaration and our requirements for single family homes
2. Architectural Restrictions
 - a. Flat Lot Rule 2017
 - i. Created a rule to discuss potential "flat lots" in NV to fill a perceived hole as compared to the uphill and downhill rule.
 - ii. This rule is more constraining than our current enforcement of 1.5 on the uphill side
 - iii. Issues around enforcement of this rule
3. Enforcement of Declaration C-2
 - a. Uphill & Downhill
 - i. The "uphill" part has a max of 1.5 stories with the "downhill" part having a max of 2 stories
 - ii. There is no explicit definition of 1.5 or 2 stories
 - iii. Historically have viewed the 1.5 in something in between with builders and homeowners including facade or empty space to adhere to this rule
 - b. 1.5 stories

-
- i. This requirement puts pressure on the square footage required for modern homes
 - ii. Added friction between building modern homes and nice single family homes
 - 1. Moving to under 2 rather than 1.5 stories
 - c. 2 stories
 - i. Historical interpretation that is has been viewed as one story with a daylight basement (ADD image)
 - ii. However since this was not defined, building code was required to be used to conditionally approve a homeowner challenge to what constitutes a story

Homeowner Discussion

- 1. Middle Housing
 - a. Questions on ADUs/DADUs versus multigenerational housing
 - i. Specific requirements around what constitutes and ADU versus having a family member live with you
 - b. 2 versus 3 car garage
 - i. Revising these as part of the updated Declaration
 - c. Advisory Vote - See Roll Call Sheet
- 2. Flat Lot 2017 Rule
 - a. This is not in the Declaration, but this was a rule that was passed at the 2017 Annual Meeting
 - i. This rule is much more restrictive than the uphill and downhill
 - b. ACC Perspective (Mike Lavin)
 - i. Using technology, including GIS maps and topographical information to gain more clarity around flat, uphill, and downhill lots
 - c. Language of rule (Dave Andrews)
 - i. Look to use applicable legal language to define this going forward
 - d. Cannot repeal this today, but want to discuss
 - e. Advisory Vote - See Roll Call Sheet
- 3. 1.5 stories on the “uphill”
 - a. Interpretations (Steve Curren)
 - i. This could be viewed as 50% of the livable space on the second story.
 - ii. Don’t necessarily have a good interpretation of what this is, therefore have been using dormers, facade differences,
 - 1. Reference Mercer Island requirements
 - iii. City of Bellevue has a much higher height restrictions on homes (35’ versus 25’ in the neighborhood)
 - iv. The 1.5 protection does not protect views as much as one may believe it does.
 - b. Historically about views (Dave Andrews)
 - i. Original community had the homes staggered, focused on the views, mid century modern homes
 - ii. However, newer homes are being built, trees have grown

-
- iii. Looking at potential setbacks on the homes, limit the building height of the homes to be less than the City of Bellevue
 - c. What is the goal of the community (Howard Ro); Response (Erin Lavin)
 - i. Want a gradual transition of the community, but people do not want towering homes (looming) in order to maintain privacy, views
 - 1. There may be 10-15 homes that may have views
 - d. Views (Tony); Response (Mike Lavin)
 - i. Everyone can put a 1.5 story on a lot right now, this has not changed, and this
 - ii. The Declaration does not have a view protection
 - iii. Can we request that the views be protected (Wendy Gilliard) - most likely not as this is likely subjective
 - e. Advisory Vote - See Roll Call sheet
4. 2 stories on the “downhill”
- a. Currently
 - i. Have one home that is a 3 story
 - ii. Two homes have been conditionally approved for the 2 story with a daylight basement should it not be considered a story
 - 1. These are conditionally approved as the term “story” has not been defined
 - iii. If we get too restrictive in our definitions, this can cause issues, but if we also remain too broad in our definitions, this can also cause issues
 - iv. Intention of one story and daylight basement, but issue is whether it should be two stories with a daylight basement that is not viewed as a story per Bellevue city code
 - b. Modernization (Liz)
 - i. Looking to modernize in a cohesive way, and need to determine what that way is
 - ii. Response (Erin) we have some restraints as it is our C-2 declaration/protection so we can’t change too much
 - c. Changing of Declaration (Bill Kearns)
 - i. Is it easier to add more information as to definitions, building codes, looks, etc.
 - ii. Would need to take this back to the lawyer to see what or how we could change
 - d. If we can’t come to an agreement, we could lose everything, including single family home protection
 - e. 2 stories versus 2 visible levels (Peter Van Breta)
 - i. Request if there is a visible level, can this be counted as a level to meet the 2 story “downhill” requirement
 - f. Look at each lot (Jamie Ro)
 - i. Each lot is different and cannot limit other being able to build
 - g. Step-up (BZ Ellis)
 - i. If we do a 1.5 in the “uphill” then we would have to look at the step up / down

h. Advisory Vote - See Roll Call sheet