

# RESIDENTIAL ZONING CHANGES BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES

SEPTEMBER 2023

MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING

## Summary

The Bloomington-Normal (BN) Region has seen an increase of housing prices for rental and real-estate properties during the past three years. Changes to residential zoning to allow for different housing typologies such as duplexes and triplexes, is seen as a way to increase housing affordability and housing diversity. With the idea of finding options to increase affordable housing in BN, this white paper was developed to identify policy changes successfully implemented in cities and states in the U.S. to allow for different housing typologies or “missing middle housing” in the typical Detached Single-Family Residential (DSFR) Zones.

Policy changes in two states and six cities were analyzed. Overall, the different ways in which cities have modified their zoning codes shows us that there is no one size fits all solution. Cities have changed their DSFR zoning districts to allow two, three and even four units per lot. Also, the changes were not always applied to the entire city. While two cities applied the change to all their DSFR zoning, the majority changed only a percentage of their DSFR zones. Complementary policies such as reducing parking requirements and allowing for housing typologies (i.e. manufactured housing) are considered important to encourage the increase of missing middle housing, however, not all cities are modifying their codes to change existing requirements. Finally public engagement was carried out by cities that implemented residential zoning changes. Planners mentioned that public engagement is crucial for having residents’ support. The ideas for allowing for diverse housing typologies and having a more compact growth mostly came from the residents.

## Background

McLean County is facing growing prices in real-estate and rental markets. Between 2020 and 2022, average house prices increased by 27 and 32 percent for resale and newly built homes respectively<sup>1</sup>, a higher percentage when compared to the country’s average increase (US house prices grew by 14 percent in 2022<sup>2</sup>). During the same time, rental prices also increased significantly, making it impossible for some households to find housing in their price-range<sup>3</sup>. Additionally, the Bloomington -Normal (B-N) region is experiencing a housing shortage partly due to the economic growth propelled by Rivian and Ferrero in the past few years<sup>4</sup>. Based on the Bloomington-Normal Economic Development Council estimations, there is an unmet need for nearly 7,500 units in the BN region<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Denham, R. (2022); St. Louis Fed (2023).

<sup>2</sup> CEIC Data (2023).

<sup>3</sup> The Pantagraph (2022).

<sup>4</sup> Bloomington-Normal Economic Development Council. (2022).

<sup>5</sup> Hoban, P. in Schlenker, C. (2023).

Over the past few years, Residential Zoning Change, also referred as *Zoning Reform* has gained traction from planners to increase affordable housing and control housing prices in cities<sup>6</sup>. Researchers believe that local governments can likely have the greatest impact on the provision of affordable housing and even shelters, by addressing land use and zoning regulations<sup>7</sup>. Residential Zoning Change for affordable housing has also been supported by the White House. Encouraging state and local governments to reform their zoning to allow for more multifamily housing and greater housing density is listed as one of several actions to increase affordable housing supply<sup>8</sup>.



*Example of multifamily housing in Downtown Bloomington*

Research suggests that zoning change could help reduce racial and income segregation and cities' environmental impact. By offering a variety of housing sizes and types, the housing market would become more affordable and accessible to people of different income levels<sup>9</sup>. Building smaller houses at higher densities in infill areas could help cities reduce urban sprawl and in turn increase walkability<sup>10</sup>.

Residential Zoning Change / Zoning Reform refers to modifying the typical Detached Single Family Residential zoning (DSFR) to allow for "missing middle housing". Missing middle housing includes duplexes, triplexes (plex reform up to six units), townhomes, cottage homes and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) that can be built in addition to an already existing detached single dwelling or as the main structure of a lot. Based on the need to increase housing stock and affordability in McLean County, this white paper was developed to identify zoning changes implemented by cities as examples to allow for missing middle housing. The following sections will recount and review examples of zoning changes, complementary policies, and public engagement efforts to garner residents' support.

## **Methodology**

To identify zoning policies implemented at state and city level, two states and six cities that have changed their residential zoning in the U.S. were selected. Less than 15 states have passed or are considering residential zoning changes<sup>11</sup>. States selected for the analysis were Oregon, the first state to require their cities to change their zoning in 2019 with House Bill 2001, and Washington, one of the more recent examples requiring changes in residential zoning with House Bill 1110 from April 2023.

---

<sup>6</sup> American Planning Association (2023).

<sup>7</sup> Levine Einstein, K., & Wilson, C. E. (2023).

<sup>8</sup> The White House (2021) and The White House (2022).

<sup>9</sup> Garcia. Et al, (2022).

<sup>10</sup> Grey, N. (2022).

<sup>11</sup> Flint, A. (2022).

As of July 2023, there were almost 30 municipalities in the country that have implemented zoning changes (plex reform) to allow for missing middle housing<sup>12</sup>. In order to have a variety of examples, cities were selected based on population size, location, and date when zoning changes were implemented. They include: Minneapolis, Minnesota; Rochester, Minnesota; Buffalo, New York; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Walla Walla, Washington and Champaign, Illinois. Champaign, was included as a local example of ADU reform. Table 1 includes characteristics of each state and city selected. For comparison purposes, data for the City of Bloomington and the Town of Normal were also included.

For each state and city, information was searched based on the following categories, which can be considered as the low hanging fruit of zoning changes to allow for missing middle housing<sup>13</sup>. Also in the list is included the outreach process municipalities followed:

- a) Eliminating or changing single family residential zoning,
- b) Parking requirements,
- c) Bulk Regulations (Design Standards),
- d) Allowing for affordable housing typologies,
- e) Type of document developed and outreach process.

The following sections include a summary of the findings in each category and the Appendix section contains a detailed version of the findings.

*Table 1. Selected States and Cities*

<b>State/ Municipality</b>	<b>Population size</b>	<b>Type of Legislation / Date</b>
<b>Oregon</b>	4,246 million (2021)	Housing Choices, House Bill 2001, <b>2019</b> (Middle Housing Model Choice for Medium & Large cities)
<b>Washington</b>	7,739 million (2021)	House Bill 1110, April <b>2023</b> Amended to increase middle housing
Minneapolis, <b>MN</b>	Minneapolis 425,336 (2021); St. Paul 307,193 (2021)	Minneapolis 2024, <b>2018</b> Ordinance 2019-48, Jan 2020
Buffalo, <b>NY</b>	276,807 (2021)	Buffalo Green Code, <b>2017</b>
Rochester, <b>MN</b>	121,465 (2021)	Unified Development Code, <b>2022</b>
Grand Rapids, <b>MI</b>	197,416 (2021)	Form-Based Code, <b>2012</b>
Walla Walla, <b>WA</b>	33,927 (2021)	Comprehensive Plan Update, <b>2018</b> Zoning Code Update, <b>2018</b>
Champaign, <b>IL</b>	Champaign 89,116 (2021); Urbana 38,681 (2021)	Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance, June <b>2022</b>
Normal, <b>IL</b>	53,446 (2021)	Comprehensive Plan, <b>2017</b>
Bloomington, <b>IL</b>	78,680 (2021)	Comprehensive Plan, <b>2015</b>

<sup>13</sup> Grey, N. (2022).

<sup>12</sup> Cantong, J., Menendian, S. & Gambhir, S. (2023).

### a) Eliminating or Changing Detached Single Family Residential (DSFR) Zoning

At the state level, Oregon and Washington require cities to change DSFR zoning based on cities' population size. In both examples, smaller cities are required to allow for duplexes; and large cities are required to accept up to four units per lot. In Washington, two additional units are allowed if the lot is close to a transit stop or if the two additional units are sold or rented as affordable housing.

At the municipal level, there were differences in the number of units allowed and in the scope of the change. The number of units permitted was not directly related to the city size. Walla Walla, the smallest city examined, changed its zoning to allow for up to four units in all DSFR lots, while Minneapolis, the biggest city researched, now allows up to three units per lot. Buffalo, Rochester, and Grand Rapids now allow up to two units per lot in most of the previous DSFR Zones. As for the scope, while changes applied to all DSFR lots in Minneapolis and Walla Walla, in Buffalo, Rochester and Grand Rapids, changes were made only to a percent of the DSFR lots, keeping some of their land as DSFR. Although in Grand Rapids, duplexes are allowed with special permit in DSFR zones where they are not allowed by right. See Table 2 and Appendix 1.

Table 2. Changes to Single Family Residential Zoning

State/ Municipality	Changing Single Family Residential Zoning	ADUs Allowed
State of Oregon	Applies to all previous Single Family Residential (DSFR) Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cities: population &gt; 10,000 and &lt; 25,000: Allow duplexes</li> <li>• Cities: population &gt; 25,000 - Allow duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses and cottage clusters;</li> </ul>	Yes
State of Washington	Applies to all previous DSFR Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City population &gt; 25,000 and &lt;75,000: allow at least 2 units per lot, allow 2 additional units if within 1/4-mile from major transit stop or if affordable;</li> <li>• City population &gt; 75,000: allow at least 4 units per lot; allow 2 additional units if within 1/4 mile of a major transit stop or if affordable;</li> </ul>	Yes
Minneapolis, MN	Applies to all previous DSFR Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to three units permitted per lot (R1, R1A, R2 and R2A).</li> <li>• No single-family dwelling (SFD) lots anymore</li> </ul>	Yes, since 2014 in all residential zones
Buffalo, NY	Applies to most previous DSFR zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the 6 zones where single residential is allowed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 zones: still allow only Single Family Dwellings (SFD)</li> <li>- 4 zones: allow attached houses and ADUs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Total of 9 zones allow attached houses, ADUs</li> </ul>	Yes, in 4 of 6 zones where detached housing is allowed
Rochester, NY	Applies to all except one type of DSFR zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One zone with single residential (R1)</li> <li>• (R2) Single family, duplexes, and other attached dwellings allowed</li> </ul>	Yes, in all residential zones
Grand Rapids, MI	Applies to all previous DSFR zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 Residential zones. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 zones: duplex allowed</li> <li>- 3 zones: duplex allowed with special permit (97% permits approved)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes, 1 per lot, permit required.
Walla Walla, WA	Applies to all previous DSFR zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One residential zoning: "Neighborhood Residential Zone" (RN)</li> <li>• Up to four units allowed per lot, townhomes, cottage housing &amp; tiny homes.</li> </ul>	Yes, in lots with Single Family Dwellings or duplexes.
Champaign, IL ADU Reform 2021	ADU Reform, applies to all DSFR zoning	Yes, max. 1 allowed in any residential district

## b) Parking Requirements

At the state level, Oregon and Washington set limits to the number of parking spaces cities may require per housing unit. Cities in both states, may not require developments to provide more than one off-street parking space per dwelling unit. At the municipal level, parking policies were more varied. Minneapolis and Buffalo eliminated parking requirements for single, double, and triple-family dwellings in the entire city. Rochester, Grand Rapids and Walla Walla still have minimum requirements which is about one and two spaces per Single Family Dwelling (SFD). The city of Champaign also eliminated parking requirements in their University District and does not require additional spaces for ADUs. See Table 3 and Appendix 2.

Parking policies are considered vital to promote the growth of affordable housing typologies, and experts recommend reducing or eliminating them<sup>14</sup>. Eliminating parking requirements has yielded positive results increasing housing construction in the example cities (Minneapolis, Buffalo and

Table 3. Parking Requirements

State/ Municipality	Parking Requirements
State of Oregon	Cities must require maximums instead of minimums <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements based on lot size</li> <li>• No additional parking for conversions to duplex, triplex, quadplex</li> </ul>
State of Washington	Maximum requirements depend on proximity to transit stop or lot size <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more than 1 space in lots &lt; 6,000sqf and</li> <li>• No more than 2 spaces for larger lots</li> </ul>
Minneapolis, MN	No minimums, but maximum requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single, 2 &amp; 3 family dwellings: no minimum nor maximum</li> <li>• Multi, 4+ units: 2 spaces per unit</li> </ul>
Buffalo, NY	No minimum, nor maximum requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some developments required to do a "transportation management plan"</li> <li>• Bike parking required in all single &amp; multifamily zones (1 per 5 beds)</li> </ul>
Rochester, MN	Minimum requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 per Single Family Dwelling, no maximum</li> <li>• 1 per unit for twin homes, attached dwellings, triplex, fourplex</li> <li>• 0.5 per unit for multifamily units</li> <li>• 1 per ADU</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, MI	Minimum requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 1.5 to 2 per dwelling</li> <li>• Minimum 1 per ADU</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, WA	Minimum requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 per single family dwelling</li> <li>• 2 per duplex &amp; 1.5 spaces per multifamily dwelling</li> <li>• 1 per studio apartment &amp; cottage houses</li> <li>• Bicycle parking required for all uses</li> </ul>
Champaign, IL	Reduced requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1/4 per bedroom in residential areas</li> <li>• No requirements for dwellings in "University District"</li> <li>• Elderly housing subject to reduced parking</li> <li>• No additional spaces required for ADUs</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup>Grey, N. (2022).

Champaign). In Minneapolis, no parking requirements is credited to the increase of housing supply even though the minimum building envelope for duplexes and triplexes was not increased from that of a single family dwelling<sup>15</sup>. Similarly, in Buffalo, NY, there has been a growth of different types of developments that were not possible prior to the elimination of parking requirements six years ago. Examples include the growth of small shops in residential zones and rehabilitation of old industrial buildings for residential purposes<sup>16</sup>. The city of Champaign has also seen a significant increase of housing developments in its University District where there are no minimum parking requirements.

Reducing parking can also help reduce housing prices. Researchers have found that the cost of providing parking spaces can increase rental prices by an average of 17%<sup>17</sup>. Considering that low income households are most commonly reliant on Public Transit, eliminating parking minimums could improve affordability for low-income earners.

### **c) Bulk Regulations**

Bulk Regulations or Design Standards refer to minimum lot size and building envelope (dwelling size, setbacks and heights) allowed in a residential lot. At state level, guidelines for cities are general. Cities in Oregon and Washington are to set design standards for lots with more than one unit that are no more restrictive than requirements for lots with a detached single family home. For example, Oregon cities cannot require the building envelope for two to four units to be less than what is required for a detached single-family home. However, this means that if cities apply the minimum, four units would need to fit in the same space as one.

At the city level, several cities reduced minimum lot sizes, while Walla Walla eliminated minimum lot size requirement. In most cities minimum lot sizes now vary between 4,000 to 6,000 square feet (sqf.), as a comparison, minimum lot sizes in Bloomington-Normal for Single Family Residential Zones can be: 7,000 sqf., 10,000 sqf. and 22,500 sqf. Regarding minimum building gross area, only Grand Rapids has set a minimum gross floor area per dwelling, the other cities have set maximum floor area ratios or maximum lot coverage. This is positive as housing units do not require to be larger than needed. As for setbacks, Buffalo, Grand Rapids and Walla Walla have different setback requirements for one and two dwelling units to allow for higher densities. Minneapolis and Rochester, instead, require the same setbacks for single-family dwellings, duplexes, and triplexes (in the case of Minneapolis). There were no changes in the height requirements for the different number of units in any of the cities, as in most examples heights depend on lots' location (in low-density areas or along transit corridors where two or three stories are encouraged).

Experts recommend eliminating minimum lot size, and modifying building envelope requirements (minimum dwelling size setbacks and height) to allow for higher densities<sup>18</sup>. While most cities are having different building envelope requirements to allow duplexes, triplexes or quadplexes, to be built comfortably, Minneapolis is criticized for not changing them. Planers from Minneapolis believe one of the reasons why there has not been a higher increase in the number of duplex and triplex units is because building height and setback restrictions have not increased accordingly to allow for them<sup>19</sup>. See Table 4 and Appendix 3.

---

<sup>15</sup> Britschgi, C. (2022).

<sup>16</sup> Hawley, C. (2023).

<sup>17</sup> Day, R. (2021)

<sup>18</sup> Grey, N. (2022).

<sup>19</sup> Britschgi, C. (2022).

Table 4. Bulk Regulations

State / Municipality	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum Building Envelope
State of Oregon	Minimum lot size for duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes may not be greater than what is required for Detached Single Family Dwelling (DSFD)	Building envelope may not be more restrictive than what is asked for DSFD
State of Washington	Cities shall not require standards for middle housing that are more restrictive than those required for detached single-family residences	
Minneapolis, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger lots are 6,000 square feet (sqf.) and 5,000sqf</li> <li>• Maximum floor area ratios established</li> </ul>	Maximum floor area ratios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same ratios for 1,2 &amp; 3 units in a lot in low-density areas (Same building envelopes)</li> </ul>
Buffalo, NY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger lots: 4,000sqf and 2,500sqf for Single-Family Residential</li> <li>• Min. Lots for other residential zones: 2,400sqf. and 1,500sqf.</li> </ul>	No min. but max. lot coverage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different lot coverage for single and attached dwellings: 50% and 70% respectively</li> </ul>
Rochester, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger lots for Single Residential 5,000sqf</li> <li>• Others: 3,000sqf. &amp; 2,000sqf.</li> </ul>	No min. nor max. dwelling floor area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same setbacks for single and two-unit developments</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, MI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Min. lots for single dwellings 3,500 to 8,000sqf.</li> <li>• Min. lots for 2-family dwellings 5,000 to 9,000sqf.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single-dwelling min. gross floor area 750sqf.</li> <li>• Different building envelope for single and two-family dwellings</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, WA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No minimum lot size</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% max. lot coverage</li> <li>• No side setback for duplexes</li> </ul>

#### d) Allowing for Affordable Housing Typologies

The types of affordable housing that should be allowed in DSFR zoning include single-room occupancies and manufactured housing<sup>20</sup>. State Bills from Oregon and Washington do not mention community residential facilities. The need to allow manufactured housing in existing low density residential zones is recognized as needed only in Oregon’s Bill, however there is no requirement for cities to allow for them at this stage.

At city level, there is more acceptance of allowing single room occupancies than manufactured housing. Group homes of up to six residents are allowed in most low-density residential zones in all cities while special permits are required for residences of more than six people. Regarding manufactured housing, only Grand Rapids currently allows manufactured housing in three of their six residential zones (Mid Density Residential zoning). The other cities allow manufactured homes only in specific zoning districts.

Benefits of both typologies have been discussed by advocates. Single-room occupancies where residents occupy a private bedroom with a shared kitchen and bathroom is a low-cost alternative that can help people to stay off the street<sup>21</sup>. Manufactured homes instead can be 75% cheaper than traditional homes, which means that they can help low-income households access the housing market. Manufactured homes design standards have improved considerably since the 1980s and many of the issues used to discriminate against them from residential areas have been solved with technology or can be controlled with local zoning<sup>22</sup>. See Table 5. and Appendix 3 for findings.

<sup>20</sup> Grey, N. (2022).

<sup>21</sup> Grey, N. (2022).

<sup>22</sup> Mandeker, D. R. (2016).

Table 5. Housing Typologies

State / Municipality	Single Room Occupancies	Manufactured Housing
State of Oregon	No mention in HB 2001	The need to allow manufactured homes in Single Residential lots mentioned in the House Bill. Each city must allow for manufactured dwelling parks
State of Washington	No mention in HB 1110	No mention in HB 1110
Minneapolis, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community residential facility serving up to 6 persons permitted in all residential zones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mention to support prefabricated and manufactured housing as a way to provide affordable housing</li> <li>No mention of allowing them in low-density residential neighborhoods</li> </ul>
Buffalo, NY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group homes allowed by right in all (11) Residential Zones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not allowed in Neighborhood Residential Zones.</li> </ul>
Rochester, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group Living (Congregate Housing) allowed in all residential zones except R1 (Single Family Residential)</li> <li>Dormitory not allowed in any Residential Zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only allowed in specific “Manufactured Home Parks”</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, MI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family home up to 6 unrelated residents, allowed</li> <li>Small &amp; large group homes (7-20 residents), special permit required</li> <li>Rooming or boarding house, special permit required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not permitted in Low Density Residential zoning (3 types)</li> <li>Permitted in Mid Density Residential zoning (3 types)</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, WA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group housing for disabled persons (6 or fewer) allowed by right in Neighborhood Residential (RN) Zones</li> <li>Group housing for disabled persons (6 clients or more) allowed with condition in RN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No tiny homes are allowed to be built on wheels</li> <li>No manufactured housing allowed in RN zones</li> <li>Manufactured homes are allowed as ADUs in RN zones</li> </ul>

### e) Type of Document Developed and Outreach Process

Several planning and zoning tools were mentioned as important, such as having a Comprehensive Plan with a clear vision for the city; if necessary, carry out a rewrite of the zoning code; and, have extensive public engagement.

First, zoning change requires a Comprehensive Plan with a clear vision for a city. Planners from Buffalo and Minneapolis emphasized the importance of developing a Comprehensive Plan before changes to the zoning were made<sup>23</sup>. According to Planners, zoning reform would not be possible without a Comprehensive Plan. Second, several cities (Minneapolis, Grand Rapids and Buffalo), rewrote their codes and used the opportunity to transition from a traditional to a form-based code. Form-based codes use the physical form (building heights and envelope) as the organizing principle to guide the land use development and focus on the relationship between building facades and the public realm. This type of code is credited with promoting more walkable, compact cities<sup>24</sup>. Planners mentioned that the rewrite of the code was also carried out to make it easier for the public to interpret it, as the codes make use of illustrations to explain requirements.

<sup>23</sup> McMahan, M. (2023); and Hawley, C. (2023).

<sup>24</sup> Form-Based Codes Institute (2023).

Third, extensive public engagement periods were mentioned as a key strategy to allow for missing middle housing in all the example cities. Public engagement was carried out during the development of the Comprehensive Plan and/or during the code rewrite process. In Minneapolis, public engagement for the plan's development included more than 150 meetings over a two-year period. Most of the ideas, including to allow missing middle housing in DSFR zoning, came from the community. In Buffalo, city officials mentioned extensive public involvement during the rewrite of the code with 240 public meetings over a seven-year period. As result, the zoning code was adopted unanimously by they City Council in 2017 without any lawsuit filed. Finally, in Grand Rapids, planners had public engagement periods for the development of the Master Plan and for the development of their Form-Based Code. The public engagement was an 18-month process with almost 250 community meetings, during which, citizens expressed " a strong desire for a compact, mixed use, pedestrian oriented community with a broad of housing types"<sup>25</sup>. See Table 6 and Appendix 4.

*Table 6. Public Engagement Process and Type of Document Developed*

State / Municipality	Public Engagement Process
Minneapolis, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed New Comprehensive Plan (2018)</li> <li>• Consultation Process:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2016-2018 public engagement period</li> <li>- 150+ meetings</li> <li>- People wanted to change the zoning to allow for missing middle</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Comprehensive Plan implemented in 2020</li> <li>• Re-write the zoning code, after the Comp. Plan was approved</li> </ul>
Buffalo, NY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the Comprehensive Plan from 2006</li> <li>• Land-Use Regulation Plan was developed (Form-based code) starting in 2010</li> <li>• Consultation Process:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 7-year process</li> <li>- 244 public meetings</li> </ul> </li> <li>• "Buffalo Green Code" was adopted by unanimous consensus in 2016</li> </ul>
Rochester, MN	<p>Process of development of Unified Development Code applying vision of Comprehensive Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Consultation:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3-year public comment period</li> <li>- 7,000 unique comments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, MI	<p>Comprehensive Plan development: 18 month process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 public meetings</li> <li>• Developed a Form-based code               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zoning re-writes confirmed with residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Citizens expressed interest in compact, mixed-use pedestrian oriented communities</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, WA	<p>Comprehensive Plan development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-year process</li> <li>• 14 community meetings</li> </ul>
Champaign, IL ADU Reform	<p>For ADUs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Survey on ADUs to gauge community understanding/interest in ADUs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 80% of 1,500 respondents agreed with allowing ADUs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>25</sup> Schulz, S. M. (2008).

## Conclusions

The objective of this white paper was to identify how zoning reform to allow for missing middle housing is being implemented around the U.S., and to identify additional reforms that are considered important and being implemented. Two states and six cities that have made policy changes were analyzed.

Policies to allow for missing middle housing were varied. At state level, the two states require cities to implement zoning changes based on cities population size and on a lot's proximity to transit. At the municipal level, there were no trends on how zoning was changed. Two cities (Minneapolis and Walla Walla) modified the Detached Single-Family Residential (DSFR) zoning of the entire city, while three cities (Buffalo, Rochester and Grand Rapids) modified only a percentage of their DSFR. Cities changed their DSFR zoning to allow for at least two units per lot, with Minneapolis and Walla Walla allowing up to three and four units per DSFR lot respectively.

For the additional zoning changes, parking was considered an important feature for spurring the construction of missing middle housing and for keeping prices down. Cities that eliminated parking (Minneapolis, Buffalo and Champaign in the University District) are reporting a significant increase in housing construction. In relation to bulk regulations, the tendency was (1) to increase building envelope when allowing more than one unit per lot, although two cities (Minneapolis and Rochester) kept the same building envelope for one-, two- and three-unit lots; (2) to eliminate minimum dwelling size requirements, most cities (Minneapolis, Buffalo, Grand Rapids and Walla Walla) set maximum floor area ratios or maximum lot coverage instead of minimums; and (3) to reduce minimum lot sizes. Most cities (Minneapolis, Buffalo, Rochester), reduced minimum lot sizes, while they were eliminated in Walla Walla.

Other types of affordable housing (single room occupancies and manufactured housing) were mentioned as effective housing types to increase affordability. Single occupancies of up to six-unrelated residents are allowed in all cities. However, there is still resistance to allow manufactured housing in residential districts. Although mentioned as alternatives to affordable housing in Oregon's HB 2019 and in the Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan, manufactured housing is only allowed in half of the residential zones in Grand Rapids and as ADUs in Walla Walla.

Finally, extensive public participation in the development of the comprehensive plan and/or the code amendments process was fundamental to understand people's views and for community support. All cities considered in this analysis had extensive public engagement periods and in all cases, the idea of having higher densities came from the community. Overall, exhaustive public involvement proved to be successful.

## References:

- American Planning Association (2023). 2023 Federal Priority. Zoning Reform. <https://www.planning.org/policy/priorities/zoning-reform/>
- Britschgi, C. (2022). Eliminating Single-Family Zoning Isn't the Reason Minneapolis is a YIMBY Success Story. *Reason Free Minds and Free Markets*. [Eliminating Single-Family Zoning Isn't the Reason Minneapolis Is a YIMBY Success Story](https://www.reason.org/insights/eliminating-single-family-zoning-isnt-the-reason-minneapolis-is-a-yimby-success-story/)
- Bloomington-Normal Economic Development Council. (2022). Regional Housing market Analysis. Bloomington-Normal, Illinois. <https://www.bnbiz.org/demographic-profiles>
- Cantong, J. Menendian, S. & Gambhir S. (2023). Zoning Reform Tracker Updated April 25 2023. <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/zoning-reform-tracker> Accessed on July 5, 2023
- CEIC Data (2023). United States house Prices Grown 1992-2022. [US House Prices Growth | Economic Indicators | CEIC \(ceicdata.com\)](https://ceicdata.com/)
- Day, R. (2021). Minimum parking, maximum rent: Let's cut tenants a break by ending parking minimums. *Chicago Policy*. December, 2021. <https://chi.streetsblog.org/2021/12/14/minimum-parking-maximum-rent-lets-cut-tenants-a-break-by-ending-parking-minimums>
- Denham, R. (2022). Home prices soar, even as frenzied Bloomington-Normal market cools off. WGLT, Published November 28, 2022. [Home prices soar, even as frenzied Bloomington-Normal market cools off | WGLT](https://www.wglt.com/news/local/home-prices-soar-even-as-frenzied-bloomington-normal-market-cools-off/)
- Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (St. Louis Fed) 2023. All Transactions House Price Index for Bloomington, IL (MSA). [All-Transactions House Price Index for Bloomington, IL \(MSA\) \(ATNHPIUS14010Q\) | FRED | St. Louis Fed \(stlouisfed.org\)](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/ATNHPIUS14010Q)
- Fint, A. (2022). A State-by State Guide to Zoning Reform. <https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/articles/2022-12-state-by-state-guide-to-zoning-reform> Accessed on July 5, 2023
- Form-Based Codes Institute (2023). Form-Based Codes Defined. <https://formbasedcodes.org/definition/#:~:text=Form%2Dbased%20codes%20address%20the,drawn%20diagrams%20and%20other%20visuals.>
- Garcia, D., Alameldin, M., Metcalf, B., Fulton, W. (2022). Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing. *Terner Center for Housing Innovation UC Berkeley*. <https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/research-and-policy/unlocking-missing-middle/>
- Grey, N. (2022). *Arbitrary Lines. How Zoning Broke the American City and How to Fix It*. New York: Island Press, 2022.
- Hawley, C. (2023). Buffalo Green Code. *May 2023 Luncheon: Prosperity Through Zoning Reform*. May 17, 2023. [May 2023 Luncheon: Prosperity through Zoning Reform - YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)
- Hoban, P. in Schlenker, C. (2023). Bloomington-Normal housing supply gap widens. WGLT, Published June 15, 2023. [Bloomington-Normal housing supply gap widens | WGLT](https://www.wglt.com/news/local/bloomington-normal-housing-supply-gap-widens/)
- Jha, S. (2023). The Role of Middle Housing in Tackling America's Housing Challenge. *Up for growth news*. June, 2023. [Up For Growth | The Role of Middle Housing in Tackling America's Housing Challenge - Up For Growth](https://www.upforgrowth.com/news/the-role-of-middle-housing-in-tackling-americas-housing-challenge/)
- Levine Einstein, K., & Wilson, C. E. (2023). Cities, Zoning, and the Fragmented Response to Homelessness. *Boston University Initiative on Cities*. January 2023. <https://hdl.handle.net/2144/45465>
- Mandeker, D. R. (2016). Zoning Barriers to Manufactured Housing. *Washington University in St. Louis School of Law*. Augst 2016. [Zoning Barriers to Manufactured Housing by Daniel R. Mandelker :: SSRN](https://www.wustl.edu/law/mandelker/zoning-barriers-to-manufactured-housing/)

McMahan, M. (2023). Race, Place and Equity, Minneapolis 2040. *May 2023 Luncheon: Prosperity Through Zoning Reform*. May 17, 2023. [May 2023 Luncheon: Prosperity through Zoning Reform - YouTube](#)

Schulz, S. M. (2008). Creating a Form-Based Code in Grand Rapids. *The Review*. September-October 2008. [Grand Rapids - MMR article 2008.pdf](#)

The Pantagraph (2022). Priced Out: Bloomington-Normal renters struggle with higher costs, limited options. [https://pantagraph.com/news/local/priced-out-bloomington-normal-renters-struggle-with-higher-costs-limited-options/article\\_137387c2-5167-11ed-b0e7-4fb983f594c8.html](https://pantagraph.com/news/local/priced-out-bloomington-normal-renters-struggle-with-higher-costs-limited-options/article_137387c2-5167-11ed-b0e7-4fb983f594c8.html)

The White House. (2021). FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Administration Announces Immediate Steps to Increase Affordable Housing Supply. Briefing Room. Statements and Releases. September 01, 2021. [FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Administration Announces Immediate Steps to Increase Affordable Housing Supply | The White House](#)

The White House. (2022). President Biden Announces New Actions to Ease the Burden of Housing Costs. Briefing Room. Statements and Releases. May 16, 2022. [President Biden Announces New Actions to Ease the Burden of Housing Costs | The White House](#)

## Appendix 1:

Table A. Zoning Changes

State/Municipality	General objective	Policy
State of Oregon	<p>Allow for "Middle Housing" in all Single-family residential districts.</p> <p>For cities with populations over 10,000 and urban areas.</p>	<p><b>Medium Cities: population &gt; 10,000 and &lt; 25,000.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Allow duplexes (2 units on a single lot).</li> </ul> <p><b>Large Cities: population of 25,000 or more:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On lots that allow only DSFR, allow duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses and cottage clusters;</li> <li>○ Medium cities may allow triplexes onwards by a percentage of the total number of parcels (80% for triplexes, 70% for quadplexes &amp; cottage clusters and 60% for townhouses).</li> <li>○ Existing DSFR may be converted into a duplex;</li> <li>○ Cities may create additional standards to increase middle housing i.e., for people with disabilities.</li> </ul>
State of Washington	<p>Goal: creating 1 million new homes by 2044</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alternative: cities can implement the requirements for at least 75% of the lots dedicated to single-family detached housing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>City population &gt; 25,000 and &lt;75,000:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At least 2 units per lot on all lots;</li> <li>○ At least 4 units per lot on lots within 1/4-mile walking distance from major transit stop;</li> <li>○ At least 4 units per lot if one unit is affordable.</li> </ul> <p><b>City population &gt; 75,000:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At least 4 units per lot on all lots;</li> <li>○ At least 6 units per lot on lots within 1/4 mile of a major transit stop;</li> <li>○ At least 6 units per lot if two units are affordable.</li> </ul> <p><b>City population &lt; 25,000 contiguous to a large city:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At least 2 units per lot on all residential lots;</li> <li>○ A city may allow ADUs to achieve 35 the unit density required.</li> </ul>
Minneapolis, MN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R1 and R1A "multiple family" descriptor replaces "single-family."</li> <li>○ R2 and R2B "two-family" replaces the "single-family"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Two and three-family units are permitted in the R1, R1A, R2, and R2A districts;</li> <li>○ There are no lots that allow only single-family units;</li> <li>○ Units that existed when this ordinance became effective may not change to be two or three-units;</li> <li>○ ADUs are allowed since 2014 in low-density residential zones. Policy has been getting more permissive though the years.</li> </ul>
Buffalo, NY	<p>From the Green Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Target sustainability; and employ smart growth.</li> <li>○ Promote land use and transport patterns that encourage compact development and promote a full array of transport choices to help conserve energy, air, water &amp; soil.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are still 2 Neighborhood Residential zones where only detached houses are allowed. No ADUs allowed in these two zones;</li> <li>○ ADUs (carriage houses) are allowed in 4 out of the 6 zoning types where single residential is allowed;</li> <li>○ There are 11 Residential Zones;</li> <li>○ Attached houses may not exceed 120 feet horizontally (6 units) and can be 3 or 4 story's high depending on the location;</li> <li>○ No specification on number of units limit per lot.</li> </ul>

State/Municipality	General objective	Policy
Rochester, <b>MN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase the percentage of land with multifamily zoning from 18% to 28%.</li> <li>○ Reducing minimum lot sizes, remove density requirements and minimum parking requirements to multifamily housing.</li> <li>○ Developed a form-based code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More than one dwelling is now allowed in all residential types (R-2, R-2x, R-3 and R-4), except on R-1 (includes, twin home, attached, duplex, triplex and fourplex);</li> <li>○ Rezoned commercial districts to allow mixed-use housing;</li> <li>○ ADUs are allowed in all residential districts (including R1);</li> <li>○ City offers affordable housing incentives.</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, <b>MI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developed a form-based code ten years ago. With it, the city allowed for duplexes to be built in previously single-residential zoning.</li> <li>○ The form-based code focuses on form rather than use and helps mitigate exclusions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are 6 ‘Residential Zone Districts’;</li> <li>○ Two-family dwelling permitted in Mixed Density Residential zone (3 types) and 1 type of Low-Density Residential;</li> <li>○ Permit required for 2 dwellings in 2 types of Low Density Residential;</li> <li>○ Most housing types are permitted by right or special exception requiring public hearing. Planning commission approves 97% of the applications;</li> <li>○ 1 ADU allowed per lot when a single detached house is in the lot. They require a special permit and have an owner occupancy requirement.</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, <b>WA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consolidated single-family zoning into a single low density zoning type, wider variety of uses in that zone and flexible ADU regulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Changed its low density zoning to be one type of residential zoning: “Neighborhood Residential Zone” (RN). A variety of houses up to fourplexes, townhomes, cottage housing and tiny homes are allowed by right;</li> <li>○ Up to four units allowed per lot;</li> <li>○ There is still Multi-family Residential zoning (RM);</li> <li>○ ADUs allowed only when there is a single-family dwelling in a lot.</li> </ul>
Champaign, <b>IL</b> ADU ordinance June 2022		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ADUs permitted in any residential district.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 2:

Table B. Parking and Bulk Requirements

State / Municipality	Parking Requirements	Bulk Regulations
State of Oregon	<p>Cities were asked to develop new parking requirements and require maximums instead of minimums.</p> <p>Large cities Max.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1 space per development on lots &lt; 5,000 sqf.;</li> <li>○ 2 spaces per development on lots &gt; 5,000 sqf.;</li> <li>○ No additional parking for conversions of a SFD to a triplex, quadplexes;</li> <li>○ Triplexes and quad, no more than 1 space per unit.</li> </ul> <p>Medium cities max.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One space per unit</li> </ul>	<p>Maximum density, setbacks and off-street parking requirements do not apply to duplexes developed on parcels that allow for a Single-Family Dwelling (SFD). The following applies to the development of duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No minimum lot size greater than what is required for single-family dwellings may be required;</li> <li>○ No less coverage than what is required for single family houses may be required;</li> <li>○ No density maximums may be applied to the development of duplex, triplex &amp; quadplex.</li> <li>○ Height limitations: may not be more restrictive than those applicable to SFDs;</li> <li>○ No lot parcel coverage is required, if one is put in place, it may not be greater than for SFD housing.</li> <li>○ Cities must allow conversion of existing SFD into duplexes.</li> </ul>
State of Washington	<p>Parking maximums req:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No parking required for middle housing in developments 1/2 mile from a major transit stop;</li> <li>○ No more than 1 space can be required on lots &lt; 6,000sqf;</li> <li>○ No more than 2 spaces can be required in larger lots.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cities shall not require standards for middle housing that are more restrictive than those required for detached single-family residences;</li> <li>○ May apply any objective development regulations required for detached single-family dwellings, including, set-back, lot coverage, stormwater, clearing, and tree canopy and retention requirements;</li> <li>○ Cottage housing: open area min. 20% of lot.</li> </ul> <p><i>Density requirements do not apply when:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Area is served only by private wells, with less than 50 connections, watersheds &amp; Lots that designated urban separators.</li> </ul>
Minneapolis, MN	<p>No parking minimums, but maximums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Parking maximums: no max. for single, 2 or 3-family dwellings;</li> <li>○ Multiple-family, 4+ units: max. 2 spaces per unit or rooming unit, 1.5 spaces when close to transit stations;</li> <li>○ Bike parking minimums.</li> </ul>	<p>In all districts SFD, duplex and triplex, subject to same min. lot area, max. building height and lot coverage requirements in low density areas.</p> <p><u>Lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minimum lot sizes are maintained;</li> <li>○ Min. lot area and width are the same for the four types R1 &amp; R2: 6,000sqf, R1A &amp; R2B: 5,000sqf (same for community living up to 6 people) of housing except for cluster development, for which lot size is double the size (12,000);</li> <li>○ Lots may now be subdivided to be less than the min. lot in specific areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building envelope:</u></p> <p>Max. floor area ratios established:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 'Interior 1' &amp; 'Interior 2' lots, 1 to 3-family dwellings 0.5;</li> <li>○ 'Interior 3' lots SFD 0.5 ratio; 2-family: 0.6 ratio, and 3-family: 0.7 ratio;</li> <li>○ 'Corridor' lots ratios 1.5 to 3.0; 'Transit' lots ratio: 5 to 10;</li> <li>○ ADUs max. area - 800sqf. Detached ADUs max area - 1,300sqf.</li> </ul>

State / Municipality	Parking Requirements	Bulk Regulations
Buffalo, NY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bike parking is required in all new single and multiple dwelling units;</li> <li>○ No parking requirement for any type of residential building. No maximums specified either. (1st city in the US that eliminated parking requirements). But do have landscape screening requirements.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Detached House min. lot area, 4,000sqf and 2,400sqf (other min. lot areas 1,500sqf and 1,800sqf for different neighborhood zoning).</li> </ul> <p><u>Building envelope:</u></p> <p>No min. but max. lot coverage for dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Max. lot coverage single dwelling 50% to 70%;</li> <li>○ Max. lot coverage attached dwelling 70%. However, min. lot size can be smaller (1,500sqf &amp; 1,800sqf);</li> <li>○ Townhomes: Min. Lot 900 sqf., and max building coverage, 90%;</li> <li>○ ADUs min. lot area where they can be built 600sqf. Max. lot building coverage: 90%.</li> </ul>
Rochester, MN	<p>Parking minimums and maximums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Min. one per Single Family Dwelling, no max;</li> <li>○ Min. one per unit for Twin homes, attached dwellings, Triplex, fourplex. No max.;</li> <li>○ 0.5 per unit/multifamily units;</li> <li>○ One per ADU;</li> <li>○ Flexibility for reducing parking on lots close to transit routes.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger lots still for SFD (5,000sqf), other Residential lots are smaller: R2, R2x, 3,000sqf, and 2,000sqf min. respectively.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building envelope:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No min. nor max. floor area ratio;</li> <li>• Same setback requirements apply for the SRD and for the two-unit developments;</li> <li>• No min. footprint for ADUs., but max. 1,000sqf. Same setbacks as for main structure.</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, MI	<p>Parking minimums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.5 or 2 spaces required per dwelling;</li> <li>○ 1 space required per ADU.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Min. lot for single family 3,500sqf – 8,000sqf. Size varies depending on neighborhood type;</li> <li>○ Min. lot for two family dwellings 5,000sqf - 9,000sqf, depends on neighborhood type.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building envelope:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Single dwelling min. gross floor area 750sqf;</li> <li>○ Different building envelope. Different setbacks, lot width, green space for single and two-family dwellings;</li> <li>○ ADU max. gross floor area, not less than 400sqf and less than 850sqf.</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, WA	<p>Min. parking requirements, but it is a reduction from before 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2 per SFR;</li> <li>○ 1 space per ADUs, 2 per duplex;</li> <li>○ 1 per studios &amp; cottage homes;</li> <li>○ 1.5 for multifamily.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No min. lot size.</li> </ul> <p><u>Building envelope:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 50 % max. lot coverage;</li> <li>○ No mention of min. dwelling floor areas;</li> <li>○ Side setback reduced from 20" to 0" for duplexes;</li> <li>○ 35 feet max. height (3 stories);</li> <li>○ ADUs max. size 800sqf.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3:**

*Table C. Affordable Housing Typologies*

<b>State / Municipality</b>	<b>Single Room Occupancies</b>	<b>Manufactured Housing</b>
State of Oregon	No mention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The need to allow manufactured homes in Single Residential lots is mentioned in the House Bill;</li> <li>o Each city must allow for manufactured dwelling parks;</li> <li>o Manufactured homes are allowed as ADUs in Portland.</li> </ul>
State of Washington	No mention	No mention
Minneapolis, <b>MN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Comprehensive Plan: Review existing policies and regulations to remove barriers to support amongst others: shared housing, co-housing and cooperative-housing;</li> <li>o Zoning Code: Community residential facility serving up to 6 persons (Permitted in all residential zoning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Support prefabricated and manufactured housing as a way to provide affordable housing;</li> <li>o Not permitted in low-density residential neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
Buffalo, <b>NY</b>	<p>Group Homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Allowed by right in all (11) Residential Zones (N-1D, N-1C, N-1S, N-2C, N-2E, N-2R, N-3C, N-3E, N-3R, N-4-30, N-4-50).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mobile/manufactured homes are not allowed in Neighborhood Residential Zones.</li> </ul>
Rochester, <b>MN</b>	<p>Group Living (Congregate Housing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Not allowed in R-1;</li> <li>o Allowed in R-2, R-2x, R-3 and R4 (p. 90 Code);</li> <li>o Dormitory not allowed in any Residential Zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mobile/Manufactured homes only allowed in specific “Manufactured Home Parks” (p. 99 Code).</li> </ul>
Grand Rapids, <b>MI</b>	<p>Adult foster care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Family home up to 6 residents allowed;</li> <li>o Small &amp; large group homes (7-20 residents): special permit required;</li> <li>o Rooming or boarding house: special permit required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mobile homes not permitted in Low Density Residential zoning (3 types);</li> <li>o Mobile homes permitted in Mid Density Residential zoning (3 types).</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, <b>WA</b>	<p>Group homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Group housing for disabled persons (6 or fewer clients) allowed by right in Neighborhood Residential Zones (RN);</li> <li>o Group housing for disabled persons (6 clients or more) allowed with condition in RN;</li> <li>o No mention of other types of group housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No tiny homes are allowed to be built on wheels.</li> <li>o No manufactured housing allowed in RN zones.</li> <li>o However, manufactured homes are allowed as ADUs in RN zones.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 4:

Table D. Type of Document Developed and Outreach Process

Municipality	Type of Document developed	Outreach Process & Comments
Minneapolis, <b>MN</b>	<p>Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Approved in 2019 “Minneapolis 2040;</li> <li>○ A form-based growth was proposed, higher densities and heights are proposed around transit Corridors.</li> </ul> <p>Zoning code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developed a form-based code with overlays allowing higher buildings along transit corridors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ During the Comprehensive Plan’s outreach process, many people voiced on changing zoning to allow for missing middle housing.</li> <li>○ People agreed on allowing up to four units per lot with SFR classification. Planners cut back to allow only three units per lot;</li> <li>○ Timeline: 2016-2018 public engagement period (150+ meetings);</li> <li>○ Engagement methods: workshops, dialogues, street festivals, tweet w/ a planner;</li> <li>○ Only one council member voted against the plan (the one representing the whitest and wealthiest community).</li> <li>○ The president of the City Council was a planner. She helped the approval process. They also had a supportive Mayor.</li> <li>○ After the Comprehensive Plan was approved, they re-wrote their zoning code.</li> </ul>
Buffalo, <b>NY</b>	<p>Comprehensive Plan: Approved in 2006 (won awards).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developed a new Land Use Regulation Code (Green Code), based on the comprehensive plan. They started from scratch in 2010;</li> <li>○ Objective: to develop walkable neighborhoods;</li> <li>○ Green Code: city-wide form-based code. Zoning with illustrations that are easier to understand. Land Uses not the central organizing principle;</li> <li>○ Clear and predictable approval process;</li> <li>○ Code was adopted in 2017.</li> </ul>	<p>Public outreach for the development of the Green Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 244 public meetings;</li> <li>○ 7-year process;</li> <li>○ Ordinance was adopted by a unanimous consensus. They have not had any lawsuits.</li> </ul>
Rochester, <b>MN</b>	<p>Developed the new Unified Development Code applying vision of Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Encouraging affordable housing was one of the main ideas;</li> <li>○ Reduce min. lot sizes, remove density limits, offer affordable house incentives and allow ADUs in all lots</li> <li>○ The code has flexible rules and a simplified language</li> </ul>	<p>Public outreach for the development of the Unified Development Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3-year public comment period online and in-person;</li> <li>○ 7,000 unique comments.</li> </ul>

Municipality	Type of Document developed	Outreach Process & Comments
Grand Rapids, <b>MI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The city developed a Smart Growth Comprehensive Master Plan in 2001;</li> <li>○ A Neighborhood Pattern Workbook was created to engage citizens in a discussion about their neighborhood's character;</li> <li>○ The Code is a form-based code that gives more importance to form rather than use.</li> </ul>	<p>Public outreach for the Code's re-write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development of the Comprehensive Plan was an 18-month process with nearly 250 community meetings (for the development of the Master Plan and Zoning re-writes).</li> <li>○ People liked the character of their neighborhoods and i.e. in zoning re-writes, ideas were tested with community.</li> <li>○ Citizens expressed interest in having compact, mixed-use pedestrian oriented communities with broad range of housing options.</li> </ul>
Walla Walla, <b>WA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2018 the city approved zoning reform allowing ADUs &amp; promoting multifamily housing. New Neighborhood Residential Zone was approved at this time.</li> <li>○ Comprehensive Plan Update was completed in 2019;</li> </ul>	<p>For the Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Two-year process (<a href="#">link</a>)</li> <li>○ Total of 14 meetings. 13 initial meetings to determine the community's desires;</li> <li>○ One final meeting where the draft policies and land-use map were presented to the community to verify if their vision was represented;</li> <li>○ A survey was also carried out.</li> </ul>
Champaign, <b>IL</b>	ADU Ordinance approved in 2022.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community survey on Accessory Dwelling Units to gauge community's understanding/interest in ADUs.</li> <li>○ 80% of 1,500 respondents agreed with allowing ADUs.</li> </ul>