



Missing Middle Work Group - Notes August 24, 2017

In attendance: Chair: Carole Richmond
Vice Chair: Paula Ehlers
Denise Pantelis, Bob Jacobs, Roussa Cassel, Amy Tousley, Ken Pekola,
Dennis Olson, Carl Kagy

Staff: Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner
Eric Christensen, Water Resources

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - a. Chair Richmond welcomed the group to the meeting.
2. Review of Today's Agenda
 - a. Chair Richmond gave an overview of the current agenda.
3. Discussion of Issues on the *Scope of Issues for Review*:
 - a. Should these uses be permitted in all neighborhoods? Should factors such as proximity to transit routes or commercial services be considered?
 - i. Should be allowed in as many districts as possible.
 - ii. Should be allowed to have 2-3 units, etc. Current code is too restrictive. Cluster housing should be encouraged.
 - iii. "Neighborhood" is factored in to the existing zoning. When people buy a home they are buying into that zone. Changes to the code can alter that character. Public needs to be polled about what they want.
 - iv. Concern about those uses that are currently non-conforming. Lot sizes are an issue.
 - v. Nobody wanted low-income housing in Seattle – it was all clustered. Recommendation was to scatter it throughout the city. Should scatter all of these types of housing around the City. GMA encourages density.
 - vi. Do not want to be like Seattle. Do not want existing houses to be removed in most cases. Look at 'what should we be getting out of this?' Example: My neighborhood is 8 blocks. 123 4th is 137 units in ½ of a block. Not sure this is going to really make a significant impact.
 - vii. Home Owner Associations probably have a lot of influence.
 - viii. Difference between Home Owner Associations (HOA) and Registered Neighborhood Associations (RNA). Neighborhoods don't have the same types of decision-making responsibilities and powers.
 - ix. Think long term. Not trying to be alarmist. Think about how the neighborhoods are managed over time.
 - x. Allowing a mix of housing types along the way will prevent more tear downs. Size of lot will really help decide what will go there.
 - xi. It is also about choices. Not everyone wants to live in a single family home or an apartment. Opportunity to downsize.

- xii. Struggling with notion of evolution to Manhattan. Aren't single family neighborhoods worth keeping?
- xiii. There's no need for the whole community to become multifamily. Single family is an option.
- b. Should size of housing unit and 'pro-rate' hook-up fees for sewer/water, stormwater fees, or impact fees be considered?
 - i. Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) = 1 Single Family Residence (SFR)
 - ii. Stormwater fees are based on amount of impervious surface
 - iii. Drinking water fees are related to the meter size
 - iv. Wastewater =
 - i. 1 SFR = 1 ERU
 - ii. A duplex is considered 2 SFRs (2 meters)
 - iii. A triplex is considered 2.1 ERUs
 - iv. 1 apartment = 0.7 ERU (10 apartments = 7 ERUs)
 - v. Wouldn't LOTT be the entity to amend the fees?
 - i. Yes, for wastewater. Water Resources has requested them to consider reduced cost for duplexes.
 - vi. The City does try to make rates equitable.
 - vii. To some extent, ratepayers subsidize development. That is, general facilities charges (GFCs) rarely catch up with the maximum that could be charged.
 - viii. 20,000 new residents in 20 years. That is a lot of facilities with known costs. City fees should be fair and based on their use/impact, but they do need to pay their share. New units should not to be subsidized by existing ratepayers.
 - i. Water Resources has some discretion over GFCs.
 - ix. For affordable housing, the rate of return for investors is lower, but they pay the same market fees. If we are trying to create incentives, our current system doesn't do that. They might as well build market rate housing and get a better return of investment.
 - x. GFCs. Make our rates as equitable as possible. Fee reductions could be made for certain types of development if there is a public benefit.
 - xi. Impact fees should scale with the size of the building. Get more infill, more density, and more transportation options.
 - i. Stormwater is based on impervious surface area (e.g. roof and pavement) drinking water is based on the water meter (which is sized to plumbing fixtures in the house)
 - xii. Public benefit has to be shown. How do you show lower cost housing will be gained? Not especially germane to these housing types which are sold.
 - xiii. Duplexes seem to be biggest challenge. We should clean that up. Utility and impact fees should scale.
 - xiv. Impact fee studies – yes. Recommend some sort of study; it should address fairness in assessing fees.
 - xv. Stormwater can be handled on-site in most cases; the fee should be reduced.

- iii. Fire sprinkler required in basement Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) – why? This is now required for any new residential unit and it can be cost prohibitive for ADU conversions in an existing home.
 - i. Need more information about the reasons why this is required by the City. Are there studies to support this requirement?
- iv. Have got to get more input from those in low density neighborhoods. Broad outreach is needed.
- v. Consider coming up with a definition of tiny homes.
- vi. Average household size 2010 census. More than 50% of people live in 2+ households.

4. Public Comment

- a. Judy Bardin – Olympia Comprehensive Plan identified 3 high density areas. We should revisit developing these nodes. More density here; lots of choice.
 - i. 25 and 35 units per acre. 123 4th is 200 units per acre. We can get a lot of density in these nodes.
- b. Chris VanDaalen – I can appreciate the comments to get more public input. Currently those most impacted by these potential changes are those who are homeless. Reintegrate them into neighborhoods. Need more supply.
- c. Dan Rubin – Excited about infill ideas. We live in SFR here since 1980. Adding an ADU is a nice option. Not afraid of diversity in our neighborhoods. A Land Trust may be a viable option to address affordability issues in the long-term.
- d. Pat Rasmussen – Mandate to provide affordable housing. Affordable housing is a crisis for many seniors. Many live only on \$800 a month. Seniors are afraid; they don't have enough money for housing. Need tiny homes on wheels in Olympia.

5. Next Meeting

- i. The next meeting will be held on September 21, 2017 in Council Chambers at Olympia City Hall.
- ii. Topic: continue to discuss issues for the next housing types on the Scope of Issued for Review matrix (Garden/Courtyard Apartments, Cottage Housing Villages, Boarding Houses/Single-Room Occupancies, Manufactured Homes).

For more information on the Missing Middle Project, please visit our web page:

olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle