



## Missing Middle Work Group - Notes September 28, 2017

In attendance: Chair: Carole Richmond  
Amy Tousley, Ron Deering, Todd Monohon, Denise Pantelis, Carl Kagy,  
Dennis Olson, Rick Walk, Austin Hildreth, Bob Jacobs, Mike Matlock

Staff: Leonard Bauer, Deputy Director  
Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner

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 Issue for Review:

### Issues on the Scope of Issues for Review:

- A. Cottage Housing Villages (aka pocket neighborhoods)
  - a. Local examples: 37<sup>th</sup> off College Street (Habitat for Humanity Project), 50<sup>th</sup> and Ruddell (known as The Cottages), Meadows area east of Lacey
  - b. Big impediment is risk-aversion by banks and builders - marketability.
  - c. Incredible demand; biking, walking, transit, parking. Parcels of a certain size in walkable areas.
  - d. Allowing phasing and bonding is a sensible approach. Is single-owner or condominium important?
  - e. Flexibility in design and layout is important. Also provides flexibility for ownership options resulting in different price points.
  - f. Use architect Ross Chapin's 12 design principles in design guidelines.
  - g. Keep to roughly 1 ½ story height in order to maintain compatibility (per Chapin).
  - h. Strategize for cohesive development over time. Aim for flexibility – don't be too specific. Design review will consider neighborhoods.
  - i. 2-story okay for single-family cottages.
  - j. Fire access; needs to be compliant with fire codes.
  - k. Need binding site plan or master plan if phased.
  - l. Lower parking requirements.
  - m. Can be viable over time if selling each lot individually.
    - i. Will a lower parking requirement be enough to encourage more supply? Other factors include less maintenance, affordability

- ii. Sometimes affects neighborhoods if resources are not there for maintaining common areas. Single-owner developments could be more viable in the long term.
  - n. Condominiums work better, especially when there is individual parking near the unit.
  - o. Can long-term property maintenance really be controlled through design?
  - p. Design isn't the only answer, it depends on the values of the people that live there.
  - q. Cost is an issue – GFCs, impact fees make it tough. Flexibility is important. Not likely to have much on-street parking, especially with Low Impact Design and narrow streets. Can cluster parking 2-4 spaces for each few units.
  - r. Can find out if the owner lives nearby? Takes better care.
  - s. City shouldn't try to regulate type of ownership or require a Home Owner's Association (HOA)
  - t. Relax the rule that 50% of parking should be in a lot. Provide additional options for arranging parking into small clusters, or at individual units.
  - u. Layer density bonus, up to double density, for cottages or clusters to make more financially viable.
  - v. There is an efficiency to installing the utilities to each lot when the property is subdivided. Don't tear up the ground twice.
  - w. Would need to adjust minimum lot sizes. Tough to do within LID requirements
  - x. Lacey and Tumwater allow two units of cottages for every one unit of density allowed in the underlying zone.
  - y. Phasing with a master plan in construction and in fees (coordinated payments per units, as they are built).
  - z. Do not agree with "payment plans" – City would essentially be lending money.
  - aa. Could do townhomes in groups as part of cluster/cottage developments.
- B. Courtyard/Garden apartments & single-room occupancy (SRO)
- a. "Density-creep" a concern. A little more each year and will get rid of single-family neighborhoods.
  - b. SROs are already present in neighborhoods (i.e. roommates sharing a house). Should provide for them.
  - c. Need to be sure and consider schools' capacity within current schools. Increasing density too much will have negative effects.
  - d. Setbacks should focus on outer perimeter and should be reduced on Courtyard apartments.
  - e. SROs are often the first step to getting into housing. People living jointly in a house, sharing spaces, roommates.
- C. Tiny homes on wheels – What path, if any, can the City provide toward allowing tiny homes on wheels within state law?

- a. Currently classified as RVs.
- b. Allowed on foundations.
- c. If tiny home is built to IRC (with traditional utilities), okay by Building Official.
- d. If tiny home is built to RV codes, not allowed as a permanent residence.
- e. Lacey and Tumwater do not allow tiny homes built to the RV code as permanent housing.
- f. IRC and RV codes are very different.
- g. Hookup and impact fees are paid for in reference to the lot the house is on. If the house is on wheels, would those fees go with the house rather than the property? You would have to track it.
- h. There is a proposal for RV code with a specialized safety rating, closer to IRC.
- i. Fresno, California allows tiny homes on wheels: spells out six requirements that must be met, then it is essentially a guest house.
- j. What about hookup fees and impact fees?

4. Next Meeting

- i. The next meeting will be held on October 28, 2017 in Council Chambers at Olympia City Hall.
- ii. Topic: Discuss draft recommendations for all issues previously discussed by Work Group.

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

[olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle](http://olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle)