



Missing Middle Work Group - Notes October 26, 2017

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

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 Work Group Progress
 - A. Chair Richmond recapped the progress of the work group over the past few months, including hosting two open houses on the topic.
3. Discussion of Draft Recommendation Summaries:
 - A. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)
 - a. Height – What if primary residence is less than 24 feet high? Will that make the ADU out of character? At least in the historic district. Could tie to height of the existing home.
 - b. Owner living on-site – add “regulatory practicality” as a reason for the proposed change, because it can’t be enforced.
 - c. Do not like the idea of waiving the requirement for a second space for parking if they are also adding an ADU. What if there is no on-street parking in the area?
 - d. Consider removing “cooking facilities” from the ADU definition so people don’t try to build homes without cooking facilities in order to avoid having to pay the fees etc. They just end up being rented out illegally.
 - e. Parking should be tied to availability of on-street parking or right-of-way width. Only reduce off street parking requirements if that is the case.
 - f. Concur with the proposed changes for building height, not requiring the property owner to live on site, and reducing the minimum size for manufactured homes so they can be used as ADUs.
 - g. A neighborhood could look at areas for parking reductions as part of a subarea plan.
 - h. Do not want the lack of one parking spot to be the reason for not allowing an ADU.

- B. Cottage Housing
 - a. Concern about what might happen if single sewer lateral is allowed to serve multiple cottages but then gets plugged.
 - b. Parking – one extra space for every two cottages doesn't make sense. Re-word to better explain.
 - c. Look at phasing of all “growth cost charges” rather than just frontage improvements.
 - d. Concern regarding right-of-way phasing of frontage improvements.
 - e. Could the City extend phasing of frontage to subdivisions?
 - f. The size of a cottage is about half the size of a typical house. Can the impact and connection fees be reduced?
 - g. Is a courtyard necessary? Could allow to be flexible in how we configure certain percentage of open space?
 - h. Does eight hundred square foot maximum need to include garage? Could garages be exempt?
 - i. Concern if too many clusters are built close together, prefer diffused or scattered throughout neighborhoods.
 - i. Concern is regarding lot management and sustainability when missing middle is clustered in large numbers. Also fits in neighborhoods better if scattered.
 - j. The wording is confusing in proposed parking.
 - i. Clarify is like 1.5 per unit.
 - k. Incorporate design principles, such as those included in Ross Chapin's research.
 - i. Can this be incorporated into the design guidelines review?
- C. Courtyard Apartments
 - a. Concern they would result in tear downs.
 - b. Consistent with triplexes and fourplexes.
- D. Duplexes
 - a. Should the locations where duplexes are allowed be tied to criteria of six hundred feet from a transit route and commercial zones, as is proposed for triplexes and fourplexes.
 - b. Concern of crowding neighborhood schools with too much density.
 - c. Need to look at adjusting lot and impervious surface coverage limits.
 - d. Not concerned about duplexes being clustered together as will be less likely to proliferate in only one area.
 - e. Make sure there are robust duplex design standards.
 - f. Lot sizes are already small.
- E. General Provisions
 - a. Consider whether to keep 4 – 4.99 density in the R 4-8 district as a transfer of development rights (TDR) requirement to ensure density (e.g. 5 or greater).
 - b. Broaden impact fee and general facility charge (GFC) studies to see if we could look at whether at different square footages there is an

obvious break in the degree of the impact, or include number of bedrooms in studies.

- c. May also want to look at when fire sprinklers are required.
 - i. Equity issue: fire sprinkler costs could push people out of housing, into housing that is older and does not have fire sprinklers, or out of housing altogether (on average a homeless person lives 28 years less than those who are housed).
 - d. Is sprinkler requirement out of concern over response times being longer due to congested streets and roundabouts?
 - e. The new sprinkler requirement for ADU conversions in existing homes, such as in a basement, are expensive and may be encouraging more non-permitted ADU's.
 - f. Encourage LOTT to look at the portion of sewer general facility charges to also be looked at for potential decreases in the fees tied to the size of the unit or a lower amount of use per unit for these types of housing.
 - g. Acknowledge that decreases in general facility charge and impact fees for some housing may impact others' costs.
- F. Manufactured Homes
- a. Agree that when a manufactured home is proposed as an ADU it should be reviewed under the ADU design review criteria, rather than the criteria of any other design review type.
- G. Single-Room Occupancies
- a. Tough to pencil out at 6-12 per acre. Probably won't happen.
 - b. Look at density bonus to make it more encouraged.
- H. Tiny Houses
- a. If less than eight hundred square feet changes as part of impact fee studies, change here too.
- I. Townhouses
- a. Greater side yard setback may need to be retained to buffer square footage.
 - b. Concerned these changes may lead to teardowns of older existing homes to make way for more townhouses.
 - c. Change in character of the neighborhood results if someone can buy several adjacent lots, tear down the houses, and string together new townhouse units.
 - d. Still need to meet density, so unlikely.
 - e. Might stimulate redevelopment where needed.
 - f. Two parking spaces still needed – could tie to number of bedrooms or square footage (same for all missing middle types)?
 - g. Concerned that teardowns will result in a loss of housing that generally serves as “starter homes”.
 - h. One and a half parking spaces does not make sense if separate ownerships; either 1 or 2.

- J. Triplex/Fourplex
 - a. Same comment as previous regarding teardowns, seems to be an incentive.
 - b. School crowding concerns in existing neighborhoods.
 - c. Not likely to get a bunch of these housing types clustered. Consider encouraging these more by not requiring the location be within six-hundred feet of a transit route or commercial area.
 - d. Infill in the existing neighborhoods could also reduce the transportation costs to schools to building further out.
 - e. Market costs will usually limit when teardowns occur; cost of land, demolition, and then rebuilding is fairly high. Some teardowns possible, but probably minimal.
 - f. Try to define where the point where potential teardowns become more likely.
 - i. Include looking at projected market conditions.
 - ii. Can some of this be addressed through design guidelines.
 - iii. Transit routes could change over time.

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

olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle