



Missing Middle Work Group - Notes April 27, 2017

In attendance: Chair: Carole Richmond
Ken Pekola, Carl Kagy, Matt Newton, Roussa Cassel, Denise Pantelis,
Mike Matlock, Kirsten Evenson, Austin Hildreth, Bob Jacobs, Ron
Deering, Paula Ehlers, Todd Monohon, Dennis Olson

Staff: Leonard Bauer, Community Planning and Development Deputy
Director

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of Work Group Issues Identified at Last Meeting
 - a. The group reviewed the previously identified issues. A project schedule was passed out, which shows how issues will be discussed over the next three meetings.
3. Discussion: Neighborhood Compatibility Issues
 - a. Overview of Current City Regulations (Summaries Attached)
 - i. The group discussed current City regulations related to each of the policy questions below.
 - b. Discussion of Policy Questions:
 - i. Should missing middle housing types be permitted in additional areas in Olympia? If so, which areas?

Work Group comments:

1. Do we have demand data?
2. Anecdotal – one builder approached once a month for tiny home village
3. Demographics increase demand from older retired and millennials
4. Hard to get good data on demand if not allowed under current zoning
5. Missing middle housing is in short supply – because restrictive zoning. Duplex/triplexes fit better in neighborhoods than 5-12 unit apartments. Would like more specific demand data by type of housing
6. Big difference between established neighborhoods and vacant land, start by asking neighborhoods what they want and talk about each type of missing middle infill housing
7. Covenants restricting housing types in many places still in effect

8. Go to each individual neighborhood association first to see what they want
 9. Don't need owner-occupation requirement. Could increase within existing permitted areas better than zoning 'new' areas
 10. If City opens zoning; neighborhood associations could still restrict through covenants
 11. Hear strong demand for accessory dwelling units, especially one bedroom; can't do because of ownership requirement
 12. Our strongest demand is duplex with two bedroom with market rate rentals
- ii. Are the existing limits on the scale of missing middle housing appropriate?

Work Group comments:

1. 16 foot accessory dwelling unit height limit is too low; should be slightly higher for unit over garage, e.g. 20 – 22 feet
 2. Can't make one size fit all, can scale to the neighborhood?
 3. Demographics of future forecast? Can survey current accessory dwelling unit owners for why?
 4. Will see shift in transportation and walkability, which will attract people who want missing middle type housing
 5. Include consideration of autonomous vehicles
 6. Agree with getting feedback from neighborhoods; some more appropriate for missing middle infill housing
 7. Too detailed to get into development regulations
 8. Will need more flexibility in scale – smaller and larger – design can mitigate but need to rely on marketplace to see what is needed
 9. Try to be flexible with standards to do that, e.g. more ranges, to meet intent
 10. Can't have subjective codes – hard to design if you do not know the standards
- iii. In addition to limits on scale, are there any other design factors that should be regulated due to a public interest?

Work Group comments:

1. Can incentivize some design considerations rather than require them?
2. Accessory dwelling unit within existing building does not need design requirements, treat internal/external accessory dwelling units differently
3. Simplify as much as possible so variances, etc. are not needed – or they will be built without permits
4. If building off-site and moving to a neighborhood lot, can't match the neighborhood well – different considerations?
5. Some neighborhoods are eclectic and do not really have a consistent character to match; try new things unless

neighborhood does have consistent established character, such as Bigelow neighborhood

iv. What is the appropriate level of parking; on-street and off-street?

Work Group comments:

1. Current requirements assume everyone has a car. That will change in the future
 2. Depends on who serving – Homes First is affordable and few residents own cars, so they focus on locations near transit
 3. Most small multi-family residents still have a car or even two, sore point for neighbors if off-street parking is not provided
 4. Allow variance or reduction if close to transit
 5. Also can reduce if close to downtown or if tiny homes on wheels are allowed
 6. Not static, situation may need to change as technology and habits change
 7. Lot sizes changed over time – now smaller lots make it hard to add new units and new parking
 8. Younger/older people moving into cities
 9. Unfortunately don't have as convenient of transit opportunities as larger cities
 10. If base requirement of two for single family home is already met, then seems a lot to add a third; if can demonstrate they have two already, shouldn't require additional for accessory dwelling unit
 11. 'New structure' accessory dwelling units of 800 square feet may need, tie parking requirement to the size of the unit – larger units = require an additional parking space
 12. Like having on-street parking occupied; helps slow traffic
- v. For clustered missing middle housing (e.g., cottage or co-housing), should transition period be allowed from current development to clustered housing development?

Work Group comments:

1. Homes First would like to do that with mobile home parks, move people from substandard to more modern small housing
2. How many mobile home parks do we have?
3. Yes, would allow more people to be able to move to cottage housing
4. Would need to also allow to phase impact fees as each unit is built, not all at once
5. Common areas are an important part; need to ensure that comes on-line – through a development agreement or other phased development permit
6. If replacing units one-for-one, shouldn't be charged new impact fees

4. Homework Assignments

- a. Send any additional thoughts on these questions to Mr. Bauer.
 - b. Chair Richmond asked work group members with construction experience to provide information on cost issues at next meeting.
5. Next Meeting – Main Topic: Building Construction Requirements and Cost
- a. May 25, 2017; 4:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.
6. Announcements
- a. Olympians for People – Oriented Places is hosting tour of accessory dwelling units on June 3, 2017.
 - b. Missing Middle Open Houses – held in conjunction with City Council’s Land Use and Environment Committee meetings.
 - i. May 18, 2017 at Olympia High School. 5:30 p.m.
 - ii. May 30, 2017 at Capital High School. 5:30 p.m.

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

olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle