Joyce Phillips

From: Carol Johnson <caroljppcs@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:15 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Missing Middle planning change

3/5/18

Dear Commissioners-

We are sharing our concerns with the planning commissions and are hopeful that the big changes get communicated clearly to citizens.

1. The drawings at the meetings and at the open house are misleading in that they are not to scale on the lots. The views presented make the increase in density appear moderate, when in fact given the size of the structures whether they be cottages or duplexes, the lots will be densely packed and look nothing like R4-8 neighborhoods. If there was fair representation, I think people would have a better sense of how it will look and affect their neighborhood.

2. The 50 percent density bonus is just too much. On a 2.3 acre lot close to us, the density would go from 19 units to 29 units! You are making a zoning change in effect from R4-8 to R6-12 without saying it. I bought my property in R4-8 not in R6-12. To make this kind of change is a rezone by any other name without du3/5/18e process.

3. Furthermore, the increase in cars and pollution by increasing density is not addressed. What are the requirements/plans for parking, fire and increased traffic?

4. It is not clear what the mitigation would be in landscaping with this increased density in neighborhoods. It would be preferable to have dialogue with neighborhoods about the changes.

5. The changes in planning are city wide, negotiation and mitigation of developments with neighborhoods seems lost.

Mark and Carol Johnson

360-790-3286

Joyce Phillips

From: VYLAM NGUYEN <vylam474@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:16 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: RE: Very Concerned - Important

Thank you for the reply. Unfortunately the comprehensive plan answer certainly doesn't address ALL the angles of that go into something as serious as this is and will be going forward.

I wish there was more time for the city and its citizens to account for angles and also find viable solutions for everyone living in these areas.

I will plan to attend the meeting tonight and the coming meetings in hopes more thorough information and a better plan is in place.

Vylam Nguyen

360-790-6051

On March 5, 2018 at 2:16 PM missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Thank you for your comments. Below is a response to your question:

why are you suggesting to up zone R4-8 when there is existing R6-12 that has not been developed?

Cities in Washington state are required to adopt zoning that is consistent with their comprehensive plan. Zoning provides the regulatory framework in which private property owners can make decisions about uses of their property. Providing for a greater variety of housing types in our low-density residential zoning districts, including both R4-8 and R6-12, carries out several policies in the Olympia Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted after a five-year public process. The policies respond to many public comments during that process that there was not sufficient choices for housing for smaller households, and not a broad enough spectrum of affordability of different housing options. The policies also seek to accommodate new residents in Olympia through infilling our existing area, minimizing the City's need to expand outwardly into farm and forest lands.

From: VYLAM NGUYEN [mailto:vylam474@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 10:07 AM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Very Concerned - Important

" I just found out about the Missing Middle Housing and want more answers as this is going to affect my housing value"

"My neighborhood is not ready for duplexes or fourplexes in my neighborhood"

"The density and designs are not clear nor are what the suggested changes are going to look like in my neighborhood"

"The increased density is going to drive the prices down in my neighborhood"

"I have a home next to me that could be converted to a duplex and do NOT want that in my neighborhood"

"There is a vacant lot next to my property that they could put a fourplex on"

"Why are we upzoning R4-8 when there is existing R6-12 that has not been developed?"

Vylam Nguyen

360-790-6051

Joyce Phillips

From: Carol Johnson <caroljppcs@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:20 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Missing middle concerns correction

Carol Johnson <caroljppcs@gmail.com>

to missingmiddle

3/5/18

Dear Commissioners-

We are sharing our concerns with the planning commissions and are hopeful that the big changes get communicated clearly to citizens.

1. The drawings at the meetings and at the open house are misleading in that they are not to scale on the lots. The views presented make the increase in density appear moderate, when in fact given the size of the structures whether they be cottages or duplexes, the lots will be densely packed and look nothing like R4-8 neighborhoods. If there was fair representation, I think people would have a better sense of how it will look and affect their neighborhood.

2. The 50 percent density bonus is just too much. On a 2.3 acre lot close to us, the density would go from 19 units to 29 units! You are making a zoning change in effect from R4-8 to R6-12 without saying it. I bought my property in R4-8 not in R6-12. To make this kind of change is a rezone by any other name without due process.

3. Furthermore, the increase in cars and pollution by increasing density is not addressed. What are the requirements/plans for parking, fire and increased traffic?

4. It is not clear what the mitigation would be in landscaping with this increased density in neighborhoods. It would be preferable to have dialogue with neighborhoods about the changes.

5. The changes in planning are city wide, negotiation and mitigation of developments with neighborhoods seems lost.

Mark and Carol Johnson

360-790-3286

Joyce Phillips

From: Jim Cubbage <JimC@workingsystems.com>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:30 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: March 19th Hearing

Hello,

I'm hoping you can postpone the above meeting. I just started hearing about these changes in the last month and have seen very little public coverage. The proposed changes are far-ranging and deserve a reasonable comment period in order to hear all the best possible ideas. I also understand the Neighborhood Associations have only recently been given an opportunity to comment. A quick turn around from the final report to a vote before the commission has the faint odor of a stampede to avoid comment. I know you all want comments because you know it will improve the final result. Towards this end, please consider delaying the March 19 hearing for more consideration.

Best regards,

Jim Cubbage
Working Systems Inc
101 North Capitol Way Suite 302
Olympia, WA 98501
360-943-7640 ext 102
http://www.workingsystems.com

Angie Warner-Rein <angie.warnerrein@gmail.com>
5:49 PM
to missingmiddle, jphillip
RE: Serious Problems with Missing Middle Housing Proposal

From:
Angela Warner-Rein
1353 Thurston Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

To:
Dear Olympia Planning Commission Members,

I have a number of concerns regarding the Missing Middle (MM) Housing Proposal. The MM as it currently stands does not support the Comprehensive Plan.

A few of the Comp Plan goals are as follows:

- Focus higher residential densities downtown, along urban corridors, and near neighborhood centers.
- Walkable neighborhoods with unique centers and identities
- Development that complements the historic character of the community
- The design review process should recognize differences in the city with the objective of maintaining or improving the character and livability of each area or neighborhood.
- Increase affordable housing
- Increase housing for increased population density

MM as a market rate housing model rezone will not be able to increase affordable housing options for the majority of people that live in the Olympia area now with their income levels. The MM proposal also encourages the following problems:

- Absentee land lord rentals will increase with current ADU proposal
- A Code Enforcement disaster (in regards to ADUs) with the current model of reactive Code Enforcement that is under-funded and under staffed
- Serious parking problems in neighborhoods that already have too few parking spaces and/or sidewalk infrastructure problems
- Some neighborhoods affected in much greater percentages of change of housing and character than others
- 75% of The Eastside Neighborhood would be affected by housing/building code changes
- Tear-downs in lower socio economic neighborhoods and/or with older development

As a resident and tax payor in the City of Olympia I strongly urge the OPC Members and City Staff to listen to the public and neighborhood feedback you've been receiving regarding problems with this MM proposal:

- Slow this process down and
- Create an integrated plan that actually coordinates with the Comprehensive Plan and it's existing goals.

This rezone proposal seems complicated, haphazard, fraught with contradictions and clearly benefiting local developers at the tax payor's expense, with serious and expensive negative consequences to the future of our neighborhoods and residents. Where is the pressure coming from for this MM proposal to pass so quickly? The Comprehensive Plan is well developed, please keep it's integrity intact as a citizen advisory group that is carefully planning our future and well-being together.

With respect and deep concern, your neighbor, Angela Warner-Rein

3.5.18

Hello:

This is in regard to the proposed Missing Middle Housing rezoning.

We live on Rejoice Way SE, which is directly adjacent to a parcel on Boulevard Road that would be affected by this above change.

As we were not earlier notified of this zoning change and just found out about it, we would like to request an extension for additional review and input from the neighborhood. I am surprised that there is not a more formal notification process for adjacent properties to be appraised of such changes, especially when it is such a drastic change. This extension would allow for more details to emerge and a better consensus from the neighborhood.

With only marginal information, I understand that up to 8 residential units could be built on this property. I understand the need for additional housing, but I do not concur with altering stable neighborhoods that are single family standalone structures. The consequences of this high density approach is potentially a more transient neighbors that typically don't eschew the same perspectives of a quality well-maintained stable neighborhood. This impacts the quality lifestyle of our homes and will probably impact the value of our homes too. There are other tracts of land that will not have this same type of impact and would be better suited for this type of development.

Art Arneson	3208 Rejoice Wy SE
Sharon Arneson	3208 Rejoice Way SE
Susan Guilford	3213 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Carol Guilford	3213 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Amy Peterson	3217 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Julie Brader	3205 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Thomas Brader	3205 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Susan Duncan	3225 Rejoice Way SE Oly
Andrea Kovich	1304 NORTH CT SE Oly

Joyce Phillips

From: John Kelcher <jkelcher@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 10:08 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Missing Middle Housing – Proposed Zoning Code Changes

To whom it may concern,

I fully support the opinions noted below. If necessary, I will work tirelessly with the large (and growing) constitutes of neighbors to fight this to include funding and supporting appropriate legal actions. In addition I will lobbing with these same individuals against the re-election of any board members who vote in favor is such an appalling recommendation. This is clearly done with complete disregard of the citizens they govern and done for the sole greed of the City to generate tax revenues with little thought about the impacts it will have on our neighborhoods and most importantly our children.

I fully support the following opinions which were created by a fellow neighbor:

This proposal is in direct conflict with the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.

> PS3.1 Promote a variety of residential densities and housing types so that housing can be available in a broad range of costs.
>
> PP6.1Cooperate with Thurston County and its other municipalities to ensure comprehensive plans are coordinated and consistent.
>
> PL1.2Focus development in locations that will enhance the community and have capacity and efficient supporting services, and where adverse environmental impacts can be avoided or minimized.
>
> GL14Olympia's neighborhoods provide housing choices that fit the diversity of local income levels and lifestyles. They are shaped by thorough public planning processes that involve citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials.
>
> PL14.2Concentrate housing into three high-density Neighborhoods: Downtown Olympia, Pacific/Martin/Lilly Triangle; and the area surrounding Capital Mall. Commercial uses directly serve high-density neighborhoods and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. High-density neighborhoods are highly walkable. At least one-quarter of the forecasted growth is planned for downtown Olympia.
>
> PL14.3Preserve and enhance the character of existing established Low-density Neighborhoods. Disallow medium or high-density development in existing Low-density Neighborhood areas except for Neighborhood Centers.

GL20Development maintains and improves neighborhood character and livability.

PL20.1Require development in established neighborhoods to be of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.

The Wastewater Management Plan portion of the Comprehensive Plan states the following;

"…wastewater goals and policies may conflict with other City goals (e.g. promoting infill development)…"

This is not an exhaustive list.

This suggests the appropriate process for consideration of this proposal would be better suited as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(1)(d), not simply an administrative code revision.

A city-wide relaxation of the development standards will change the real estate market in Olympia. This will put a target on Olympia for absent investors and will diminish home ownership. As this proposal has the potential to significantly change market conditions in Olympia, TRPC's analysis of the monetary threshold of single family teardowns is based on out of date data.

Thanks,
John

Sent from my iPhone

Joyce Phillips

From: Ryan Hall <ryan@olympiaconsulting.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 9:02 AM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Re: When will my email be responded to?

Hello,
I have extensively reviewed your outreach plan. It makes sense now that most of us had no idea of this effort.
All of your outreach involves some form of those impacted having to come to you.
You should have done a mailing. I see nothing about a mailing.
Can you please verify if a mailing was done and when it was sent?
Thank you,
Ryan
p.s. I have not heard back about if the addresses I sent to you are in the re-zoning areas. Since I have not, I have told my neighbors that you are not responding, which means those voting on this are not impacted. That is disturbing and heartbreaking, but not unexpected.

On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 2:32 PM, missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Mr. Hall,

We appreciate your comments. City staff check this e-mail address weekly and respond to substantive questions. I've tried to address the questions in both your e-mails below.

This e-mail address has been available for over a year now for anyone to comment or ask questions about the Missing Middle process. I've attached a brief summary of the highlights of the public process that has been underway since January 2017. There has been additional coverage in The Olympian newspaper multiple times, local radio and TCTV, and other notices as well.

Parking is currently required to be provided by all new residential uses on their property (ie., off-street). These regulations would continue under the Missing Middle recommendations, with one exception: accessory dwelling units would not be required to provide an additional off-street parking space under the draft recommendations.

Stormwater is required to be handled by infiltrating on-site by all new development in accordance with City regulations. There are maximum portions of a property that are permitted to be covered by impervious surfaces, as well. These regulations are not proposed to be changed.

The Olympia School District has been consulted throughout the process, and a study by Thurston Regional Planning Council is available on the Missing Middle web page that includes analysis of potential impacts on schools.

Thanks to Olympia voters who passed a public safety levy in November, police staffing is being increased. Evidence is lacking to indicate that there would be an increase in crime due to missing middle housing types, however.

From: Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 10:09 AM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: When will my email be responded to?

Hello,

I sent an email asking questions about the Mission Middle project a week ago and have not heard back. Can you please confirm you received it? It is very hard for all of us to fight this issue, when you do not respond to our questions about it. Shows a lack of outreach. Which is a huge problem with this process from day one.

Also, the reason the email just arrived to you is because the public outreach process was very insufficient and I had no idea about it. In fact, I talked to a Tumwater police officer today who works the Middle Street area and that officer had no idea about this project.

Did you know our Tumwater PD is down seven positions? I am reaching out to Olympia PD to find out how many positions they are down. More people means more need for police. We have police shortage. This needs to be resolved before the housing goes in.

Also, I would like information on if any of the people voting on Missing Middle live in the zones being proposed for this project. I am not asking for addresses. Just if any of them live in the proposed zones.

I'd like request you do a new survey about the Missing Middle, once you properly do outreach about this proposal. It would most likely be very revealing.

Thank you,

Ryan

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell

OLYMPIA
CONSULTING LLC

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell

OLYMPIA
CONSULTING LLC

Joyce Phillips

From: linda S Wozniak <lswozniak@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 9:19 AM
To: missingmiddle

To whom it may concern:
Please improve the quality of our city by including:
L20. Require development in established neighborhoods to be of type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.
I have enjoyed my neighborhood for over 30 years and am very concerned about the actions that may decrease the safety and aesthetic quality of my neighborhood.
I am also dismayed over the lack of upkeep that has followed the new round-abouts on 22nd and Boulevard and 18th St. If this lack of foresight also accompanies the rezoning you are considering then I vehemently object!
Please make our capital city worthy of its title!
Linda Wozniak

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Joyce Phillips

From: ANTONETTE MIKLICH <tonimik@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 5:18 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: New zoning proposal

I am opposed to this proposal that increases the density of housing in our neighborhoods. I believe it will decrease our property values and change our Olympia neighborhoods into areas that will not be desirable. I understand that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Olympia but packing families into high density little boxes will cause more problems then it solves. I believe crime will increase. I believe it will increase enrollment in our schools and decrease the quality of education that is now in Olympia Schools. When I purchased my home thirty years ago, I bought here because of the neighborhood and schools. I have pride in my home and take good care of it. I believe that multi family housing that belongs to a landlord who doesn't live here will change that desirable quality.

Please consider what this proposal could do to existing neighborhoods and show some respect for those of us who care about Olympia's neighborhoods.

Antonette Miklich

Joyce Phillips

From: ANTONETTE MIKLICH <tonimik@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 6:56 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: March 5 meeting

I am writing this because I am very angry. I just read on a neighbors post on the Nextdoor site that there was a meeting yesterday evening to present comments on the Missing Middle proposal. Why is there not a public announcement of these meetings? I shouldn't have to learn this information from a neighbor. I have lived in Olympia for 35 years, owned my home for 30 years and have voted for most property tax increases to improve my city. I am feeling disrespected by the city council on this Missing MIddle Proposal. I feel you are going to push this on us whether we like it or not. I will not vote for any council member who is in favor of this proposal.

Antonette Miklich

Joyce Phillips

From: Mary Coacher <marycoacher@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 7:10 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Re: request for more time.

I want more time to understand and have questions answered about the Missing Middle and how it will affect my neighborhood. Please extend the hearing date so that I have time to learn about this proposal.
Sent from my iPhone

Joyce Phillips

From: Ryan Hall <ryan@olympiaconsulting.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 11:41 AM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Re: When will my email be responded to?

Please send me info on where I can find the names of who sits on planning commission. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 7, 2018, at 10:45 AM, missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Mr. Hall,
> The members of the Olympia City Council will vote on final adoption of any changes to city code regarding the Missing Middle recommendations.
> The members of the Olympia Planning Commission vote on a recommendation to the City Council prior to the City Council's vote on whether to adopt.
>
> **From:** Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
> **Sent:** Monday, March 5, 2018 2:36 PM
> **To:** missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Subject:** Re: When will my email be responded to?
>
> Thank you for finally responding to my emails.
> Are you unwilling to tell me if any of the members voting on this proposal live within the rezoning areas?
> If not, I can make a public records request for this information. Is that a better pathway?
> I am not asking for addresses of people - but this is fair information to ask in this situation.
>
> On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 2:32 PM, missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:
>
> > Hi Mr. Hall,
> >
> > We appreciate your comments. City staff check this e-mail address weekly and respond to substantive questions. I've tried to address the questions in both your e-mails below.
> >
> > This e-mail address has been available for over a year now for anyone to comment or ask questions about the Missing Middle process. I've attached a brief summary of the highlights of the public process that has been underway since January 2017. There has been additional coverage in The Olympian newspaper multiple times, local radio and TCTV, and other notices as well.
> >
> > Parking is currently required to be provided by all new residential uses on their property (ie., off-street). These regulations would continue under the Missing Middle recommendations, with one exception: accessory dwelling units would not be required to provide an additional off-street parking space under the draft recommendations.

Stormwater is required to be handled by infiltrating on-site by all new development in accordance with City regulations. There are maximum portions of a property that are permitted to be covered by impervious surfaces, as well. These regulations are not proposed to be changed.

The Olympia School District has been consulted throughout the process, and a study by Thurston Regional Planning Council is available on the Missing Middle web page that includes analysis of potential impacts on schools.

Thanks to Olympia voters who passed a public safety levy in November, police staffing is being increased. Evidence is lacking to indicate that there would be an increase in crime due to missing middle housing types, however.

From: Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 10:09 AM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: When will my email be responded to?

Hello,

I sent an email asking questions about the Mission Middle project a week ago and have not heard back. Can you please confirm you received it? It is very hard for all of us to fight this issue, when you do not respond to our questions about it. Shows a lack of outreach. Which is a huge problem with this process from day one.

Also, the reason the email just arrived to you is because the public outreach process was very insufficient and I had no idea about it. In fact, I talked to a Tumwater police officer today who works the Middle Street area and that officer had no idea about this project.

Did you know our Tumwater PD is down seven positions? I am reaching out to Olympia PD to find out how many positions they are down. More people means more need for police. We have police shortage. This needs to be resolved before the housing goes in.

Also, I would like information on if any of the people voting on Missing Middle live in the zones being proposed for this project. I am not asking for addresses. Just if any of them live in the proposed zones.

I'd like request you do a new survey about the Missing Middle, once you properly do outreach about this proposal. It would most likely be very revealing.

Thank you,

Ryan

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell
<image001.jpg>

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell
<image002.jpg>

Joyce Phillips

From: Leonard Bauer
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 2:18 PM
To: Joyce Phillips
Subject: FW: Cleaner version. Delete earlier note, pls. FW: Missing Middle concerns.

Please include with OPC packet. Thanks

From: nancy [mailto:biz4nikki@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 7, 2018 12:43 PM
To: Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Cheryl Selby <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Clark Gilman <cgilman@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Cleaner version. Delete earlier note, pls. FW: Missing Middle concerns.

Hi Leonard,

I was hoping she would take the time to view part of her city that could be (severely) adversely impacted by the missing middle.. I'd also be happy to show City staff, other council members/planning commission's the subject property and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Even the current regulations that allow for Townhomes are no less than an assault to the adjacent single family home neighborhoods.

100 foot wide buildings that are 45-plus feet tall, located 10 feet from the property lines are NOT a "blend" or "compatible" as the City missing middle literature and public noticing has stated.

How can the city accurately represent that a 80-100 foot building, 45 - 50 feet tall, complete with upper/lower story decks/window sliders sited just 10 feet from a single story, single family home rear property line is a blend or compatible housing product?

Yes, I'm stating that twice hoping that you and others will read that statement and take it to heart.

The West Coast will never get ahead of complaints that there aren't enough housing units and they aren't at the proper price points. California heard this sentiment even 20 million people ago... And it's more expensive than ever there now with the companion problems of poor air quality, Etc...

IMO, It's dishonest for the zoning regs to (now or in the future) permit a single family R 4 - 8 (those are the words on the second floor zoning map in City Hall) exceed that number of units and also vary from that housing product -- include Apartments, townhomes, etc.

I understand that this slippery slope has already happened but the MM is a further degradation of the current zoning.

The city should be concerned about all four sides of a project and require a responsible development.

Not only a cute front to the project with a handsome sign, water feature and a tree. And then have the other three project sides clearly adversely impact the existing neighborhoods.

What elements could be included to provide more responsible projects? Proper Landscaping as tall (trees) as the two-story windows and fully located on the project side of the property. Yes this would require increased setbacks.

Decks that would face onto each other on the sides of the buildings or face onto the project front. No more than the number of units as advertised in the residential zones. And single-family should mean just that... Single meaning one and a home meaning a singular structure. Massive structures like the Briggs Townhomes would completely eliminate light and sun from the adjacent properties.

It's unbelievable to me that the city would allow an entire adjacent property to lose all Light and sun. With only 10 ft setbacks, you are encouraging even more arborvitae walls to be planted and we both know how unsightly, odorous and, from a fire safety standpoint, unsafe they are..

If a structure just 10 feet off the property line caught fire, then the fire departments would have no choice but to go through the adjacent properties and likely cause considerable disruption and damage.

Even if other jurisdictions are going this missing middle (or something similar) route, it doesn't make it right. It's important that the city is an institution that residents and non-residents alike can trust. No double talk.

Before I bought my property I went to City Hall and looked at the zoning map. The map has an R 4- 8 designation for the property that's currently undeveloped behind me.

So given my 75-foot wide rear property line, I thought I would have one single family home and a partial second behind me. Max of two stories and a 20-foot setback. Now, under the missing middle proposal, I'm looking at 8 apartments ten feet off my property line! 6 upper story decks (including my neighbors properties) looking onto my property. Complete loss of reasonable privacy, Quiet, Light, ability to Garden Etc.

If Olympia wants to rezone, which is really what is proposed, then it ought to go through that process.

I honestly think the Planning Commissioners don't understand the full impact of The Proposal. And the city staff have not shown the Planning Commissioners what the most adverse impact could be to an existing property owner with proper diagrams.

The plan views that the staff continues to offer don't reflect how people experience the city environment. Most of us don't live in a helicopter.

All I can figure is that a significant number of Olympia employees don't plan to retire to Olympia and/ or are already living outside of Olympia. And City staff compensation is really driving this agenda.

People have told you they want missing middle price points. The Cottage Company homes that you've shown people are priced at the Mid five hundreds in Silverdale, Washington. Certainly not a middle price point for Olympia.

And most people don't know that Cottage could be a two-story 1200 square foot unit that is attached. Most people would call that a two-story duplex.

At any rate, I'm quite saddened to see such a poor proposal... It's poorly conceived and poorly presented.

It will only lead to primarily rentals in Olympia within the urban core - and, of course, every city should try to provide various price points.

But, a city dominated by rental neighborhoods will mean more shoody neighborhoods which Olympia already has plenty of....

More absentee landlords, disheveled homes, barking dogs, inoperable cars, increased crime, etc. The City of Olympia does not have a good record with regard to code enforcement. A drive through Olympia is evidence of that...

How can this be a proper vision for Olympia?

More vertical housing downtown where the height aren't an assault to adjacent properties should be encouraged. More people downtown would actually create a safer environment and thriving business climate.

ADU use within existing homes should be encouraged, fees lowered, expedited planning, waiver of sprinkler requirements, Etc. Many Washington homes are quite large for the number of occupants.

I was a government employee myself for more than three decades and I know your job is not easy.

Nonetheless, I am requesting that the city speak clearly about The Proposal with proper depictions of housing products and potential maximum impacts so that there can be an appropriate, honest and forthcoming dialogue.

I believe the current zoning regulations that are not consistent with the product type or a number of units within a zone should be repealed.

A zoning title that is accurate with regard to the number of units and product type.... And anything other than that should be considered a rezoning (not a redefinition within the current Zone) with the appropriate processes. The average person buying a home in Olympia should not have to be attorney or planner to understand the zoning regulations.

I'm sure there are probably some grammatical errors in this note but I hope you understand the general spirit and nature my comments.

Thank you.

On Mar 7, 2018 11:06 AM, "Leonard Bauer" <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hello Nancy,

Mayor Selby has asked me to follow up on your e-mail, as she will be departing for a trip as part of a regional delegation to China. Please feel free (as always) to contact me with any questions.

Leonard Bauer, FAICP/Deputy Director

601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967

360.753-8206 | www.olympiawa.gov

From: Cheryl Selby
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 2:09 PM
To: Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Fwd: Missing Middle concerns

Hi Leonard,

Can you follow up with this constituent? I'm scrambling trying to get ready for my China trip this Thursday and will be gone two weeks.

Thanks!

Cheryl

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** nancy <biz4nikki@gmail.com>
> **Date:** March 6, 2018 at 7:57:59 AM PST
> **To:** <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Subject: Missing Middle concerns**
>
> Good morning Madam Mayor,

The neighborhoods are quite concerned about what development could occur on currently undeveloped property on Piper Street about a block from Olympia High School. Would you be willing to visit the site and discuss what the missing middle could mean for the adjacent neighborhoods?

I'm a retiree to the area... Earned a planning degree from UC Davis and I worked in government for 30 plus years. Employment as a Transit Manager for both city/regional bus systems, Real Estate Manager for three government agencies including Project Manager for a townhome project near the Colma BART Station, Executive Director of a regional planning agency, Program Manager for Transportation Corridor studies like the study almost underway for the Nisqually region...

I also served as acting City Manager on a few occasions.

Or, I'd be happy to come to your office if we could arrange for meeting.

Thank you,

Nancy Knofler

Joyce Phillips

From: Kathy McCormick <kathy.mccormick@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 3:20 PM
To: missingmiddle
Cc: CityCouncil; Leonard Bauer
Subject: Comment to Include in OPC Public Hearing record re: Support for Adoption of Missing Middle Regulation Proposals

Please include the letter below in the comment record for the Olympia Planning Commission Public Hearing March 19th re: Missing Middle Proposals

Our region and City of Olympia has a housing crisis that will be alleviated by the supply of a full range of housing types including those that will result from the Missing Middle actions proposed. Years of growth of people and jobs but not housing has precipitated housing crisis in many areas including ours. Action on Missing Middle regulations is important and should be adopted as soon as possible. Kathy served as staff to the City during the multiyear process of adoption of the 1994 Olympia Comprehensive Plan (OCP) - completed in compliance with the 1990 State Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA was to be the antidote for sprawl, continued household reliance on multiple car ownership, the loss of farm and forest land, and the threats to clean water and air that result.

Missing Middle types of housing have been included as an important element since the 1994 OCP. There was a huge amount of support for this housing as it was understood to fill the need for the variety of housing types needed by the changing demographics identified in the OCP as well as the housing needed as Olympia grew. Infill housing was seen as a way to fully use the existing infrastructure instead of taking on the huge financial burden of continued expansion of infrastructure making stressed City budgets worse over time. However the last 24 years have seen few of the Missing Middle housing types emerge. The City process has been incredibly thorough, has spanned the last 15 months and by the OPC public hearing will have had 34 public meetings on the subject. The underlying causes of the lack of these housing types being built have been identified and thoroughly discussed by a full range of residents.

We have attended several of the study sessions undertaken with the work group as well as taken part in surveys, open houses, planning commission meetings and our neighborhood association meeting. Presentations and answers to questions have been thorough as well as clearly presented. Graphics and analysis have been carefully done and have made the process transparent. We support the draft recommendations and are in hopes that the City will finally realize the potential that this infill housing can achieve for the housing choices we must have to get and keep our residents housed as their needs change through life. In actuality, the analysis regarding the number of housing units that will be produced through the proposed changes is fewer than we would have hoped but will finally contribute to the much needed variety and location of housing needed to even begin to achieve the promise of the OCP vision.

Monday night at the Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) meeting staff went through the concerns and questions that have been expressed by those who oppose this city action. One of the suggestions posed is that the city should focus on the transit corridors and the HDC - 4 areas. Kathy was staff to the City when analysis was completed and regulation changes made to transit corridors and HDC-4 areas with the hope that additional housing would result. While there were some opportunities the conclusion was that in close in transit corridors development would be slow due to limitations of lot size, access, continued value of existing buildings and lack of return on investment for redevelopment. In HDC-4 areas where larger properties with large expanses of parking lots exist - these projects are also difficult due to complications of ownership, large upfront investment that would be required, and again the loss of revenue in areas that continue to return investment for business and property owners.

The City has been wise to undertake the Missing Middle process since it is an important next step to provide additional much needed housing throughout our city. This action is a crucial step toward more housing opportunity for a full range of incomes. It also provides the opportunity to attract those who can afford new housing - however small the units may be - possibly vacating Olympia's older housing resulting in increased supply of affordable housing for those with fewer means.

We ask that the OPC forward recommendations to fully implement the MIssing Middle regulations proposed as quickly as possible to the Olympia City Council for their consideration and adoption.

Sincerely

Kathy and Mike McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA 98501

Joyce Phillips

From: Joyce Phillips
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 12:22 PM
To: 'Bob Jorgenson'; missingmiddle
Subject: RE: Your request for information

Hi, Bob.
I believe you are asking about the maps Leonard discussed at the Planning Commission meeting on Monday. The maps that show where triplexes and fourplexes could be added are included on the Missing Middle Housing webpage, under Triplexes and Fourplexes (click on "See maps of recommendations"). This link shows the maps with the transit routes that were there before and adds the maps Leonard showed at the meeting on Monday. The Missing Middle Residential Capacity Assessment that was prepared by Thurston Regional Planning Council is related and is the last bulleted item on the page under "New/Updated Information". http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/codes-plans-and-standards/missing-middle.aspx
Thanks!
Joyce

From: Bob Jorgenson [mailto:Bob.Jorgenson@cbolympia.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:08 AM
To: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>; missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Re: Your request for information

Joyce,

Thanks for that info. Also I know that no one else is asking for anything but myself but you might be able to find it on the website faster than I. How many homes/lots currently zoned 4-8 fall into the bucket of being converted to a duplex zone? Also what is the number of homes/lots within the 600' of the bus line will be permitted to build or convert to tri/4plex? I think Leonard mentioned that in the SEPA analysis but I couldnt find it online.

Thanks Again for your work on this,

Bob

From: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Thursday, March 8, 2018 10:44 AM
To: Bob Jorgenson
Cc: Leonard Bauer
Subject: Your request for information

Hi, Bob.

You recently asked me to pull together information about the dates and types of outreach the city did for Missing Middle Housing. Here is what I have, which is pretty high-level and you've already seen it. We've recently received a public records request for similar information, which our records specialists are working on. If you are not part of that request please let me know. I will see if the same information can be sent to you as well. Thanks! Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

Note: Emails are public records, and are potentially eligible for release.

Joyce Phillips

From: Laura Chartoff <lchartoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 2:36 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: no sidewalks/pedestrian safety

My neighborhood is Canterbury (Wedgewood/Vista Ave/Danbury). We do not have sidewalks. And there are lots of kids here, walking to and from the elementary and middle schools, in the street. Allowing increased density will reduce pedestrian safety by increasing car traffic. Increasing density is not appropriate here unless the city installs sidewalks. Thank you

Joyce Phillips

From:	Leonard Bauer
Sent:	Wednesday, March 07, 2018 4:30 PM
To:	'Kathy McCormick'
Cc:	Joyce Phillips
Subject:	RE: Comment to Include in OPC Public Hearing record re: Support for Adoption of Missing Middle Regulation Proposals

Thanks for your comments. We will include in the OPC packet for the public hearing.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathy McCormick [mailto:kathy.mccormick@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 7, 2018 3:20 PM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Comment to Include in OPC Public Hearing record re: Support for Adoption of Missing Middle Regulation Proposals

Please include the letter below in the comment record for the Olympia Planning Commission Public Hearing March 19th re: Missing Middle Proposals

Our region and City of Olympia has a housing crisis that will be alleviated by the supply of a full range of housing types including those that will result from the Missing Middle actions proposed. Years of growth of people and jobs but not housing has precipitated housing crisis in many areas including ours. Action on Missing Middle regulations is important and should be adopted as soon as possible. Kathy served as staff to the City during the multiyear process of adoption of the 1994 Olympia Comprehensive Plan (OCP) - completed in compliance with the 1990 State Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA was to be the antidote for sprawl, continued household reliance on multiple car ownership, the loss of farm and forest land, and the threats to clean water and air that result.

Missing MIddle types of housing have been included as an important element since the 1994 OCP. There was a huge amount of support for this housing as it was understood to fill the need for the variety of housing types needed by the changing demographics identified in the OCP as well as the housing needed as Olympia grew. Infill housing was seen as a way to fully use the existing infrastructure instead of taking on the huge financial burden of continued expansion of infrastructure making stressed City budgets worse over time. However the last 24 years have seen few of the Missing Middle housing types emerge. The City process has been incredibly thorough, has spanned the last 15 months and by the OPC public hearing will have had 34 public meetings on the subject. The underlying causes of the lack of these housing types being built have been identified and thoroughly discussed by a full range of residents.

We have attended several of the study sessions undertaken with the work group as well as taken part in surveys, open houses, planning commission meetings and our neighborhood association meeting. Presentations and answers to questions have been thorough as well as

clearly presented. Graphics and analysis have been carefully done and have made the process transparent. We support the draft recommendations and are in hopes that the City will finally realize the potential that this infill housing can achieve for the housing choices we must have to get and keep our residents housed as their needs change through life. In actuality, the analysis regarding the number of housing units that will be produced through the proposed changes is fewer than we would have hoped but will finally contribute to the much needed variety and location of housing needed to even begin to achieve the promise of the OCP vision.

Monday night at the Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) meeting staff went through the concerns and questions that have been expressed by those who oppose this city action. One of the suggestions posed is that the city should focus on the transit corridors and the HDC - 4 areas. Kathy was staff to the City when analysis was completed and regulation changes made to transit corridors and HDC-4 areas with the hope that additional housing would result. While there were some opportunities the conclusion was that in close in transit corridors development would be slow due to limitations of lot size, access, continued value of existing buildings and lack of return on investment for redevelopment. In HDC-4 areas where larger properties with large expanses of parking lots exist - these projects are also difficult due to complications of ownership, large upfront investment that would be required, and again the loss of revenue in areas that continue to return investment for business and property owners.

The City has been wise to undertake the Missing Middle process since it is an important next step to provide additional much needed housing throughout our city. This action is a crucial step toward more housing opportunity for a full range of incomes. It also provides the opportunity to attract those who can afford new housing - however small the units may be - possibly vacating Olympia's older housing resulting in increased supply of affordable housing for those with fewer means.

We ask that the OPC forward recommendations to fully implement the Missing Middle regulations proposed as quickly as possible to the Olympia City Council for their consideration and adoption.

Sincerely

Kathy and Mike McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA 98501

Joyce Phillips

From:	Joyce Phillips
Sent:	Wednesday, March 07, 2018 4:35 PM
To:	'Bob Jorgenson'
Cc:	Leonard Bauer; Kellie Braseth
Subject:	RE: bob j small request please

Hi, Bob.
Below are the Planning Commissioner's names and email addresses. Please note that comments on Missing Middle Housing, that are meant to be included in the public record, should be sent to the missing middle email address at missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us. Comments received at that email address are included in the Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) packets or provided at the OPC meetings. Comments to Planning Commissioners are not included in the record unless they are also copied or forwarded to the missing middle email address, or to staff.

Chair: Rad Cunningham, rcunning@ci.olympia.wa.us
Vice Chair: Mike Auderer, mauderer@ci.olympia.wa.us
Tammy Adams, tadams@ci.olympia.wa.us
Travis Burns, tburns@ci.olympia.wa.us
Paula Ehlers, pehlers@ci.olympia.wa.us
Brian Mark, bmark@ci.olympia.wa.us
Carole Richmond, crishmon@ci.olympia.wa.us
Missy Watts, mwatts@ci.olympia.wa.us

And the 9th seat is currently vacant. The names of the Planning Commissioners are listed on the following city webpage: http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/advisory-committees/planning-commission.aspx

While it is not required, I do request that you copy me on any email to the Planning Commissioners. This is in case we receive any public records inquiries or requests.
Thanks!
Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

From: Bob Jorgenson [mailto:Bob.Jorgenson@cbolympia.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 7:04 AM
To: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: bob j small request please

Joyce,

If you can send me every ones full name and email who is on the planning commission.

Thanks,

Bob Jorgenson
3333 Capital Blvd
Olympia, WA 98501
Cell 360.888.2765
www.bobjorgenson.com

Joyce Phillips

From:	Matt Tharp <matt.tharp@eng-software.com>
Sent:	Thursday, March 08, 2018 9:49 PM
To:	Leonard Bauer
Cc:	missingmiddle
Subject:	Middle Housing Olympia
Attachments:	Survey Results.pdf

Dear Mr. Bauer,

I writing to you today in regards to the Middle Housing Initiative that is apparently taking place within the City of Olympia.

I have lived in Olympia since I was 16. I went to Oly High and then WSU before returning to Olympia to raise my family. Recently, while on a business trip out of the country I received some concerned emails from neighbors regarding the Middle Housing Initiative that appears to be moving forward which could affect not only my neighborhood but many of the neighborhoods within the city limit.

Before making any judgements I have tried to educate myself on the facts and I, as well as my neighbors, are very concerned.

From the website I have gathered a few items that are very concerning.

First, It appears that the initiative was released to the public on November 17th, 2018. It also appears there were two Q&A sessions conducted by the city on December 11th, 2018 and December 13th. If my math is correct that those sessions were scheduled less than 1 month after the initial announcement. How can this be enough time to inform our citizens of a pretty significant change to zoning codes which may have a dramatic effect on the place in which we live?

I also found information showing meeting notes from March of 2017. How come I didn't receive a notification of this? Every home owner in areas being considered for rezoning should have been notified.

It appears in December the City of Olympia conducted a survey of 650 people at the maximum. See attached doc. The city has 51,202 (2016) residents in it. The survey represents just over .01% of the population. Why did I not receive any information on this? Why did none of my neighbors receive any information on this? To be frank, this survey does not represent the thoughts of the city population.

It also appears the city is expecting to grow by 1000 residents per year for 20 years. This I understand is maybe a sound projection backed by math and history. However, why is the city deciding that is ok to add multi-family housing to neighborhoods with half acre vacant lots? Why are we planning for people that cant currently afford housing or property as it exists today? Why are we planning for these people who aren't even residents yet?

From looking at downtown it appears the city has enough problems with the small business economy and homelessness. However, I do understand the City needs to plan for the future but I do not believe adding neighborhood density to pre-existing and established neighborhoods is the way to do it. There is a reason I live where my home sits. I wanted privacy, property, and I could pay for it. It's not right to diminish my hard work by allowing some builder to heavily profit on townhomes or a 4 plex in a single family home neighborhood.

My neighborhood has homesites with half acre lots located in R4-8 zoning district. There is one site that is undeveloped because a man wanted to keep the site as a backyard sanctuary. If this lot goes up for sale the city's "rezoning" would

potentially allow for mutli-family housing to be put on that lot and subsequently in the middle of my neighborhood. Is this accurate?

This will undoubtedly cause my home and my neighbors homes resale value to go down.

What impact will this have on the Olympia School District? Last year McKinney held a meeting to discuss the possibility of sending kids to Reeves instead of the traditional Washington Middle School. The schools appear to be over desired occupancy already. I live 4 minutes walking distance from Washington Middle which is one of the big reasons I paid a large amount of money to live in my neighborhood.

What is the total amount of vacant apartments in the city? What is the occupancy rate on apartment complexes in the city?

Where are we concerned with people moving to our community that can't afford housing?

My hope is that this is not final and that the meeting on March 19th will provide for the city to hear some of its residents who have paid large amounts for privacy, property, and to live in an established well put together neighborhood which doesn't include low income housing.

If I wanted to live in an area with low income housing I would move there and my hope is that the city will think about this further and make sure all residents who could potentially take issue with this are notified.

Heck maybe we should vote by zoning district and see what happens. I am pretty sure that the people in some of these zoning districts don't want low income housing pop up in their neighborhoods as their property taxes continue to rise. I could be wrong.

Any feedback you can provide about how my neighbors and I can fight this would be appreciated.

Best Regards,
Matt

Matt Tharp
Business Development Manager
Engineered Software, Inc.
4529 Intelco Loop SE, Lacey, WA 98503
360.359.4035 | 360.350.8364
matt.tharp@eng-software.com | www.eng-software.com

ENGINEERED
Software, Inc.

Missing Middle Infill Housing: Survey Results

Olympia

December 2017

The City of Olympia is considering code changes to allow more housing choices in our community and wanted to hear from the community on a few key issues. As part of the City's outreach efforts a brief, non-scientific survey was conducted between November 15th and November 30th. The information below shares the results of the survey. Responses to the open ended survey question are largely unedited ~ however where references to a specific person or personal information were made, they were deleted.

The term "Missing Middle" refers to a range of housing types that can provide more than one housing unit per lot and be compatible with existing neighborhoods. Allowing for a range of housing options is essential to help ensure housing availability for all. Why is this important? Olympia is expecting an additional 20,000 people over the next 20 years.

Creating urban neighborhoods for a variety of income types is vital to creating housing opportunities for everyone. Missing Middle housing provides more housing choices for members of our community. It fills the gap between apartments and single family housing.

ADU (Accessory Dwelling Units), sometimes called Backyard Cottages

ADUs are a second, smaller dwelling located on the same lot as a single-family house. They may be an internal conversion of a portion of the existing house or garage, added onto the existing house, or a separate detached structure (sometimes called backyard cottages).

1. *Currently the code requires the property owner to live at the property, in the main house or in the ADU.*

   The proposed change is that the property owner would NOT be required to live on site. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 649 Skipped: 2

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
21.73% 141	10.17% 66	8.78% 57	19.57% 127	39.75% 258	649	3.45

2. *Currently the code says a home (with or without an ADU) can be no higher than 35 feet in height. However, an accessory building (any other structure) NOT attached to the home can be no higher than 16 feet in height. As a result, an ADU cannot be built over a detached garage.*

   The proposed change is that the building height for accessory structures be increased to 24 feet, thereby allowing an ADU over a detached garage. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 650 Skipped: 1

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
8.92%	5.38%	6.15%	20.77%	58.77%		
58	35	40	135	382	650	4.15

Duplexes

A duplex is a single building containing two dwelling units. Duplexes differ from townhouses in that an entire duplex building is on a single piece of property.

3. *Currently the code does not allow new duplexes in most residential neighborhoods.*

   The proposed change is to allow new duplexes in most residential neighborhoods. View the map to see currently permitted vs proposed areas. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 636 Skipped: 15

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
16.04%	8.02%	5.35%	22.01%	48.58%		
102	51	34	140	309	636	3.79

Triplexes and Fourplexes

Triplexes and fourplexes are considered apartment buildings containing three and four dwelling units, respectively. They differ from townhouses in that the entire triplex or fourplex building is on a single piece of property.

4. *Currently in the code triplexes and fourplexes are allowed only in a small portion of residential areas, even in areas that are intended to accommodate up to 12 residences per acre.*

   The proposed change is to allow triplexes and fourplexes in more residential neighborhoods. View the map that shows currently permitted vs proposed areas. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 630 Skipped: 21

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
22.54%	10.63%	6.19%	22.54%	38.10%		
142	67	39	142	240	630	3.43

Cottage Housing

Cottage housing is "four or more small, detached dwelling units sharing a commonly owned courtyard/common area and parking area." Cottage housing differs from co-housing because it does not have to include shared community structures.

5. *Currently the code allows 4-12 small cottage homes, to be clustered around a green space. Cottage developments can build up to 20% more homes per acre than allowed for other types of housing (called a "density bonus").*

   The proposed change is to increase the density bonus for cottage developments to 50%, keeping the green space requirement. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 626 Skipped: 25

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
11.98%	7.99%	8.31%	26.52%	45.21%		
75	50	52	166	283	626	3.85

Courtyard Apartments

Typically, courtyard apartments are characterized by several attached apartment units arranged on two or three sides of a central courtyard or lawn area.

6. *Current Olympia currently does not have specific provisions for courtyard apartments and treats them the same way as any apartment complex.*

   The proposed change is to allow courtyard apartments in more residential areas, limited to one story in some areas, and two stories in other areas. View the map that shows the currently permitted vs the proposed areas. Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 620 Skipped: 31

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
17.42%	10.81%	8.87%	25.32%	37.58%		
108	67	55	157	233	620	3.55

Tiny Homes

Olympia's Municipal Code currently does not have a separate definition of tiny houses; neither does the International Building Code (IBC). The State of Washington permits tiny houses built on trailers with wheels as recreational vehicles. Olympia permits permanently-located tiny houses as single-family houses.

7. *Currently tiny homes on foundations must meet all residential building and zoning codes, including providing two off-street parking spaces.*

   The proposed change is to only require one off-street parking space for a tiny home on a foundation and no additional parking spaces if the tiny home is used as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Do you agree or disagree with this proposed code change?

Answered: 601 Skipped: 50

STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
10.15%	4.83%	5.82%	21.96%	57.24%		
61	29	35	132	344	601	4.11

8. *Do you have additional comments about the Missing Middle Housing code changes that you would like to share?*

Answered: 231 Skipped: 408

#	RESPONSES
1	Infill housing developments, along with redevelopment and building of more mixed use structures, are essential to meeting long-term goals of the city in becoming more livable, walkable and overall sustainable. Thank you for moving us in this direction. 12/1/2017 12:38 AM
2	Olympia needs to improve/increase residential density to accommodate projected population growth. And setting those provisions now is the time to do it. 11/30/2017 11:34 PM
3	I can only somewhat agree with # 7 only because no additional parking should be required. If it required no parking for both types, I would strongly agree. I strongly oppose all parking requirements in code. I would like to see no parking requirements for any type of construction, including apartments and commercial construction. Parking is not a health or safety issue and should be at the discretion of the landowner and/or developer based on market demand or personal preference rather than a requirement. Because our state generally has a cleaner electricity mix due to the BPA, vehicle emissions are the largest source of greenhouse gases here, and we should remove all requirements from code that support their extensive use. 11/30/2017 11:34 PM
4	Thank you for moving on this! I will be first in line for cottage housing! 11/30/2017 11:01 PM
5	Yes! To more housing options!!!!! 11/30/2017 8:59 PM
6	These proposals address areas where codes contribute to epidemic homelessness. Easier partitioning of large houses, even incentives, would be good public policy. 11/30/2017 5:09 PM
7	I am very concerned about the triplex and quadiplex proposal. Covering 600 feet adjacent to transit routes covers virtually all of the Eastside Neighborhood where I serve on the neighborhood association board. These buildings will be similar in size and character as MacMansions that are disliked in urban areas throughout the country. They impact the character of neighborhoods. When I served on the Planning Commission that level of density was rejected in the Comprehensive Plan draft we proposed, and was adopted by the Council. I am supportive of all the other Missing Middle proposals. I hope that our neighborhood and others will receive an explanation of why triplexes and quadriplexes are a necessary component of the

Missing Middle project. As the map indicates, no other neighborhood will be as impacted as ours if it is adopted. 11/30/2017 4:24 PM

8 Tiny homes offer an option for affordable housing for seniors like me. Our tiny homes can be in the yard of a friend or relative, in the neighborhood of our choice, in a tiny home community, in a cohousing development, or on a small piece of land. We can live in a tiny home village with other seniors to age in place, sharing care givers. We can pay $300 or $400 a month to be in the yard of a homeowner – they can use that to help pay their mortgage – both will benefit. Neighborhoods will benefit from having seniors in their midst. Tiny homes are inexpensive and require little maintenance. Utility bills are small. Median rents in Olympia climbed to $1,058 in 2016. Thurston County ranks near the bottom in the state for housing affordability. Many seniors live on social security of $800 a month or less. To rent a place, it's required that housing be 30% of our income, clearly impossible for many. This is causing much stress within the senior community and leads to homelessness. Olympia's Comprehensive Plan sets a goal that affordable housing is available for all income levels throughout the community. Further, Growth Management encourages infill in neighborhoods to accommodate new growth. I support the Missing Middle proposed changes that permit tiny houses: *** Tiny houses may be permitted as single-family houses, accessory dwelling units or cottage housing if they meet all applicable codes. *** A group of tiny houses can be permitted as a co-housing development in most residential zoning districts, providing a clear option for tiny house communities. *** A tiny house on wheels can be permitted as a single-family house if it has a foundation and meets building codes. 11/30/2017 4:14 PM

9 This question actually allows real input. First of all, I think it is really dirty of all of you to do this during the holidays and in such a short time period. Most of us lead very stressful lives just trying to survive. This process is a true scam in itself. To my knowledge, the Missing Middle code has not been allowed to be vetted by everyone who will be affected. 11/30/2017 4:04 PM

10 A per unit, or square-foot tax must be implemented to create a fund for building and maintaining low-income -- not "affordable," low-income -- housing, where low-income in defined as no more than 150% of Federal poverty level for a given family size, and rent is limited to no more than 30% of gross income. 11/30/2017 3:15 PM

11 I prefer building high density in downtown. 11/30/2017 2:58 PM

12 I am hoping that these changes are implemented soon. So many single folks are looking for affordable housing and this would help many people. 11/30/2017 2:44 PM

13 Alternate sidewalk requirements for infill development where sidewalks aren't adjacent or likely to connect 11/30/2017 1:33 PM

14 While I agree that single-family-house type neighborhoods should grow more dense, I am concerned that current homeowners will be taxed at a much higher rate for that potential density and that it will accelerate the changes in these neighborhoods, causing hardship and resentment. And on the Westside slope, higher building heights will ruin the views of those houses behind them. I'm all for tiny houses and would put one on my lot if I could. A further comment: there are several houses I see in my immediate neighborhood near the transit lines that you are proposing for higher density--these houses are empty and decaying, but could be rehabbed for rental occupancy relatively soon, with encouragement from government (the building department) and perhaps some tax penalties for letting housing sit empty for years on end. Portland is currently taking these "zombie houses" derelict in their tax payments, garbage pickup, etc (they are squatter bait) and putting them up for sale. It's an idea to look into... 11/30/2017 1:18 PM

15 Side yard set backs should not be decreased. Maintaining trees and shrubbery needs to be proitized. As our climate warms, we will need green infrastructure to decrease heat of buildings and manage the threat of flooding. 11/30/2017 12:36 PM

16 We need to invest in the missing middle housing! We should have been doing this 5-10 years ago. 11/30/2017 11:40 AM

17 My concerns are based on what i've seen happen in Seattle where historic single family homes, often times rentals, are torn down to be replaced by mute-family multi-story condos. Because they are new the rent is much higher than the original home and is another way of pushing out moderately priced rentals. We are lucky here and have fairly large lots, it would be heartbreaking to have lovely and affordable homes torn down only to have multi-story apartments/condos be built right next to existing homes. 11/30/2017 11:25 AM

18 Strongly support the direction of removing code/planning barriers to infill. Kudos for (finally) considering these changes! Please make it happen! 11/30/2017 11:16 AM

19 Thank you for finally (hopefully) making these much-needed changes to our zoning laws. This is exactly the type of update that is needed to help accommodate our population growth and keep rental costs down. I am a property owner who has an almost-ADU on my property. I haven't added a kitchen to the space because of the outdated "owner must live onsite" rule. I also own a rental property and I have been appalled by how expensive rents have gotten in our city over the past decade. Olympia thrives on the creativity of our diverse population - let's keep it that way by keeping our housing affordable. 11/30/2017 10:22 AM

20 I don't know that I have had enough time to consider the changes but overall 11/30/2017 10:14 AM

21 I love our city. It is amazing. Why do this? I grew up in Seattle and it is a mess, with people selling their lots for more and more money. Please keep Olympia amazing and small. There are a lot of other places to live. 11/30/2017 10:03 AM

22 The survey doesn't allow for sharing the reason(s) for agreement or disagreement. The proposals might be considered to be too limiting or too expansive and receive the same answer. 11/30/2017 9:45 AM

23 I think tiny homes used as ADUs should still require one offstreet parking spot. Crowded street parking is already an issue in some neighborhoods 11/30/2017 9:37 AM

24 Thank you - this is a big improvement! 11/30/2017 9:30 AM

25 I am in full support of increasing the diversity of housing options and available all across the city. 11/30/2017 9:09 AM

26 Fully support these changes to make neighborhoods (especially those closest to town) more dense and more affordable for the diverse folks who make Olympia great. 11/30/2017 8:52 AM

27 Please factor in affordability when talking about housing. More housing is great, but not at a high rent rate. 11/30/2017 8:51 AM

28 Municipal rent cap needed. Too many landlords making too much money. So much greed. 11/30/2017 8:08 AM

29 Don't let lower income people be gentrified into homelessness! 11/30/2017 6:32 AM

30 I hope the workgroup/committee will continue to explore and respond to innovations and opportunities that develop after these specific proposals are decided upon. It would also be nice to see code exemptions or other incentives for non traditional housing that is strictly affordable (tied to income) or targeted at those transitioning from homelessness. 11/30/2017 6:32 AM

31 I think this is a great way to deal with population growth in our city. 11/29/2017 10:42 PM

32 I am in favor of people being allowed to build whatever they want on their own property, and the tiny house idea would be very nice for people on a limited income, especially if they could put it on land where there is already a house. It is a great idea for affordable housing. 11/29/2017 8:47 PM

33 I am extremely concerned about how these proposals could drastically change my neighborhood. These concerns are primarily regarding current renters being

displaced, losing sun with proposed heights, historic buildings and trees being torn down and the overall feel of a neighborhood changing. It is so worrisome to think that in some point in the future my house could all of a sudden be in full shade due to a new structure being built high adjacent to my property. Keep the historic areas of Olympia historic. Respect the history of our neighborhoods. Allow some spaces to maintain, not be overwhelmed with development. Our city used to be way more beautiful and interesting. Please don't ruin what's left of that in the name of affordable housing. How about making housing affordable with all the massive development that has already occurred and has negatively effected the beauty of our city??? 11/29/2017 8:14 PM

34 Let's build up the nodes and also consider neighborhood appropriate density. Density is important, but should not be one-style fits all. 11/29/2017 7:28 PM

35 Absolutely we need to allow more housing density on existing lots. Also, lessen the requirement/expectation that everyone wants to own (and park) single occupancy vehicles. Finally, embrace the move towards smaller homes; building and municipal codes have increased the cost of housing too much for many people, who desire downsizing in response. Thank you for your work thus far. 11/29/2017 7:21 PM

36 It would be nice to see less restrictions on height where the location permits so that we can increase density. It would be nice to see more townhomes or rowhomes to create more urban like areas in our neighborhoods surrounding the downtown area. 11/29/2017 3:47 PM

37 Thank you for working on this! This city needs more housing options in neighborhoods close to services. We're growing and sprawling, so let's make some trade offs and grow but not sprawl. 11/29/2017 11:20 AM

38 The people who this plan is intended to accommodate can live in Lacey or Tumwater or unincorporated Thurston County. Why is the type of growth envisioned by this proposed plan needed or wanted? This proposal shows that the lunatics are running the asylum. 11/29/2017 10:59 AM

39 Affordable housing is a top priority for low to middle income Olympians. 11/29/2017 10:13 AM

40 I would like to keep larger apartment buildings out of neighborhoods. 11/29/2017 7:38 AM

41 I strongly object to the deadline for this survey. To accurately and honestly gauge public opinion, it should be extended beyond the dates for the public hearings and the reporting of those events. 11/29/2017 7:01 AM

42 I'm concerned that opposition to the proposed changes is motivated by NIMBY people who are afraid their neighborhoods will diversify economically, racially and religiously. 11/29/2017 5:12 AM

43 These proposals would significantly change the character of our neighborhood. The infrastructure parking, sidewalks etc. are inadequate to support this level of density. If this proposal goes through reconsideration should be given to open all outlets to major roads such as the one at Decatur. 11/28/2017 11:13 PM

44 Simply that the proposed expansion areas are very heterogeneous. Some include older, smaller homes on modest-sized lots which make for very nice, walkable neighborhoods, but those homes would probably get torn down and replaced by duplexes or quads if zoning allowed it. I'm in favor of architecturally compatible ADUs as an alternative. 11/28/2017 9:18 PM

45 Concerning the tri and fourplexes - I disagree with allowing them in the R 4-8 zoned area (as proposed) because that could change the sense of neighborhood too much. The fear is that developers would tear down the sweet houses in Olympia to build them. Keep those buildings along the busier corridors. I like the idea of the cottages because it includes green space, but only if that green space is not a stormwater pond or other unusable green space. 11/28/2017 8:59 PM

46 Requiring off-street parking is ridiculous. Some people don't want to own a car and restricting ADUs this way is onerous. 11/28/2017 8:05 PM

47 A person living in a tiny home does not need a parking space. I suggest not requiring parking spaces for them. I wish I could place two on my property! 11/28/2017 7:54 PM

48 Parking requirements are a problem for ADUs and Tiny Houses. If you eliminate the "off-street" parking requirements, more of these would qualify. In most of our neighborhoods, there are plenty of on-street or in ROW/ and "planting strip" parking options (with the possible exception of South Capitol). Additionally, residents of tiny houses and ADUs may well not even own a car. In the urban core, on bus routes, why have this requirement? It should at least be open to review when applying for a permit as an "optional" requirement depending on the local conditions. We have an "accessory structure" that could be converted to ADU if not for the parking requirement, and we're on multiple bus lines. I am strongly in favor of opening up more options for infill housing! Thank you for addressing this need, now and for the future! 11/28/2017 7:51 PM

49 These are good, bold recommendations. Good luck getting buy-in from neighborhood associations and HOAs. 11/28/2017 6:00 PM

50 My only concern is keeping additional housing affordable 11/28/2017 4:02 PM

51 These proposals are essential to providing critically needed types of housing and will determine our ability to meet sustainability goals for our city and region. Affordability for all incomes in our city depends on more housing, especially more of these missing middle types of housing units. These changes will go a long way toward achieving the long awaited housing, land use, and transportation goals and policies so clearly articulated in our comprehensive plans for over 20 years. 11/28/2017 4:01 PM

52 Almost all of the visual images shown depict older structures. I don't think this necessarily accurately depicts what is most likely to happen if the rezoning moves ahead as planned. I think the way this development happens is very important, and that as many people as possible who will be impacted by it should have a voice in what it actually will be. I don't think this current survey is sufficient. I think we can protect farmlands and woodlands outside the city and also be good stewards of our already established urban neighborhoods, as well as stewarding new development with an eye toward environmentally/economically/socially sustainable methods. There is a lot more to be taken into account here. Slow down! 11/28/2017 3:45 PM

53 Thank you for allowing me to provide my opinion. 11/28/2017 3:32 PM

54 Pl 11/28/2017 3:23 PM

55 This will add to congestion and also seems a ploy to rake in more property taxes. 11/28/2017 2:32 PM

56 If it aint broke don't fix it 11/28/2017 1:39 PM

57 We need density to save our green spaces here in the city and in the county and the larger region. 11/28/2017 1:29 PM

58 In regard to parking, having recently completed a home renovation, which required the addition of two off-street parking spaces we had not planned for in the initial design, I suggest that there be provisions for renovations, small lots, tiny houses, ADUs, etc that allow for a waiver on off-street parking if there is ample on-street neighborhood parking available that does not impact commercial business use. 11/28/2017 12:17 PM

59 These proposed changes should be focused along public transit routes in coordination with Intercity Transit. Thank you for developing these changes and allowing public input. 11/28/2017 7:51 AM

60 It would be important to have input from neighborhoods in some on-going stakeholder body in order to provide feedback in a regular continuous way and head off problems before they become significant detriments. 11/28/2017 7:41 AM

61 We actually own a perfectly good lot in a residential neighborhood of Boulevard Rd, and would love to build homes on it but, after trying to work with the city and hiring a land attorney we were told we could not build on it because of a bunch of red tape. The process has been very frustrating. A great acre lot in a nice neighbor is just going to sit empty because of old zoning rules that really don't make any sense. 11/28/2017 6:10 AM

62 Thanks for all the hard work on this very important issue. I am glad to see the City looking forward in creating denser neighborhoods in smart ways. 11/28/2017 6:03 AM

63 Provide housing for the homeless. Studies have shown that providing housing is cost effective, in regards to policing and hospital care, and demonstrates compassion and decency. 11/28/2017 3:11 AM

64 Olympia and Tumwater area contains ample space for development of the missing middle homes. My neighborhood on North Street does not have open lots for building, with the exception of one lot at North and Lorne. Please do not create the same density in this area as can be seen in Seattle and Tacoma. I have chosen Olympia-Tumwater because I prefer NOT to live in a densely populated area. If I wanted to live in a densely populated area, I would move to Seattle or Tacoma. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my point of view. 11/27/2017 11:12 PM

65 We should be encouraging people to share and conserve resources rather than make it hard or illegal 11/27/2017 9:57 PM

66 These changes are desperately needed! This area needs more affordable housing for seniors and other single adults. 11/27/2017 7:50 PM

67 Yes but I will submit them in an email. 11/27/2017 4:18 PM

68 Our community has a housing crises that we need to deal with immediately. 11/27/2017 12:04 PM

69 Please do something for us. Almost $1,000 per month for a tiny apartment is breaking People. 11/26/2017 9:50 PM

70 I think this effort is being shortsighted and go very strategic. What I am not seeing is how the infrastructure of Olympia will be upgraded to handle the increased density. How will the City make real plans for schools? How about traffic management? Schools are already very full and traffic is a bear. Should we not be looking at a more macro level in partnership with Lacey and Tumwater who have land to help meet the need of the population growth? There has got to be another way aside from the ideas proposed here, which will clog neighborhoods and infrastructure already strained under the current population. I encourage you to truly master plan. Look at

places that have done this well. One example is The Woodlands, Texas. 11/26/2017 9:23 PM

71 All the schools in SE Olympia are already overcrowded. Adding the "missing middle housing" will only make the situation worse. There needs to be more plans for schools before housing plans begin. 11/26/2017 9:01 PM

72 While I support increasing density in many instances to accommodate a growing population, it should not displace existing affordable single family home stock. Our neighborhood (Carlyon North) has many smaller, affordable single family homes in a tightly knit neighborhood. Allowing developers to bulldoze two- and three-bedroom homes to build tri- and four-plexes would truly change the character of the neighborhood and limit options for those who want to live in a predominantly single-family home with walkability. 11/26/2017 10:44 AM

73 I am not in favor of increasing density and changing the character of a solid residential neighborhood. I think these proposals, as well as all the social service providers, need to expanded throughout Olympia. The Eastside barely has sidewalk or adequate parking. spread the burden. 11/25/2017 3:35 PM

74 We should focus more on saving our Greenspace. What about local schools which are already overcrowded. There isn't room for 20000 more people, so there is no sense in trying to accomodate them. 11/25/2017 8:51 AM

75 I live on the Eastside and would be okay with duplexes, meeting height requirements, but definitely not 3-4 plexes. This is a single family residential area, and I don't want to see a lot of multi family housing developed here. 11/24/2017 2:19 PM

76 I appreciate the efforts being put into broadening housing options 11/23/2017 9:51 PM

77 As an older person in a 3 bedroom home in the Eastside neighborhood, I have often wished the codes were more flexible in terms of what is allowed so that I might more easily share housing with others. These proposed changes allow more flexibility with co housing and cottage housing, which is something that many people my age are talking about but until now, had little way of implementing. Thank you. 11/23/2017 8:23 PM

78 Include regulatory provisions that ensure that housing units are built well of good-quality materials; provide incentives for building following green practices in choosing and sourcing materials, including multiple alternative energy sources, minimizing waste during the building process, and incorporating recycled and recyclable materials whenever possible. ANY new housing structures built in Olympia must limit environmental impact, and provide healthful living

environments for occupants, at ALL levels of cost/affordability. 11/23/2017 6:01 PM

79 I have a comment on question 7 regarding ADU parking. I think on street parking for them is fine if the street is wide enough or if parking is restricted to one side. We live on an older narrow street and sometimes it is difficult to get larger vehicles through when cars are parked on both sides. So please consider adding a minimum street width requirement with regards to ADU parking. I know it will make it a little more difficult to explain and administer, but I have driven around in some of the neighborhoods in Seattle where the streets were so crowded with parked cars that I thought might be dangerous if there was a fire or other emergency. I'm sure it also makes everyday things like garbage pick up more difficult. 11/23/2017 8:19 AM

80 This MMH initiative and survey is a waste of City Planners time & $$$. Make up a new initiative to keep busy in 2018. 11/22/2017 10:53 PM

81 Why try and cram the crowds here? Is this about money? We are going to turn this wonderful city into a downtown Seattle. 11/22/2017 10:30 PM

82 This survey is irresponsible. It asks us to express opinions without knowing the full implications of the proposals. The survey results should be disregarded. 11/22/2017 8:02 PM

83 Nice work! 11/22/2017 4:01 PM

84 Higher density housing is lower quality living. We went through this higher-density drive in Seattle and it does not improve neighborhoods, but makes for shabby housing and more neighborhood problems. The notion that increasing population has to be met by making higher density neighborhoods is a mistake and not sustainable unless the concept is that ever higher densities will be required ad infinitum. 11/22/2017 9:24 AM

85 No. 11/22/2017 7:45 AM

86 With the overcrowding that we already have at Olympia High school, and Washington Middle school, why would we try to make that worse? Oh, not to mention the Elementary schools. Olympia is a great place to live and raise a family. Why turn this beautiful town into Seattle or Tacoma? Money? You guys make me sick. 11/22/2017 7:18 AM

87 Get government out of the way. 11/22/2017 7:05 AM

88 The fire department's over reaching requirement that they were able to just institute of sprinklers in ADU's & new housing is an onerous burden with limited benefit & in fact creates a greater risk of damage due to malfunction. How many

people die in house fires in Olympia that justify this costly requirement & overreaching that is not supportable in fact. 11/21/2017 10:56 PM

89 Densify neighborhoods! Please zone for integrated commercial/restaurants! 11/21/2017 9:08 PM

90 I don't know how you propose to add so many people to Olympia without addressing how this will affect our schools. Specifically the area around Olympia High School and Washington Middle School. I also think our housing in these particular areas are dense enough. There is a lot of space on the westside and that is where the majority of new building and population should take place. There is a place to implement this type of housing in Olympia, but not in the proposed areas around Olympia high school, this area does not accommodate that. Please, please consider how this is overloading our schools and unless more building of schools is done, shifting kids to other schools is not an option as they will quickly fill and will not be able to accommodate the new building in their areas. It is quite a mess. 11/21/2017 8:50 PM

91 I now live in a wonderful, quiet, large lot, 70s neighborhood. Best decision i ever made. I have no desire to go back to high density neighborhood life with all the noise, neighbor drama, and lack of privacy. High density should be concentrated towards the downtown core where it can be dense enough to support services; otherwise, I fear it will just result in blight rather than vibrancy, and reduce everyone's standard of living (with road congestion and overcrowding) 11/21/2017 7:53 PM

92 Permitting missing middle housing in already established neighborhoods and historic districts should adhere to neighborhood design standards and maintain existing community character. Converting or adding to historic properties or in historic districts should be reviewed and approved by the Heritage Commission and adhere to design guidelines. 11/21/2017 7:49 PM

93 Is the intent to encourage demolition of homes on the Eastside, and build new higher density housing, thus pricing the current dwellers on the Eastside out of their homes? You'll be pushing current lower income residents out of the City, but giving highly subsidized trash housing in the downtown apartment complexes to people who couldn't afford the same apartment at market rates. I say encourage demolition of everything east of Franklin on 4th and State streets and market to developers who could bring corporate businesses and new building projects into Olympia. That will get rid of our poopers and drug population out of downtown quickly. 11/21/2017 7:48 PM

94 Allow tiny homes on wheels to be full time residences. 11/21/2017 7:16 PM

95 I am for more housing and people coming from other counties and I am a big advocate of Olympia and believe people should live here themselves to get the Oly

experience but not at the expensive of free flowing traffic and high costs of living. I think middle housing, done with good taste and efficiency, can be beneficial to the local economy without frustrating the current Olympians. 11/21/2017 4:22 PM

96 Changes that increase the availability of denser affordable housing may help alleviate housing shortages and mitigate the environmental impacts of development. Good work! 11/21/2017 3:36 PM

97 I believe all the codes should favor nonprofit housing developers over for profit. There should be additional incentives included to ensure priority is given to nonprofits developing for people earning 50% or less of Area Median Income. 11/21/2017 3:35 PM

98 I believe all the codes should favor nonprofit housing developers over for profit. There should be additional incentives included to ensure priority is given to nonprofits developing for people earning 50% or less of Area Median Income. 11/21/2017 3:23 PM

99 I believe all the codes should favor nonprofit housing developers over for profit. There should be additional incentives included to ensure priority is given to nonprofits developing for 50% or less of Area Median Income. 11/21/2017 3:07 PM

100 I see the Eastside neighborhood is expected to accommodate a portion of the 20,000 additional population. I'd like to know what the total proposed buildout (existing and proposed) population of this and other neighborhoods is. Also many more people who do not live in Olympia will be traveling to and from jobs and shopping here. The effect will be to multiply traffic impacts. I'd like to see a discussion of the effects of cumulative increases in population and commuter traffic within the neighborhoods. 11/21/2017 1:34 PM

101 I am concerned about over-crowding quiet, established neighborhoods where cluster homes and courtyard apartments may be located. In other cities I've seen the streets become crowded with cars such that the streets were all but impassible. When this happens, the standard of living falls and crimes rise. These things, in turn, lower property values and make the neighborhoods less safe for our children. Have these issues been addressed and resolved? 11/21/2017 1:16 PM

102 It does not make me happy to see this increased density of housing on the Eastside of Olympia, specifically. However, if in fact this occurs, there should be restrictions on the amount of rent charged for these dwellings which are crowded on to small spaces at 20% more than acceptable. Do you realize neighborhoods will be stressed to the maximum and cease to exist if you continue down this multiple path as versus trying to continue single family affordable housing? This should be your focus above all else. Affordable housing. While, I realize there is only so much a city can do-it is disheartening to see the inflationary trend of real estate to the degree that only

developers will be able to make a lot of money at the expense of the individual or family. Do you understand what I am saying? And what about the elderly? Maybe you should be building some housing for the elderly who currently have options of either trying to stay in their home until the bitter end or pay 5-6 thousand dollars a month for assisted living! That eats up a life time savings quite quickly. Maybe a percentage of those designated "cottage type housing" or row houses or courtyard apts. should be designated for elderly at a reasonable cost. Is this a focus of the city or are you simply planning for the hoards that are predictablly coming to Olympia? 11/21/2017 9:24 AM

103 What about coupling with zoning changes to allow neighborhood restaurants/stores, ensuring sidewalks are complete, bike lanes in place - more density means more people needing to move around. Would be nice if they had more neighborhood stores and restaurants as options to avoid longer trips in cars and encourage walking/biking! 11/21/2017 6:37 AM

104 High density = good. But parking must be considered and provided for. 11/21/2017 6:21 AM

105 Unclear to me how R1 zoning areas will be impacted by ADU? 11/20/2017 9:54 PM

106 I would love to see these changes. It is so important that affordable housing be available to everyone in our community regardless of income level. Thank you! 11/20/2017 8:54 PM

107 Leave the coding changes in the Olympia Northeast Neighborhood alone. It is fine the way it is! 11/20/2017 7:51 PM

108 I have watched the Stone Way neighborhood in Seattle experience densification efforts by the city. Much of the conflict comes up around the parking needs of the swarms of cars belonging to patrons of businesses and apartments on the Way, that spread out across the adjacent SFH neighborhoods. There are not few vehicles used for densification there, but life becomes less enjoyable in the surrounding areas. A few years back the city approved a business parking plan at NW Perceival and Harrison that gives me little confidence about their ability to predict and manage parking in a more densely packed area. Crossing Harrison between the upper roundable and Woodard Park area is already risky between 7:30 and 9:00 am and 3:00 to 6:00 pm. If buses are to serve those in densified areas we need safe access to transit and streets wide enough to accommodate new bus routes. We have raised our kids in our neighborhood, at a time when kids could ride bikes on the street and we could invite parents to drive their kids to Boy Scout or Girl Scout meetings at our house. In the Stone Way example, this is very difficult to pull off. A last thought is that in the upcoming age of autonomous vehicles, more cars will likely be on the road, especially for seniors who cannot otherwise drive. How can densification accommodate the actual parking needs of the individuals with cars living in ADUs, Duplexs, Townhouses, Tri plexes 4 plexes etc.? 11/20/2017 6:24 PM

109 Eliminate parking requirements for tiny houses, particularly if they are located on transit lines. 11/20/2017 5:55 PM

110 I strongly disagree with any decision to turn the NE neighborhoods into essentially "build whatever you want here" areas. These neighborhoods have a character and lifestyle to maintain. 11/20/2017 3:31 PM

111 It is important to determine and be involved with style and design elements when allowing denser housing, so the character of neighborhoods is maintained. Big boxy duples, tri-plexes, four-plexes, or courtyard apts. would NOT be welcomed, but if they are designed to blend into neighborhoods, and if they are NOT bulldozing viable older homes of character just to densify a lot---then it may be supportable. I've talked with many citizens who fear this....and find this reason to fail to support this initiative. We talk here about the article "Don't Ballard-ize Bellingham"....and others which allow too aggressive an attitude towards densifying, as standards and neighborhood concerns are lost. I also strongly believe that the City should offer a number of building designs available to the public for no or low-cost, which would encourage the kinds of missing middle housing which is desirable. Garage apartments, basement apartments, tiny homes, clever above-garage transforms, clever stand-alone cottages which utilize space, sustainable elements, etc. It would be very encouraging and advantageous to provide the community with plans and ideas which make this more possible. In this way we GUIDE those who desire to densify, the right kinds of plans and ideas, and assist with some of these barriers to doing it. The Oly-POP-sponsored tour of Missing Middle type housing included many very interesting deliveries on this kind of housing....please consult them for more ideas. And sponsor more well-publicized tours like this, so citizens can be inspired and get ideas. 11/20/2017 1:40 PM

112 More Tiny homes!!!!! 11/20/2017 12:47 PM

113 This effect should be coordinated with each neighbourshiids subarea plan. 1/20/2017 12:04 PM

114 I think it's a good idea to infill our residential or mixed use areas rather than expand into currently unbuilt acres. 11/20/2017 12:01 PM

115 I would like the parking requirement for ADUs revisited. Currently this requirement restricts the ability to construct more ADUs and continues to emphasize reliance on cars rather than other forms of transportation like buses, bicycles, walking, carpooling, etc. 11/20/2017 11:49 AM

116 Strongly support all of these code changes 11/20/2017 11:05 AM

117 Concerned about increased traffic, utilities, crime, schools, and infrastructure. Have these issues been addressed? 11/20/2017 10:53 AM

118 Need to define "single family residence" to include properties where there is only one dwelling unit, and properties where there is a primary dwelling unit and an ADU. This is because covenants in many areas limit lots to "single family residences" but that term is not defined in either the covenants or current city code. Also: it is important that an ADU NOT be required to have a separate utility account for water/sewer/stormwater/solid waste. That would add $100+/month to the cost of living in an ADU. 11/20/2017 10:49 AM

119 Zero population growth would be the ideal solution, but no one in their right mind thinks that is likely to happen. 11/20/2017 10:25 AM

120 The persons currently living on the streets downtown are a real detriment to safe living downtown and the close perimeter 11/20/2017 9:58 AM

121 Be careful of code changes tied to existing bus routes, since such routes are at IT's discretion and subject to major changes based on funding. 11/20/2017 9:55 AM

122 this is a very well done and comprehensive step to add in affordable housing that serves the community. i'm very pleased to see this progressive and necessary step in planning for our future from the council's workgroup, and hope it will be approved. 11/20/2017 9:31 AM

123 I think there needs to be more allowances for tiny houses that are not on a foundation, that they are allowed to be used as ADUs. 11/20/2017 9:17 AM

124 Should require design compatibly with existing neighborhood. 11/19/2017 10:42 PM

125 I would support no additional required parking, ever. I think market forces will solve parking supply and demand issues, i.e. people will build the parking space they need. Also, it should be super inexpensive and awesome to use bike/transit and not have a car. That is way less awesome and practical if you have to pay for a parking space or two. Can I turn my unused parking into a parklet? For infill development, reducing the setbacks for ADU's and tiny homes, especially in target infill areas, would be another good idea to consider. 11/19/2017 10:15 PM

126 Raise the height requirement for adu 16 feet is ridiculous. 11/19/2017 10:12 PM

127 it is my understanding that new construction - which includes remodels and add-ons - requires fire suppression system. That is cost prohibitive for creating additional housing that is for lower income because the rent would have to be higher than if this system was not required. I would like to see this regulation changed. 11/19/2017 9:45 PM

128 I still think the city should consider some work-arounds to allow tiny houses on wheels (yes, which are technically RVs) to be a legal dwelling for Olympians. Consider making allowances for RV's that "fit the character of the neighborhood", which would exclude dumpy RVs and encourage tiny houses that fit with the neighborhood. Simple guidelines on how to deal with wastewater are needed, as people are already living in tiny houses all over the city. They don't want to break the rules, so simple guidelines instead of miles or red tape are needed to encourage this low-cost, mobile living situation. Look at what Portland has done recently, as they're the leader in supporting the "missing middle" and being inclusive of tiny houses on wheels. Thanks for reading! 11/19/2017 8:04 PM

129 I am very pleased with these collective proposals that will spur more creative and affordable housing options for our City 11/19/2017 6:52 PM

130 So much depends on how well the increased housing is designed and sited. Existing neighborhood character needs to be honored and neighborhood shopping and services need to be present so that our neighborhoods are more walking/biking incentivized--so that people have real options for living with way less driving, like European towns and neighborhoods. 11/19/2017 5:58 PM

131 Keep the residential feel of the neighborhood! 11/19/2017 5:21 PM

132 You pictures all show quaint versions of these housing types but rarely do they end up like that. They are older homes turned into rentals that are not well kept up nor have desirable tenant. 11/19/2017 11:30 AM

133 Please do not change the code for the Governor Stevens neighborhood. It may be close to the bus line, but many lots back up to wetlands. Increasing the density of housing near these wetlands will increase run off and impact the wetlands even more. Many of the lots back up to wetlands and the drive ways are very shallow. Many streets are very narrow and already have too many cars parking on them. At times emergency response vehicles cannot drive down Maringo Rd because it is too narrow with cars parked on both sides. Adding more cars put residents life at rick if they call 911. Already multiple house do not have parking associated with them and park three cars on the street on Maringo Rd. Adding higher density housing will also increase traffic into the Governor Stevens neighborhood. People already speed through the neighborhood and the corner of Maringo and Eskridge is very dangerous. 11/19/2017 10:50 AM

134 If you want more housing units in the city, make it easier to build. currently. the first word out of a planners mouth is NO. I might remind you, without building,you don't have a job! 11/19/2017 8:53 AM

135 Don't bring the Seattle ghettos down here. Sounds like you guys just want a bunch of government house. As someone who commutes many hours to Seattle and knows

people who own housing in Seattle mass housing is not the solution. Why not do some research on it. 11/19/2017 6:34 AM

136 Having not yet thoroughly read through all the documents surrounding this initiative, I found it difficult to answer these questions with any certainty. Mostly I wanted to say, "It depends" or "Maybe, as long as x, y, and z were to happen". I'm very curious to see if the plans include alternative processes such as permeable surfaces or composting toilets. I think it's incredibly important that the city slow this process down so that the community can more fully participate, and take in the diversity of ideas and opinions that will ensure that the MM initiative gets rolled out with the most integrity and least damage possible. 11/18/2017 9:35 PM

137 Urge State Building Code Council to adopt Appendix V of new 2018 IBC for application to tiny houses and include Tiny Homes on wheels. 11/18/2017 8:22 PM

138 Tiny homes should have off street parking even if it is an accessory dwelling unit. Single room occupancies should not be allowed in residential areas. 11/18/2017 8:05 PM

139 Exploring incentives for current homeowners to create ADU's or Tiny Home sites on their existing property is important. This could help make these housing access issues more relevant to homeowners who might otherwise not believe that housing access issues pertain to them. Understanding that they could benefit from rental $ or a tax break would likely engage more property owners positively. Otherwise I fear a "Not in my neighborhood" attitude will prevail amongst middle and upper middle class communities. 11/18/2017 7:51 PM

140 Tiny house ADU needs one on street parking space. 11/18/2017 4:35 PM

141 It would be helpful to know how many additional people each neighborhood or region of the City is expected to absorb - it's hard to answer these questions without some sense of what full buildout would look like in a given neighborhood. 11/18/2017 2:28 PM

142 Access to and requirements for hook up to sewers (LOTT) should be mandatory. Additional septic systems or septic hooks should not be allowed within the Growth area. 11/18/2017 11:16 AM

143 The permitting process is ridiculously expensive. Consider doing something like Portland where a commitment to renting to low-income for 5 years gets the process paid by the city. Also get rid of the sprinkler requirement it's prohibitively expensive. Educate the community about nimby-ism and help them understand that everyone deserves housing they can afford. 11/18/2017 8:44 AM

144 My only concern is that they don't end up looking run down and unkept. When people in neighborhoods want the owner to live in the main house or not to build

duplexes etc it is primarily the concern that renters are not going to take care of the house and property. You see it already without the code changes. 11/18/2017 8:34 AM

145 This feels like a backhanded way to upzone residential areas and as an Olympia resident in an R 4-8 zone I strongly disagree with these efforts and will vigorously oppse efforts to change the character and density of my neighborhood. Thank you. 11/18/2017 7:48 AM

146 I understand the need for different housing types but pretty pictures of pristine cottages do not accurately portrait the reality of transit residents, renters that do not maintain or have pride of ownership from destroying single family residences. 11/18/2017 5:45 AM

147 Residential is a net negative tax burden. Grow business land uses and let lacey and Tumwater suffer the high housing density and subsequent burdens. Then attract those people to Olympia for retail shopping and restaurants etc. Learn how to make Olympia wealthy. Cities can decline OFM/GMA growth and you know lacey and tumwater will take it. Take Olympia upscale while lacey turns into Renton. PS. Keep those roundabouts coming! 11/17/2017 9:56 PM

148 Please only allow these changes in new neighborhoods. Please don't ruin the Govenor Stevens neighborhood.we have historic homes, narrow streets & lots that back up to wetlands. Please focus on new construction & not slowly eroding the character of our neighborhood. Having a quality of life is what makes Olympia great. Don't turn it into Ballard that lost all its character to fourplexes. Focus on the Mc-neighborhoods having these type of construction. 11/17/2017 9:03 PM

149 Development regulations, fees and property taxes need to be restructured to incentivize property owners to develop missing middle housing on their property. Developing missing middle housing must be an investment opportunity that provides property owners long-term financial benefit and increase in property value. 11/17/2017 7:38 PM

150 1. In our neighborhood, a large percent of landlords are absentee. We've had a number of housing code and drug violations in rentals where the absentee owners did not keep the property up to minimum standard and did not act against tenants where drug trafficking was known. Off site owners or property managers is not a good thing. 2. We have rental houses occupied by up to six renters, each with a car. Our narrow streets are already crowded with those cars. 3. I see nothing in the plan about what the city will provide to manage higher density housing - police, code enforcement, sidewalks, safe walking & biking. More people means more impact. Olympia services have not kept up with the current needs. For example, Bigelow Ave is one a bus line (desirable per your proposed plan). It is already a busy, over-parked, dangerous thoroughfare that even the buses struggle to navigate. If you are going to propose changes, add a COMMITMENT to provide the infrastructure. 4. My

presumption is that you expect "market forces" to make this work. It would be a financial boon to developers but the rest of us have to live with the good and the bad consequences. 11/17/2017 7:05 PM

151 I do. Property owners, such as the one who owns the 1234th, should not be allowed to use their empty units as AirBnBs, avoiding hotel/motel taxes and inspections that are required for hotels/motels. 11/17/2017 6:23 PM

152 We need to reduce the development fees and charges for infill. Each utility considers their cost and they are all then compounded to create a huge sum. It seems that the overall impact/development fee needs to be considered and decreased Also fire sprinklers in all new residential is over the top. I think it is sold as minimal cost to install and great savings in insurance rates. We need to check the reality of that. I think the cost benefit was over sold and it is making it more expensive to develop in the city all based upon the safety trump card 11/17/2017 6:19 PM

153 I have a problem with large fees being charged to build. Is their going to be a scaled down version since utilities are already in place. 11/17/2017 6:01 PM

154 The biggest problem for Olympia is not even the zoning restrictions but the cost to build. The city fees and the process for approval is absurd and turns away many qualified builders. If the city would make it more affordable to create more affordable housing new units would be added immediately. As a developer I speak with many other developers...nobody wants to do business with City of Olympia if they have the choice. Lewis county is more appealing by a long shot 11/17/2017 5:48 PM

155 We just built an ADU. The biggest unnecessary expense in our opinion was a sprinkler system. A 400 Sq. Ft. unit in which no one is ever more than 10' from an exit does not need a sprinkler system costing thousands of dollars. We also would like to see the other options that require a minimum distance to public transit be changed from 600 ft. to 1000-1200 ft. That increases the options that are still well within easy walking distance. 11/17/2017 5:12 PM

156 ADU should have a height of up to 35 feet, No additional parking requirements for tiny houses. Lot coverage should be increased to 60% (with driveways and garages NOT included) Currently 7200 Sq ft of land is required for a duplex, this must be changed to 5000 sq ft for up to 4 units. Impact fee for ADU's must be waived. Impact fees for new construction by senior and disabled people must be waved. 11/17/2017 4:55 PM

157 Our roads can barely handle the traffic we have. Bethel Street is a mess when it rains. No drainage and water spills into driveways. More traffic will make things so much worse than they already are. I think having an owner occupied residence with a tiny home or ADU should be made easier. Keeping the owner on the property

helps ensure more accountability for the increased numbers in the neighborhood. 11/17/2017 4:49 PM

158 excellent work by our city government, great ideas, thank you 11/17/2017 4:39 PM

159 Must have at least one designated parking place 11/17/2017 4:02 PM

160 we have to many multi-unit homes and this would make it worst. 11/17/2017 2:43 PM

161 While I agree with allowing more housing options in our urban areas, it is PARAMOUNT the county FIRST get real about our drinking water supplies (that is, how many users can safely draw from our aquifers- now AND in the future), and the county also needs to act NOW to completely treat and control our sewage and effluent (we're not doing that now). We need to clean up FIRST, before our population rises any more. 11/17/2017 2:08 PM

162 Don't build a bunch of ugly new housing developments in Olympia. They lack character. Keep it classy. 11/17/2017 2:05 PM

163 Increasing the density of housing in our neighborhoods would cause an increase in traffic and decrease available street parking. It would cause overcrowding in the city. We opted to move to Olympia in 1996 because it was not an overcrowded city. More people also means more service needs, which in turn will in turn cause the City Council to keep raising our property taxes through levies, etc. Don't turn Olympia into the next Seattle!!!! 11/17/2017 1:27 PM

164 Please ensure that new structures meet design standards that make them blend with the existing neighborhood, maintain adequate side yard setbacks (5' minimum), and ensure off street parking is required for close-knit neighborhoods. Please consider adding a code requirement for garbage and recycling cans to be stored off the street...leaving cans on street is becoming a problem especially for multi-unit structures. 11/17/2017 12:38 PM

165 Make construction less onerous, especially for owner occupied. The permitting process has totally gotten out of control, requiring crazy levels of detail 11/17/2017 12:32 PM

166 Do not repeat the mistakes Seattle has made - more housing yes, overly dense housing no. 11/17/2017 12:00 PM

167 Get rid of the requirements for ADUs to have sprinklers. It's absurd that they have a higher standard in that regard than a regular home. 11/17/2017 11:27 AM

168 What so the single family neighborhoods think of these proposals by builders that have influence over city staff?? By putting these kinds of dwelling in existing single

family neighborhoods, you will change the character of the neighborhood and drive the families out. 11/17/2017 10:56 AM

169 I indicated disagreement with the courtyard apartments re-zone proposal. I think the changes are too strict. The buildings should not be limited to 1-storey. At a minimum 2-storey buildings should be allowed - maybe more. Also, the survey didn't ask about manufactured homes although I know that was a focus of the work group. Manufactured homes should not be allowed as ADUs. Zoning should be strictly limited to current home parks and should not be allowed as in-fill. Finally, I think, in addition to the Harrison high-density corridor and downtown, we need to encourage taller construction limits even in many existing single family neighborhoods like on the westside near Garfield and Hospital Hill. New construction should be permitted up to 40-50' with some neighborhood-scaled condos/apts. in addition to tri- and four-plex styled units to increase density and the urban character. 11/17/2017 9:51 AM

170 We should also be thinking about expanding small-scale commercial infill in areas were residential zoning makes up most of the lots, to encourage walkable neighborhoods. 11/17/2017 9:42 AM

171 We support the idea of higher-density housing, but only if the city proactively enforces our municipal codes so we don't end up with more unregulated rentals like Dr. Duane Moore's legion of slum rentals. The purple bus parked at one of those houses on the 1200 block of Marion St. NE is used as an ADU; do we really want more of those throughout the city? 11/17/2017 9:40 AM

172 I think the best use of tiny homes is to push them directly next to each other, like, 10 in a row. Have 2 rows facing each other about 10' apart. Maybe put a roof over the walkway between the rows of houses. And, consider stacking layers of these paired rows, maybe 12 stacks high. Use an elevator and a fire escape stairway to allow moving between the stacks. 11/17/2017 9:32 AM

173 I do think parking issues will continue to need further thought and discussion. 11/17/2017 9:26 AM

174 we need to keep parking spaces for new residents. people still need their cars! 11/17/2017 8:52 AM

175 Olympia needs affordable housing for individuals who do not qualify for low income housing. It is especially critical for retirees who are being displaced when they retire and have to move to find less expensive housing. 11/17/2017 8:34 AM

176 Incentives to build rental tiny homes? 11/17/2017 8:30 AM

177 I'm concerned that all the proposed map changes seem to hit the same areas. I realize this is due to transportation routes, but it impacts certain areas disproportionately. 11/17/2017 8:04 AM

178 The Governor Stevens neighborhood has major parking issues. Due to my neighbors having apartments & tiny homes I have 2 to 3 cars daily parking in front of my house. I sometimes have to park down the street from my home. The neighbors do not provide parking at their properties. It makes it hard to get groceries to my home. Many properties in my neighborhood have no driveways or very short driveways that do not accommodate multiple cars. Also roads are very narrow preventing cars from being able to park on both sides of the road. At times it is difficult for emergency response vehicles to get down Maringo Rd. Corner of Maringo & Eskridge is very dangerous & how many people enter Governor Stevens neighborhood. People almost get hit daily & many close calls for drivers. The neighborhood needs less traffic not more. It is also one of the few historic neighborhoods in Olympia. Lots of history & older homes. Please encourage keeping the historical value of the neighborhood & build those high density homes in newly constructed neighborhoods. Don't ruin one of the nicest neighborhoods. Putting higher density in Governor Stevens neighborhood is a really horrible & short sighted idea. 11/17/2017 7:59 AM

179 Those empty buildings downtown could be converted into apartments with green areas surrounding them for families. People no longer want to live in suburbia. they want to live in the cities! 11/17/2017 7:34 AM

180 thank you for working to improve housing density/ 11/17/2017 7:14 AM

181 Thank you for considering these changes. I think additional types of housing such as those mentioned will become even more important as demographics bring LOTS more aging boomers who would love options giving independence, yet closeness to family members or other retirees. Please approve! 11/17/2017 7:13 AM

182 I feel that ADUs are in incredibly inefficient dwelling space. We need more large apartment buildings. We should have replaced legion park woods with apartment buildings. We should fill the isthmus in front of capital lake with more apartment towers, not just the one that is there with little knuckle buildings around it. The fixation with green space (which is generally immediately occupied by homeless camps) and offstreet parking is not productive. 11/17/2017 5:49 AM

183 Keep South Capitol the same. We are already ontop of one another and thete isnt much room to expand. We buy into this neighborhood for its quiet appeal but if you put too many people here, it will become loud and annoying. 11/17/2017 5:35 AM

184 I can see something happening that might not be as attractive as the photos. More information is needed. 11/16/2017 11:23 PM

185 Yes, your proposed code changes encompass too many lots, too many blocks are involved – it needs to be trimmed back some! We live about a 20 min walk from town in a mixed neighborhood and we like the combination of old and new homes - on a street where there already are rentals and duplexes. Change is inevitable, but the history of this workingman's hill is also valuable to retain. 11/16/2017 11:02 PM

186 Allow tiny homes and more people who are not rich to live! 11/16/2017 10:01 PM

187 Don't build it and they won't come? 11/16/2017 9:11 PM

188 Olympia lacks ample supply of single-family homes that are large enough to accommodate families of four or larger. Looking at our neighborhoods, one sees a plethora of small homes that families are squeezing into. The problem will not be solved by building even more cramped dwellings in our city. If the problem we're addressing is affordability, it is doubtful that tiny cottage "homes" will truly address the issue. The cost of renting a 2-bedroom apartment is currently equal in cost or more expensive than the monthly mortgage payment of a small Olympia home such as ours. Where is this "gap in middle housing" you're referring to? I don't see it and fear that this is just another way for a few privileged individuals to own more of our city's homes and rental properties, while driving out families wishing to purchase homes in which they'll raise families. 11/16/2017 9:05 PM

189 I strongly support increasing density in Olympia. As a homeowner with an ADU, I would like the option of renting out both my home and the ADU so that I can leave the area temporarily, such as to serve in the Peace Corps. 11/16/2017 9:02 PM

190 City trying to destroy existing property owners values like Seattle. Wish I could afford to move out of this area. 11/16/2017 8:53 PM

191 As a homeowner in the Rogers / Bowman area, I am open to most of these ideas. The one request I would have is that any new addition fit into the current style, aesthetics & design of the neighborhood as it stands. 11/16/2017 8:40 PM

192 I think before hire structures or duplexes are built in any area the neighbors need to agree. we bought our homes with single family. it would ruin where we live if it changes w/o our permission. I understand growth but I have put in over 100K into my home with improvements and upgrades and it is a small home. I did that planning on dying here. If someoine builds a high home /duplex next to me that ruins it for me. had i not put in all that $ i would just move but I put that much in, seriously. so it wouldn't be right to do that w/o making sure the neighbors agree 11/16/2017 8:37 PM

193 Wondering why Triplexes, etc are only being allowed within what looks like 500ft of a bus stop. Is it assumed that people living in them are less likely to have access to a car? Thanks. 11/16/2017 7:06 PM

194 How about telling the county to chill with the gophers. It's pretty much impossible to build anything 11/16/2017 6:14 PM

195 I think in many neighborhoods you can/should remove parking requirements altogether. I know a lot of people who are living without cars in Seattle and I think that trend will only increase here, might as well get ahead of it. I am super lucky to be living in an ADU (430 sq ft) in Olympia and I love it. I would be house-poor without it. I think there needs to be more allowance of tiny houses but I understand that you're limited by state law. I think the 48 hour rule for staying in RVs/travel trailers being parked in the city is too short - they are great ideas for short-term rentals and homeless. Some of the older ones even are all fixed up, adorable, I mean people rent them on AirBnB - why not use it for housing? How is that worse than having someone sleeping on the sidewalk? I don't think it is, as long as utilities are an option. A safe zone with dump site would be grand, particularly because so many RV parks do not allow (affordable) older vehicles. All that said, I appreciate the steps that you are taking with these proposed ordinances, and I think it can't happen soon enough, or in enough places in the city. Thanks for doing what you are able to do. 11/16/2017 5:56 PM

196 Tiny homes offer an option for affordable housing. Tiny houses can be in the yard of a friend or relative, in the neighborhood of choice, in a tiny home community, in a co-housing development, or in a tiny home village with others. $300 or $400 a month can be paid to live in the yard of a homeowner – they can use that to help pay their mortgage – both will benefit. Tiny homes are inexpensive and require little maintenance. Utility bills are small. Olympia's Comprehensive Plan has a goal to make affordable housing available for all income levels throughout the community. Further, Growth Management encourages infill in neighborhoods to accommodate new growth. I support the Missing Middle proposed changes that permit tiny houses. 11/16/2017 5:28 PM

197 I am concerned about diminishing on street parking space. This must be addressed. Sanitation workers already have difficulty backing down our street because of parking congestion. 11/16/2017 5:23 PM

198 Providing for density is a start, but quality of design and sustainability must also be a main consideration. 11/16/2017 5:00 PM

199 Parking, schools and emergency services need to be addressed in these proposals. It appears that on the maps Olympia will become quite dense if build out occurs as projected. We do not have schools, hospitals, transportation etc to support this. Roads would need to be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic. Stores would need to become more accessible for all outlying properties. These proposals are not addressing the downsides to putting in a density such as this. Another concern I have is the allowing of higher homes in older neighborhoods that have

existing view corridors. This would need to be addressed before I could agree with building up. 11/16/2017 4:59 PM

200 The denser we can make our neighborhoods while retaining our public green spaces, the better. I am not in favor of any parking requirements. 11/16/2017 4:11 PM

201 My problem is that owners in most neighborhoods do not maintain their homes in a responsible manner as it is. These changes will only increase the already existing problem. And current codes are not enforced (no accountability) so this will only make it worse. Then with traffic problems already existing and now this adds more occupants in neighborhoods, more cars and more traffic. Is there funding to deal with the increased traffic from these proposals? I doubt it. There are times it is difficult to get out of my neighborhood as it is. More development but NO traffic solutions. I live in Olympia but closest Intercity Transit stop is 1/2 mile away. MAKES NO SENSE!! 11/16/2017 3:59 PM

202 I hope that there is discussion around the use of housing units for airbnb purposes. If the intent is to create more affordable housing, it seems important to address this issue, which has had a huge impact on cities like San Francisco and Seattle, where more and more residents are being pushed out due to units being used more profitably for airbnb than tenants. It seems that sometimes when people rent out a small unit on their own property, they are less aware of regulations, such as landlord-tenant statutes and fair housing laws. I think it's awesome that more affordable options could be created and it would be great if the City was proactive about the accompanying issues that might arise. 11/16/2017 3:44 PM

203 The city should revise building codes and impact fees to make it more affordable to build in city limits. Some of the building codes--installation of fire sprinklers in single family homes for example--are excessive and cost prohibitive. Tiny homes should be exempt from other building codes as well. We should improve density by building up--not just out--and height restrictions should be increased more. 11/16/2017 3:28 PM

204 With the exception of the "Tiny Home" proposal, all other proposals are silent on the issue of parking. Parking is already a problem and public transportation is not adequate to support the type of growth that is envisioned by these proposals. Also we have seen in this county during the last 15 years multiple cuts to public transit during economic downturns. If housing density is to be increased, it is unrealistic to ignore or discount the need for additional parking. 11/16/2017 1:24 PM

205 In order for this survey to be valid, it has to be a random sample of the population of Olympia. All neighborhoods, income levels, age groups, and economic levels should be represented according to the underlying population estimates for Olympia. Confidence levels, or p-values should be presented. If random sample of Olympia cannot be obtained than results should not be presented as valid. This is a major

rezone of about 20-25% of the City. Most people in Olympia have no idea about the Missing Middle project. A greater effort should be made to reach out to all neighborhoods and income levels. 11/16/2017 11:39 AM

206 Don't make any zoning changes without more time for discussion. We had presentations at a recent neighborhood meeting. Those in attendance found the pros and cons for the changes of great interest and it seemed most people wanted to think about the implications more before deciding how they felt the city should move forward. 11/16/2017 11:07 AM

207 If they adopted the requirement that single family housing needs sprinkler systems, that should be removed. That contributes significantly to the cost of new housing. 11/16/2017 10:47 AM

208 If we increase housing density (a good thing, I think) we also need improved infrastructure such as sidewalks and lighting. As a longtime Eastside neighborhood resident, I am frustrated with the lack of sidewalks on many of our main streets, especially when it is dark. More and more traffic in the hood makes pedestrianship more and more precarious. 11/16/2017 10:26 AM

209 I've wanted to build an ADU above a garage for years - please change the height restrictions soon. Olympia needs more thoughtful density and less unattractive sprawl. 11/16/2017 8:43 AM

210 I believe that the tiny house movement in particular is an essential part of growing our community and making it more accessible to lower income residents. I personally am a student who wants to own a mortgage free home, and want to abide by the county's laws, only to find that tiny houses are hardly even mentioned. Openly allowing mobile tiny houses would greatly increase access to the town center number of people which thus increases dollars funneling into the community, rather than home and commuting costs. Providing a standard would ensure that tiny houses are both safe and visually appealing as well. I believe this movement is a very important topic that needs to be dissussed. 11/16/2017 8:35 AM

211 I just wanted to say thank you for exploring these options and trying to effect change. It looks like a great way to provide affordable options, diversify our neighborhoods, and cut down on sprawl. I also like that it would increase walkability, bicycle options, and access to transit. Keep up the great work! 11/16/2017 7:55 AM

212 Parking requirments, sidewalk construction requirements, and drainage/runoff codes are currently serious limitations for older neighborhoods with limited spaces. City needs to loosen restrictions to allow for more ADUs to be built. 11/16/2017 7:42 AM

213 These changes are an excellent beginning to improve our housing issues! 11/16/2017 6:05 AM

214 Additional housing units intended for low or middle income people need to be located within reasonable walking distance from grocery shopping, public transit options, parks, and on STREETS WITH SIDEWALKS. They must not be allowed to be thrown up in food deserts or on unwalkable streets. 11/16/2017 5:40 AM

215 Tiny homes on wheels should be permitted as single-family houses when on a foundation and meeting building codes. 11/16/2017 4:29 AM

216 The neighborhood in which I live at 1218 Marion NE is already cramped with poor access to inner neighborhood via narrow and few access streets. In front of my house, with 3 black houses across the street, there is no way fire trucks could pass. Garbage collectors go around. Would be unsafe. No. 11/16/2017 1:32 AM

217 I fully support allowing 800 square feet or less and single wide manufactured homes as ADU's. This would mAke it more affordable to add an ADU to a residential lot. 11/15/2017 10:02 PM

218 This is a very important issue and I am glad it is being considered! I think it is vitally important that we increase the provisions for ADU's in order to both accommodate the growing population of Olympia and the surrounding area, and also to accommodate the people who are already here and in dire need of housing options beyond cohousing that are both affordable and available. 11/15/2017 9:55 PM

219 I don't mind more duplexes and multiplexes as long as they're not really ugly and as long as they don't have the prominent garage sticking out as the main feature you see before the front door type of design. 11/15/2017 9:50 PM

220 I really appreciate this work. Thank you! 11/15/2017 9:22 PM

221 You've shown beautifully designed versions of the housing options you propose. THOSE are what we had better see built if these changes are approved. New buildings had better enhance the fabric of the existing neighborhoods, not replace it, and be genuinely affordably priced. Most duplexes, triplexes, and other smaller number dwelling units currently on the ground in Olympia are awful designs, including the one where I live. Design standards had better make these new additions to existing neighborhoods look gorgeous and not the cheap, ugly junk that all looks the same - the stuff that builders constantly try to get away with most developments in Olympia. Also, steps need to be taken to preserve existing, good-condition older housing stock - not pulling down neighborhoods of nice (well maintained) but older housing in order to pave over the existing neighborhoods with ugly boxes covered with T1-11 siding and no design ingenuity. The northeast NEIGHBORHOODS (which are communities of people) should NOT become areas of even worse speculation which drive existing residents AND RENTERS away by even

more investment companies looking for a quick buck leaving renters with nowhere affordable to go. Because the new buildings will most definitely cost more to live in than the stock that is available now. And the more speculation that, effectively, is promoted, the higher the rents are for the barely affordable duplexes now because each new owner immediately raises the rent to harder to afford levels. This has recently happened to me. My duplex was once affordable but now costs well over 50% of my limited, fixed retiree income. And that is before utilities. Something needs to be done to contain rents for existing citizens and retirees, not just build for future residents who will likely be more affluent and can afford more expensive new units that will NOT be comparable in price to what is available now. DO NOT just open up our existing neighborhoods to speculators to buy up nice homes and raze them. It is my personal experience in Olympia and elsewhere that most renters do not integrate themselves into neighborhoods and become part of the community, part of the neighborhood association, or even friends with their immediate neighbors. The bigger the individual development of duplexes, triplexes, etc., the less integrated the renters are into the neighborhood around them. The northeast neighborhood associations have developed quite a sense of community with active participation in events with their residents. Don't destroy that by dramatically changing the fabric of the neighborhood by destroying existing housing stock. Allow these new densities as infill and development on as yet undeveloped lands only in our existing neighborhoods. Only replace that which is truly derelict and falling down - not something just because it is older. NOT an excuse for investors to REPLACE already diverse neighborhoods. Keep the higher new densities immediately adjacent to major arterial streets rather than creeping further and further into established neighborhoods and then turning local access streets into new arterials. 11/15/2017 9:15 PM

222 In some cases, I do not think the recommendations go far enough. I would also encourage the city to look at impact fee structures of higher density and infill projects. Cost associated with impact fees also plays a crictical role, along with zoning, in realizing these goals. 11/15/2017 9:14 PM

223 Make permitting process for missing middle housing more streamlined and LESS EXPENSIVE. 11/15/2017 9:07 PM

224 Thank you for doing this work! We need more housing options in Olympia and missing middle efforts are fundamental to getting this done. 11/15/2017 8:59 PM

225 I am all for additional housing if done with regulations that keep owners and renters responsible for maintenance and upkeep. I also would like to see some of the open space in our old neighborhoods preserved by limiting the density of multiunit housing structures. Certain neighborhoods are better suited to tiny houses or cottages to help keep some green spaces. 11/15/2017 8:51 PM

226 I think it's teally important to neighborhood character and neighborhood quality of life to maintain an owner on site when allowing ADU. Our neighborhoods are

charming working neighborhoods and we don't want to loose that quality. Owners on site help to maintain that quality. We don't need a bunch of outside innvestora and landlords with no connection to the local properties 11/15/2017 8:29 PM

227 I agree with increasing density but you haven't addressed critical related issues: parking is inadequate in many older residential areas, streets are already narrow and this will make it worse. Continuous sidewalks and bike lanes are missing to support increased traffic and keep those of us that walk and ride bikes safe. Absentee landlords are already a scourge upon the city and there is virtually no monitoring or management of poor compliance with property care. The new rules expand the likelihood of absentee landlords. There's no mention of environmental impacts and mitigation. How does this align with other community development needs (transit, schools...). A good conversation to start but not enough context provided. Needs more outreach and work. 11/15/2017 8:11 PM

228 Re-think parking requirements to require less parking. 11/15/2017 8:10 PM

229 before undertaking any changes I would want to make sure that increased traffic volumes are investigated so the parking does not impair emergency vehicle access. 11/15/2017 8:10 PM

230 Design review will need to be strengthened to insure that Olympia is a lovely town, that neighborhoods are liveable, walkable, and that property values are not adversely impacted. The committee has done a great job with considering many factors. One issue that hasn't arisen in any conversations that I am aware of....and I don't know how many property owners are impacted....so I own about an acre here in the city -- multiple lots "divided" by a not ever developed alley way ---at some point the city should "vacate" the alley at no cost to the property owner if the city have never developed it..... 11/15/2017 8:00 PM

231 All of these changes are exactly what Olympia needs to continue to provide affordable housing for our growing population. We'll always have students and elders that need more creative housing options. These are great, creative solutions to the housing demand. Great job! 11/15/2017 1:14 PM

Joyce Phillips

From: Joyce Phillips
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 2:04 PM
To: 'ryan@olympiaconsulting.net'; missingmiddle
Subject: FW: Missing Middle Question

Hello, Mr. Hall.
All of the properties you asked about, with the exception of the last one on State Avenue, are located in either the Residential 4-8 (R 4-8) or Residential 6-12 (R 6-12) zoning districts. The other property is located in the Downtown Business (DB) zoning district. The zoning for each is listed below.
Thank you for your question.
Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

From: Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:13 PM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Missing Middle Question

Hello,
Are any of these addresses below in the proposed Missing Middle re-zoning areas?

1923 Water Street SW, Olympia R 6-12
1521 5th Avenue SE, Olympia R 4-8
3530 Morse Merryman Rd SE, Olympia R 4-8
2614 Bush Ave. NW, Olympia R 6-12
719 Carlyon Ave Se, Olympia R 4-8
120 State Avenue NE, #1432, Olympia DB

Thank you,
Ryan

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell

Joyce Phillips

From: Joyce Phillips
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 2:05 PM
To: 'Ryan Hall'; missingmiddle
Subject: RE: When will my email be responded to?

Hi, Mr. Hall.
Here is the link to the City's webpage for the Planning Commission, which includes the names of its members: http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/advisory-committees/planning-commission.aspx
Thank you.
Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

From: Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 11:41 AM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Re: When will my email be responded to?

Please send me info on where I can find the names of who sits on planning commission. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 7, 2018, at 10:45 AM, missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Mr. Hall,
> The members of the Olympia City Council will vote on final adoption of any changes to city code regarding the Missing Middle recommendations.
> The members of the Olympia Planning Commission vote on a recommendation to the City Council prior to the City Council's vote on whether to adopt.
>
> **From:** Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
> **Sent:** Monday, March 5, 2018 2:36 PM
> **To:** missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Subject:** Re: When will my email be responded to?
>
> Thank you for finally responding to my emails.
> Are you unwilling to tell me if any of the members voting on this proposal live within the rezoning areas?

If not, I can make a public records request for this information. Is that a better pathway?
I am not asking for addresses of people - but this is fair information to ask in this situation.

On Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 2:32 PM, missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Mr. Hall,

We appreciate your comments. City staff check this e-mail address weekly and respond to substantive questions. I've tried to address the questions in both your e-mails below.

This e-mail address has been available for over a year now for anyone to comment or ask questions about the Missing Middle process. I've attached a brief summary of the highlights of the public process that has been underway since January 2017. There has been additional coverage in The Olympian newspaper multiple times, local radio and TCTV, and other notices as well.

Parking is currently required to be provided by all new residential uses on their property (ie., off-street). These regulations would continue under the Missing Middle recommendations, with one exception: accessory dwelling units would not be required to provide an additional off-street parking space under the draft recommendations.

Stormwater is required to be handled by infiltrating on-site by all new development in accordance with City regulations. There are maximum portions of a property that are permitted to be covered by impervious surfaces, as well. These regulations are not proposed to be changed.

The Olympia School District has been consulted throughout the process, and a study by Thurston Regional Planning Council is available on the Missing Middle web page that includes analysis of potential impacts on schools.

Thanks to Olympia voters who passed a public safety levy in November, police staffing is being increased. Evidence is lacking to indicate that there would be an increase in crime due to missing middle housing types, however.

From: Ryan Hall [mailto:ryan@olympiaconsulting.net]
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2018 10:09 AM
To: missingmiddle <missingmiddle@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: When will my email be responded to?

Hello,

I sent an email asking questions about the Mission Middle project a week ago and have not heard back. Can you please confirm you received it? It is very hard for all of us to fight this issue, when you do not respond to our questions about it. Shows a lack of outreach. Which is a huge problem with this process from day one.

Also, the reason the email just arrived to you is because the public outreach process was very insufficient and I had no idea about it. In fact, I talked to a Tumwater police officer today who works the Middle Street area and that officer had no idea about this project.

Did you know our Tumwater PD is down seven positions? I am reaching out to Olympia PD to find out how many positions they are down. More people means more need for police. We have police shortage. This needs to be resolved before the housing goes in.

Also, I would like information on if any of the people voting on Missing Middle live in the zones being proposed for this project. I am not asking for addresses. Just if any of them live in the proposed zones.

I'd like request you do a new survey about the Missing Middle, once you properly do outreach about this proposal. It would most likely be very revealing.

Thank you,

Ryan

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell

--

Ryan Hall
ryan@olympiaconsulting.net
(360) 878-1670 cell
<image002.jpg>