

Joyce Phillips

From: Derek Pohle <ddpohle@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 10:47 AM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: Party of record request

We just started construction on a part remodel part addition to our house for the purpose of multi-generational living. My mother will be moving in with us and this project will provide her an attached apartment for semi independent living with out having to go into elder care in a facility that would drain her resources in less than a year and leave her living on Medicaid only. We unfortunately had to pay almost \$4000 in mitigation as the city determined the project was an ADU. This is an expansion of our home and is accessible and connected internally.

Derek Pohle & Melissa McFadden
2016 14th Ave SW
Olympia, WA

Joyce Phillips

From: Sandy Novack <snepointe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 6:29 PM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: Proposal for more housing

No, no, no

I am all for middle housing but this is a seriously bad idea. Are you trying to pack us in like worms. And, whatever happened to worrying about permeable land? When our house flood because there is no where for the water to go it is the city that will be sued. And it will happen with climate change and this wet state.

Please, no. Find a better way

Sent from my iPad

Joyce Phillips

From: northbeachcomm@cs.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 6:04 AM
To: Jay Burney; Councilmembers
Cc: Joyce Phillips; Cari Hornbein; Tim Smith
Subject: Tier 1 VS Tier 2 City issues; Olympia City Council

FEB 25

Hello Olympia City Council:

The City of Olympia is trying to giving a huge prize for the rich real estate developers, again!
No one can afford to live in our city anymore. This is a city only for rich people (from CA?)

The City Council is now set to re-define our city through WA State Laws.
The City only has a current population of 55,400 people, which is a Tier 2 City.

The City wants to call ourselves a Tier 1 City, which is a population of 75,000 people; this is a lie!

The City wants the WA state rules and regulations for a Tier 1 city to apply; but Olympia is a Tier 2 City!

The City wants to make it easier for real estate developers to go forward with what ever

they want in our city; we are not talking about 'LOW INCOME' Housing.

We are talking about expensive housing costs, which the City is now calling "Affordable Housing"(Market rate), this is a lie. This city has become one that is not affordable for low income, not affordable for middle income people. The City council people think that the expensive housing will help issues in our city. It will destroy our city. Wake up!

Thank you;

L. Riner
2103 Harrison
OLY., WA
98502

Joyce Phillips

From: Sandy Novack <sanovack41@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 3:01 PM
To: Joyce Phillips
Subject: Proposed new housing rules

The city of Olympia and the state are planning and have planned new rules for housing that I strongly object to. Who knew that I, the Democrat, would find living in a Democratic state just as annoying as living in a Republican state.

About the proposals to address middle housing problems.

Your proposal. In a single house lot

1. 4 units or 6 or 6 plus 2 ADU's. You will certainly be succeeding in packing as many people as you can together. Most of us, even the poor or middle would like to walk a short distance to see a forest or a tree or a bit of sky. People are happier and better adjusted when they can do that. I suggest affordable housing go up but have space around it that is not developed. Or if developers can't afford to build smaller because they don't make enough money on a house, subsidize the building of smaller houses or build public housing. They have that in large cities all the country.
2. "Frequent transit routes" and parking. I had a hip replacement, could not walk a block much less half a mile. I had a hip replacement. For 2 years before that couldn't walk 3 blocks or half a mile, might have made one block. I can't take a bus to the grocery store and bring groceries home. My grandkids go to soccer in Tumwater. Guess that would be out in one of your new places.
3. ADU's. 1,000 sq ft. That's a house, but, I guess! That's what you want it to be.
4. No street parking required or little. See above.
5. Co-living. Yikes, with no parking. I am ok with co-living, in general, but the bigger the house, the more opportunity for disaster because it is uncontrollable. 30 people could live there, yes, illegally but it is very hard to prove it. Tried that, wasn't willing to stand on my front porch and take pictures all day long to show to police.

I have lived in more than a couple of large cities. Businesses need parking places for customers, residents drive around for hours to find spaces and when they do find them leave their cars there for weeks. And, it works better in big cities because they have lots of mass transit and a central city where most people work. It can't work here because we need our cars. If we are talking about poor and middle housing, Uber everywhere is not an option.

So, no, no, no, no to your big ideas

Sent from my iPad

Joyce Phillips

From: Lorie Hewitt <bradleyhewittoly@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Joyce Phillips
Cc: John Saunders
Subject: Comments on Code Amendments for Middle Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Ms Phillips and City of Olympia staff:

Thank you for your presentation last Wednesday March 19th for the South Capital Neighborhood (SCN). Based on your presentation, various Code Amendment and Design Review fact sheets, and FAQs, I have some comments and questions on the proposal. As you know the SCN is a National Historic neighborhood. Most of the following comments are related to preserving the historic heritage and character of our neighborhood, while allowing some proportional increased density needed for housing.

- **Tier 1 versus Tier 2 city designation:** The decision to draft these amendments for a Tier 1 city when Olympia is a Tier 2 city is problematic. Doing so increases the base unit density to 6 in areas near a “major transit stop”, a pretty drastic density leap. There is no guarantee that Olympia will actually be a Tier 1 city by 2030. I have lived here 40 years and seen many population projections come and go and not ever materialize. Moreover, the city appears to be using the Urban Growth Boundary, not the City limits, as the basis to estimate future population. I fail to see the benefit of “redefining “ the city limits this way to potentially reach a Tier 1 level of population. Why intentionally reduce the flexibility to design a program for a Tier 2 city and see how it works before jumping right into Tier 1 requirements from the State? Many regulations benefit from adjustments in a 5 year timeframe, which should not be overly onerous as far as staff time. Just review the regulations in 2030 and amend them, if needed.
- **Major Transit Stop:** Olympia has complete flexibility in this area of State requirements since we do not have any major transit stops. Yet the draft amendments box us in to untested densities and probably suspend some design requirements for projects within the 1/4 or 1/2 mile (whichever is chosen) of these non existent transit stops. If the city insists on using its own creation of “frequent transit routes” and allowing increased unit lot density to 6 units instead of 4, no matter whether it’s 1/4 or 1/2 mile from the transit route this will encompass our entire SCN. Has anyone actually looked at our neighborhood lots? Fitting 6 units on them will certainly not allow for design standards that respect the historic nature of our streets and houses. Not to mention parking issues on some heavily parked streets. The option to require off street parking should not be precluded by these amendments. In addition, where is the data that show that residents routinely walk 1/2 mile in the rain to the bus stop? Even 1/4 mile is probably stretching it.

- ADUs and Unit lot Density: The proposal includes ADUs in counting the maximum number of units allowed on a lot. Please keep this as written.
- Current Residential Design requirements: One of your fact sheets says "If applying Design Review for middle housing, only administrative design review can be required" What does this mean? Already the Design review process for SCN seems to be pretty non functional. Residents have repeatedly noted the recent ongoing construction of a huge house and garage on 17th Ave SW that covers virtually an entire lot (no trees on it—were any required?). Also, it is not set back to be consistent with the historic homes on the street. If design review happened, where is the enforcement of the standards? Unfortunately this is not the first time developers or lobbyists buying properties in the SCN have ignored the design standards with no apparent City of Olympia accountability. If only administrative design review is required for all these middle housing units, is this a further weakening of requirements that preserve the historic character of the SCN? Are lot coverages/permeability, appropriate setbacks, and minimum tree density still part of administrative design review? Please also include provisions for stringent enforcement of residential design standards on these new units.
- Selling individual units on a lot to other owners: If a development is approved on a parent lot, these amendments allow for the individual units to be sold independently of each other. What provisions are in place to make sure each of these units isn't bought and used primarily for business purposes? Unfortunately, when that happens it's likely they will frequently be left vacant due to absentee ownership. And when owners are present and properties are used for business purposes, parking can become an issue on congested SCN streets. The SCN already has a large share of houses whose owners are operating businesses and leave them vacant for most of the year. We don't need more of these situations arising with extra units on our properties!
- Impact of increased density on current residents' Solar Panels: I have raised concerns about structures potentially obstructing the many solar panels in our neighborhood previously during the adoption of the Missing Middle regulations. These new middle housing amendments compound the potential for solar panel problems. With more density there is a higher chance of units close to property lines. Where are protections for not obscuring the current residents' solar panels on roofs close to the property line? A 24 foot or 35 foot tall unit will easily obscure solar panels. On our street alone two of us have panels on our carports near property lines. Any structure close to them will render them non functional!
- Question about new allowance for 3 stories in the 35 foot high units: What is the purpose of this allowance? If it's just to increase the inside space of the allowed 4 units on a lot, I don't see any problem with this. But if it's to allow for an additional apartment in each of the allowed units, I am

very opposed to this allowance. Doubling the number of resident families on a lot brings unaddressed parking congestion and possibly other issues.

- Diagram issue in FAQs document: Under “What is a unit lot subdivision?” there is a helpful diagram with 4 examples of lots with units on them. The 3rd one presents a design for townhouses. This one presents an issue regarding how the street facing townhouse would fit in with the design of many neighborhoods. It is unclear how the side of a townhouse would be designed to include windows and entries that fit in with surrounding houses. Obviously a bare wall facing the street should not be an option!
- Affordable Housing comment: I do not believe that these amendments address Olympia’s need for affordable housing. Rentals in the SCN typically are not affordable for lower income residents. It’s probably the city’s hope that rents for smaller units in SCN will be affordable. But I don’t see much in here that incentivizes affordable units.

Thank you for your work and your public outreach on these amendments. I look forward to, at some point, your response to these questions and comments.

Lorie Hewitt
401 18th Ave SE
Olympia 98501

Joyce Phillips

From: Joyce Phillips
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Lorie Hewitt
Cc: John Saunders; Brittany Gillia; Tim Smith
Subject: RE: Comments on Code Amendments for Middle Housing

Hi, Lorie.

Thank you for your patience as I prepared a response. Please see my responses below, in red text. Feel free to ask follow up questions or provide additional comments.

Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Planning Manager (she/her)
City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

Note: *Emails are public records and are eligible for release.*

From: Lorie Hewitt <bradleyhewittoly@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: John Saunders <johnosaunders@me.com>
Subject: Comments on Code Amendments for Middle Housing

Dear Ms Phillips and City of Olympia staff:

Thank you for your presentation last Wednesday March 19th for the South Capital Neighborhood (SCN). Based on your presentation, various Code Amendment and Design Review fact sheets, and FAQs, I have some comments and questions on the proposal. As you know the SCN is a National Historic neighborhood. Most of the following comments are related to preserving the historic heritage and character of our neighborhood, while allowing some proportional increased density needed for housing.

- Tier 1 versus Tier 2 city designation: The decision to draft these amendments for a Tier 1 city when Olympia is a Tier 2 city is problematic. Doing so increases the base unit density to 6 in areas near a “major transit stop”, a pretty drastic density leap. There is no guarantee that Olympia will actually be a Tier 1 city by 2030. I have lived here 40 years and seen many population projections come and go and not ever materialize. Moreover, the city appears to be using the Urban Growth Boundary, not the City limits, as the basis to estimate future population. I fail to see the benefit of “redefining “ the city limits this way to potentially reach a Tier 1 level of population. Why intentionally reduce the flexibility to design a program for a Tier 2 city and see how it works before jumping right into Tier 1 requirements from the State? Many regulations benefit from adjustments

in a 5 year timeframe, which should not be overly onerous as far as staff time. Just review the regulations in 2030 and amend them, if needed.

Thank you for your comments. The majority of the population in the urban growth area (UGA) is in the southeast area. This portion of the UGA has been under consideration for potential annexation and may be considered again within the next few years. If annexed, it will add to the population of the city limits. Additionally, there is an application in for a sewer lift station in this general area that would significantly expand development opportunities in this part of the City and its UGA. Because the City and the County have joint planning agreements, the same or similar development regulations apply within the City Limits and UGA. We strive to plan cooperatively for the entire area, not just one or the other. This is the reason the Council's Land Use and Environment Committee encouraged the first draft be drafted for our expected population in 2030.

- Major Transit Stop: Olympia has complete flexibility in this area of State requirements since we do not have any major transit stops. Yet the draft amendments box us in to untested densities and probably suspend some design requirements for projects within the 1/4 or 1/2 mile (whichever is chosen) of these non-existent transit stops. If the city insists on using its own creation of "frequent transit routes" and allowing increased unit lot density to 6 units instead of 4, no matter whether it's 1/4 or 1/2 mile from the transit route this will encompass our entire SCN. Has anyone actually looked at our neighborhood lots? Fitting 6 units on them will certainly not allow for design standards that respect the historic nature of our streets and houses. Not to mention parking issues on some heavily parked streets. The option to require off street parking should not be precluded by these amendments. In addition, where is the data that shows that residents routinely walk 1/2 mile in the rain to the bus stop? Even 1/4 mile is probably stretching it.

It is true that the City does not have any transit stops that meet the state's definition of a Major Transit Stop. To be clear, the increased number of units per lot associated with the use of frequent transit routes in this draft does not suspend or alter any design requirements or impact where the Infill & Other Residential design guidelines apply. The design requirements apply to all housing types in the Infill Design District, whether for a single family home or middle housing. The historic preservation provisions also apply to all housing types in Historic Districts.

Even though the code may allow 6 units per lot, that does not mean 6 units will actually fit. There are a lot of variables to be considered, which are even more complex when there are existing structures on a lot to take into account. Each applicant will need to demonstrate that the number of units proposed will fit and meet all requirements that apply to the property (zoning, design review, historic preservation, tree protection, etc.).

The use of frequent transit routes (rather than Major Transit Stops) and 1/2 mile instead of a 1/4 mile are policy decisions suggested by members of the Land Use and Environment Committee, and do go beyond the minimum requirements of the state law. This is a proposed approach to help address the housing crisis locally and these parts of the code amendments may, or may not, be adopted in the final action taken by City Council.

- ADUs and Unit lot Density: The proposal includes ADUs in counting the maximum number of units allowed on a lot. Please keep this as written.

Comment noted.

- Current Residential Design requirements: One of your fact sheets says “If applying Design Review for middle housing, only administrative design review can be required” What does this mean? *This means that design review must be completed without requiring a public meeting, that it will be handled as part of the building permit review process. Our code currently requires Design Review be completed by the Design Review Board and in a Public Meeting if there are 5 units or more proposed. Since middle housing includes 6-plexes, we propose to require Board level review for 7 units or more.* Already the Design review process for SCN seems to be pretty non functional. Residents have repeatedly noted the recent ongoing construction of a huge house and garage on 17th Ave SW that covers virtually an entire lot (no trees on it—were any required?). Also, it is not set back to be consistent with the historic homes on the street. If design review happened, where is the enforcement of the standards? Unfortunately this is not the first time developers or lobbyists buying properties in the SCN have ignored the design standards with no apparent City of Olympia accountability. If only administrative design review is required for all these middle housing units, is this a further weakening of requirements that preserve the historic character of the SCN? *These comments seem to be more about the historic preservation aspects of review than the design review aspects of the structure. My understanding is that the home has not yet received final approval and that there will be four trees planted on site (per the approved site plan).* Are lot coverages/permeability, appropriate setbacks, and minimum tree density still part of administrative design review? *Setbacks, lot coverage, and tree density are part of review of the site plan, not the design review (of the building) or the historic preservation review aspects of review.* Please also include provisions for stringent enforcement of residential design standards on these new units. *I suggest that the SCNA may want to work with the Historic Preservation Planner to review what is in the code, how the review is conducted, and see if there is a desire to propose or request any text amendments to the historic preservation sections of the code. If this is done, it would apply to all historic districts in the city, not just the South Capitol district.*
- Selling individual units on a lot to other owners: If a development is approved on a parent lot, these amendments allow for the individual units to be sold independently of each other. What provisions are in place to make sure each of these units isn’t bought and used primarily for business purposes? Unfortunately, when that happens it’s likely they will frequently be left vacant due to absentee ownership. And when owners are present and properties are used for business purposes, parking can become an issue on congested SCN streets. The SCN already has a large share of houses whose owners are operating businesses and leave them vacant for most of the year. We don’t need more of these situations arising with extra units on our properties!

Any resident (renter or property owner) of a residential unit can apply for a Home Occupation to operate a business from their residence. The requirements they are to comply with are included in Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) [18.04.060\(L\)](#). The purpose of the home occupation provisions is to allow for the use of a residential structure for a non-residential use which is clearly an accessory use to the residential use and does not change the residential character of the neighborhood. Home occupations meeting the requirements in the code section noted above are allowed in any district in which residential uses are permitted. If you believe a home occupation is being used in violation of those standards, please contact Code Enforcement 360.753.8487 or cpdce@ci.olympia.wa.us.
- Impact of increased density on current residents’ Solar Panels: I have raised concerns about structures potentially obstructing the many solar panels in our neighborhood previously during

the adoption of the Missing Middle regulations. These new middle housing amendments compound the potential for solar panel problems. With more density there is a higher chance of units close to property lines. Where are protections for not obscuring the current residents' solar panels on roofs close to the property line? A 24 foot or 35 foot tall unit will easily obscure solar panels. On our street alone two of us have panels on our carports near property lines. Any structure close to them will render them non functional!

The provisions to protect anyone's solar access rights remain unchanged with the amendments as drafted, but over time, as more infill occurs, it is quite possible that actions of an adjacent property owner could impact someone else's solar panel access to sunlight, either by adding an addition to their existing home or adding a new unit that shades the panels. This could also occur as existing trees grow and get taller or if new trees are planted.

The best legal way to protect existing solar access that I am aware of is by securing a solar access easement from adjacent property owner(s). The City of Olympia does not currently address solar access in its codes. I will share your comments with our climate staff and building department staff on this issue.

- Question about new allowance for 3 stories in the 35 foot high units: What is the purpose of this allowance? If it's just to increase the inside space of the allowed 4 units on a lot, I don't see any problem with this. But if it's to allow for an additional apartment in each of the allowed units, I am very opposed to this allowance. Doubling the number of resident families on a lot brings unaddressed parking congestion and possibly other issues.

This proposed change would allow someone to either have 1, 2, or 3 stories in a building, as long as the building height does not exceed the current limit of 35 feet (as measured to the midpoint of the roof pitch). This would pertain to single family residences, duplexes, triplexes, etc. It would not pertain to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) which have a maximum building height of 24 feet. There are many variables for how this may be applied. As an example, a triplex could be 3 units side-by-side-by-side or it could be three units, one on top of the other (or stacked). The code is drafted to apply to the zoning district(s) for this portion of the code. The historic preservation provisions of the code would also apply, which may mean additional design mitigations could be requested or required to reduce the mass/scale/appearance of the building.

- Diagram issue in FAQs document: Under "What is a unit lot subdivision?" there is a helpful diagram with 4 examples of lots with units on them. The 3rd one presents a design for townhouses. This one presents an issue regarding how the street facing townhouse would fit in with the design of many neighborhoods. It is unclear how the side of a townhouse would be designed to include windows and entries that fit in with surrounding houses. Obviously a bare wall facing the street should not be an option!

These examples are from a statewide handout and meant to be for illustrative purposes about unit lot subdivisions. Townhouses are already allowed in almost all residential zoning districts, including R 6-12 that applies to your neighborhood. Development of townhouses would be subject to the applicable standards of that zoning district, the Historic Preservation codes, and the Townhouses chapter ([OMC 18.64](#)).

- Affordable Housing comment: I do not believe that these amendments address Olympia's need for affordable housing. Rentals in the SCN typically are not affordable for lower income residents. It's probably the city's hope that rents for smaller units in SCN will be affordable. But I don't see much in here that incentivizes affordable units.

The opportunity to get additional units in exchange for 1 or 2 of the units being "affordable" are tied to the property owner recording a covenant stating the homes will be affordable for a period of at least 50 years. This is typically recorded prior to the issuance of the building permit(s). We have done something similar in the past for a period of 20 years but the new time period is 50 years. However, because the current draft includes your neighborhood in the area that could get the additional units because of its proximity to frequent transit routes (as locally defined), the additional units would be allowed with or without the affordable housing covenant.

Affordable Housing is defined as housing affordable to households with an income not greater than 80 percent of the median income for Thurston County as determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Affordable housing should cost no more than 30 percent of gross household income (including utilities).

Thank you for your work and your public outreach on these amendments. I look forward to, at some point, your response to these questions and comments.

Lorie Hewitt
401 18th Ave SE
Olympia 98501

Joyce Phillips

From: northbeachcomm@cs.com
Sent: Saturday, April 5, 2025 3:28 PM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: comments.....: City of Olympia -" Middle Housing" Survey Now Open

April 5

Hello City of OLY.....

These are comments for this city survey, below:

MY ANSWER; "No " tier 1. Oly is not forecast to exceed 75000 population for 20 years. We have heard the city presentation on this issue. The city staff is ignoring certain facts. Population numbers are important. You cannot "fake" them! Stop pushing for something that does not exist. Stop pushing your own agenda; Allow rich developers to build anything that they want; no rules.

City does not seem to care about public comment. The city council only cares about rich developers; giving them MFTE'S. The city council is making the city for rich people only; others cannot afford the huge taxes. Others cannot afford all the rules and regulations that only the rich developers can afford; where is the "low cost HUD housing?" It is no where.

fyi,

L. Riner

2103 Harrison

OLY., WA 98502

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Middle Housing <middlehousing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
To: Middle Housing <middlehousing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 at 11:10:22 AM EDT
Subject: Olympia - Middle Housing Survey Now Open

You are receiving this email as an identified Party of Record for the Middle Housing Code Amendments proposal.



Middle Housing Code Amendments

Community Survey Now Open

The first draft is issued for public review and comment – and we want to hear from you! Some parts of the proposal are required in order to meet state law but in other parts there is more discretion about how we proceed. We're soliciting feedback on the parts of the proposal where there is more than one way to decide how to move forward.

Get involved

Take the short survey to tell us what you think about the proposed code amendments for housing. The survey will close on April 30th.

- [Middle Housing Survey](#) on Engage Olympia

For more information on middle housing, please visit www.olympiawa.gov/middlehousing

Thank you!

Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Planning Manager (she/her)

City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development

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

360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

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

--

Joyce Phillips

From: Jim Carroll <jcarroll@springwoodave.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2025 8:14 AM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: Middle housing comments

Hi Joyce, can the new code please address shadow (or ghost) platting? It would be great to be able to do partial subdividing of a large lot in Olympia. Other cities allow this.

Also, I wanted to express disagreement with having a maximum GFA limit of only 1000 Sq ft for ADUs. I vote for no limit, at least 1200 for footprint, not GFA. Or, some language that might allow planning staff and citizens some variance for unique situations, like my 5 acre parcel, with a 1106 square foot (footprint) house that I would like to treat as an ADU, and then build a larger main house.

Thank you for taking the time to talk to me about this yesterday.

Much appreciated,

Jim Carroll

360-486-4745



April 22, 2025

Joyce Phillip, Principal Planner
Community Planning and Development
City of Olympia
middle@ci.olympia.wa.us
jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us

RE: Comment Letter re Middle Housing Code Amendments – Party of Record

Dear Joyce:

Dimension Law Group provides strategic legal counsel for development projects throughout King, Pierce, Snohomish, Chelan, Grays Harbor, and Thurston counties. Our firm specializes in helping clients construct attached accessory dwelling units (AADUs) and detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) and conversion of such units to condominiums for real property transfer. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this evolving area of long-range planning and land use regulation. We offer these comments on behalf of our diverse client base, who work tirelessly to provide affordable housing within Washington State.

House Bill 1337, adopted by the Washington State Legislature in 2023, amongst other important changes to state law, encourages the creation of new Accessory Dwelling Units. Most notably, HB 1337 requires jurisdictions to allow two AADUs or DADUs (or a combination thereof) per lot, within urban growth areas by six months after the next Comprehensive Plan periodic updates.

Construction of AADUs and DADUs is critical for diversity housing options and provision of affordable housing, which when properly constructed or redeveloped, harmonize and enhance the character of low density residential communities.

With implementation of HB 1337, jurisdictions must balance regulatory and process frameworks with economic viability for development. In respecting this balance, efficient process requirements and minimal site regulations are critical to allow for development. Specifically, we believe the below requests provide a framework for county and local governments to ensure responsible development and/or redevelopment of AADUs and DADUs. On behalf of our clients, we encourage implementation of the following principals:

- 1) The ability for AADUs and DADUs to be used as short-term rentals with allowance for owners to appropriately regulate parking, noise, and other important measures to maintain the character of low-density residential zones.
- 2) Reduce maximum size limits to avoid over-regulating sites to the extent development and construction are functionally and/or fiscally impossible.
- 3) Allowance for construction or redevelopment of AADUs and DADUs with sewer as permitted/allowed uses within critical areas and shoreline jurisdictions, provided implementation of reasonable environmental mitigation and that such structures and detached structures are not sited nor encroach in buffers.
- 4) Relaxed public health, building code and environmental permitting requirements, which do not constrain developers to the point construction is fiscally impossible.



- 5) Allowance of DADUs to be constructed at the closest feasible location to lot lines.
- 6) Authorization for construction of AADUs and DADUs regardless of physical proximity to utility infrastructure, to include sewerage systems.
- 7) Allow construction or redevelopment of AADUs and DADUs to be at least 24 feet in height and/or remove height restriction mirroring for that of the primary single-family structure.
- 8) Remove design standards that fiscally prevent development or redevelopment.
- 9) While HB 1337 allows for up to two AADUs or DADUs (or one of each) on all lots in zoning districts, which allow single-family homes, promotion of affordable housing warrants reduction or elimination of minimum lot size requirements for the principal units.
- 10) Reduce impact fees to AADU and DADU to a proportionate amount given square footage of these affordable housing types are typically smaller in size and impact from single family residences.
- 11) Eliminate or significantly reduce utility connection fees/charges, which are costs typically passed on to buyers or otherwise a fiscal imposition to developers.
- 12) Efficient process and land use regulations implementing HB 5258, which requires jurisdictions to adopt review processes for bifurcating ownership of a primary structure into separately owned unit lots or otherwise owned in common by the respective owners of the lots.
- 13) Reduce maximum requirements for parking or eliminate them entirely, which as applied, would prohibit construction or redevelopment of AADUs and DADUs.

In addition to the requests and considerations above, our clients request the allowance for tiny homes as a continued effort to expand affordable housing options. In doing so, we request prefabricated DADUs be permitted, provided they comply with state standards. Our clients have encountered multiple jurisdictions' land use codes, which do not define "tiny home" as a "use" and thus no zoning or process pathway exists for construction or siting of such as a permitted use or a conditionally permitted use. Alternative to treating tiny homes as a specified use in zoning charts, allowance of tiny homes as AADUs or DADUs would provide more certainty for developers during the design and review phase of construction.

In conclusion, our clients seek streamlined permitting processes where developers may act quickly and efficiently during all phases of construction. Efficiency reduces costs for developers and provides certainty, which in turn reduces costs for prospective buyers. All approvals for AADUs and DADUs, to include tiny homes, should be done administratively to avoid delay and reduce review costs. We also highly encourage you to consider incentives for construction or redevelopment of AADUs and DADUs as provision of diverse housing options is critical to Washington State's priority to increase housing affordability.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at this office. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Katy Sweeden,
Managing Partner, Land Use & Development
Dimension Law Group, PLLC
Office: 206-973-3500
Email: katy@dimensionlaw.com

CO-Comment Letter-Middle Housing Code Amendments – Party of Record

Joyce Phillips

From: hellocallie@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 8:43 PM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: I support going with tier 1 standards

You don't often get email from hellocallie@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Since buildings are years in the planning, financing and building, if we delay until we hit tier 1 population, we will be years behind the need. As a practical matter, we will see changes slowly. I like the idea of 3 stories.

Callie Wilson 3043 Central St SE, within ½ mile of transit.

Joyce Phillips

From: Peter Cook <pcook99@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 12:43 PM
To: Middle Housing
Subject: Very good process and data presentation

You don't often get email from pcook99@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Joyce and Team:

Excellent work in dealing with all the tricky issues and summarizing and presenting all the pertinent information to us as citizens. You are on the right track.

Keep up the good work!

Peter

Peter Cook

pcook64@alum.mit.edu

Joyce Phillips

From: Trish Gregory <TrishG@fscss.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:57 PM
To: Joyce Phillips
Subject: Re: Olympia Zoning Code Amendments

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Joyce!

Thank you again for reaching out and requesting my feedback. It was a lot to read and to be honest, I started to glaze over part way through 🙄 but in general, I really appreciate and value the intentional strategies to increase housing stock that are reflected in this. There were a few thoughts that I had while reviewing it that I have submitted below for your consideration.

The document defines an assisted living dwelling unit but not the other types. I would add a short description to clarify... suggested language below.

D (a). Dwelling, Conventional- *intended for use as a person's permanent or long-term residence. Temporary or short-term accommodations, such as hotels, motels, vacation rentals, or other transient lodging (e.g., Airbnb-style rentals), are not considered dwelling units.*

D (b). Transient Dwelling Unit. A residential unit intended for short-term, non-permanent stays, typically rented on a daily or weekly basis.

Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing were moved to "Conventional Dwelling units" in the definitions, but are still listed under Assisted Living types in the Permitted and Conditional Use table. Should be consistent one way or the other. I support them being under conventional dwelling as folks in these projects are typically living independently with optional supportive services vs living with regular ongoing staffing required.

p23. #7- Is "Emergency Housing Facility" intended to be what is defined on p 7 (cii) as Emergency Shelter? If so the title should be changed to be Emergency Shelter for consistency.

p. 99 SVPA-

"When determining where to establish a required Soil and Vegetation Protection Area or retain trees when a Soil and Vegetation Protection Area (SVPA) is not required, locations with healthy soils, native understory vegetation, and mature trees in good condition shall have priority over development when there are feasible and prudent location alternatives on site for proposed building structures or other site improvements. This may require site redesign including, but not limited to: redesign of streets, sidewalks, stormwater facilities, utilities; changing the shape and size of the parking lot; reducing or limiting proposed site grading; and changing the locations of buildings or building lots."

Have you considered that this requirement sometimes conflicts with the city's value to reduce the barriers to increasing low income/affordable housing stock? The highlighted area can be extremely costly and potentially reduce the number of units that a low income housing developer can include in a project. I value SVPA's and ensuring strong environmental stewardship while developing and I don't think it should be an automatic waiver for all low income/affordable projects, but adding language allowing for consideration of a waiver when a project can demonstrate a significant value added (increased number of homes for our most vulnerable)... it should be an option that the city is expected to consider!

I think the updates are fantastic and support more housing options! I appreciate the language regarding the mix of housing types changing to **requiring a minimum** instead of enforcing a maximum % of units to consist of duplexes, triplexes, middle housing etc.

Additionally, THIS..... 👍 👍 👍 👍 👍 p. 90 A. Projects subject to review by the Design Review Board or Joint Design Review Committee, as described in OMC 18.76.180; with the exception of affordable and Low Income Housing projects which are subject only to staff level review. That is a very positive change and will hopefully prevent some of the "nit picky" things that sometimes come up in committee/board review. It is important to balance cost and aesthetics when developing low income housing :)

If you have specific questions that you would like for me to address please feel free to reach out!

Sincerely,

Trish Gregory (she/her)
Executive Director
Office: (360) 754-9297 x 206
Cell: (360) 628-7344



3545 7th Ave SW, Olympia WA 98502

www.fscss.org

On Wed, Jun 11, 2025 at 9:12 AM Trish Gregory <TrishG@fscss.org> wrote:

Hi Joyce,

Thanks for reaching out! I am happy to review it. I should have time to look through it early next week and I will reach out if I feel like meeting or further information would be helpful!

Sincerely,

Trish Gregory (she/her)

Executive Director

Office: (360) 754-9297 x 206

Cell: (360) 628-7344



3545 7th Ave SW, Olympia WA 98502

www.fscss.org

On Tue, Jun 10, 2025 at 3:02 PM Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi, Trish.

I wanted to reach out to you because of your affiliation with Family Support Services of South Sound and your interest in housing issues.

I'm Joyce Phillips, a planner at the City of Olympia in the Community Planning and Economic Development Department. We are preparing for a public hearing, tentatively scheduled for Aug. 18th, on amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code. These zoning code amendments focus on new requirements for middle housing, accessory dwelling units, and co-living housing.

I would like to ask for your comments on the public hearing draft. It is lengthy, but here are some key highlights:

- Use “Unit Lot Density” - Allow 4 units per lot. This increases to 6 units per lot if at least 2 of the units are for affordable housing for at least 50 years, or if the property is located within a half mile of a frequent transit route (stops with 4 or more stops per hour, for 12 or more hours per day, for at least 5 days per week).
- Allow up to 2 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) per lot with a principal residential unit on it. This includes single family homes, duplexes, townhouses, etc.
- Allow ADUs to be up to 1,000 square feet in gross floor area.
- Retain existing maximum building heights in various zoning districts but eliminate the maximum number of stories allowed. Most lower density residential zones allow a height of up to 35 feet but limit that to a maximum of 2 stories.
- Allow unit lot subdivisions for developed sites. This would allow ADUs and other units (e.g., a duplex or triplex) to be sold independently of the principal unit or other units on the “parent” lot.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the various provisions, answer questions, or to take any feedback about improvements to the draft that you’d like to share. Unfortunately, I will be out of the office through July 23rd – but I would be happy to meet with you once I return. You are also welcome to submit any written comments for staff, the Planning Commission, and ultimately City Council to consider. The project email address is middlehousing@ci.olympia.wa.us. This email address will be monitored while I am away.

The draft, community survey results, and background information can be reviewed at www.olympiawa.gov/middlehousing.

Thank you for considering reviewing and commenting on the draft.

Joyce

Joyce Phillips, AICP, Planning Manager (she/her)

City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development

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

360.570.3722 | olympiawa.gov

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