



Meeting Agenda

Planning Commission

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Stacey Ray
360.753.8046

Monday, June 18, 2018

6:30 PM

Room 207

1. CALL TO ORDER

Estimated time for items 1 through 5: 20 minutes

1.A ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[18-0594](#) Approval of June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft Minutes](#)

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

During this portion of the meeting, citizens may address the Commission regarding items related to City business, including items on the Agenda. In order for the Committee or Commission to maintain impartiality and the appearance of fairness in upcoming matters and to comply with Public Disclosure Law for political campaigns, speakers will not be permitted to make public comments before the Committee or Commission in these two areas: (1) on agenda items for which the Committee or Commission either held a Public Hearing in the last 45 days, or will hold a Public Hearing within 45 days or for quasi-judicial review items for which there can be only one public hearing, or (2) where the speaker promotes or opposes a candidate for public office or a ballot measure. The Planning Commission is only accepting written comments on the Missing Middle Housing recommendations until it completes its deliberations.

5. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

This agenda item is also an opportunity for Commissioners to ask staff about City or Planning Commission business.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

6.A [18-0369](#) Amendments to the Municipal Code related to Low Impact Development (LID)

Attachments: [Amendment Matrix](#)

Estimated time: 30 minutes

6.B [18-0586](#) Missing Middle Housing Analysis - Deliberations

Attachments: [Missing Middle web page](#)
[Existing and Proposed Housing Types](#)
[Draft Alternative Code Amendment](#)
[Parking Provisions Existing and Proposed](#)
[Parking Provisions Other Jurisdictions](#)
[Written Public Comment](#)

Estimated time: 90 minutes

7. REPORTS

From Staff, Officers, and Commissioners, and regarding relevant topics.

8. OTHER TOPICS**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Approximately 9:30 p.m.

Upcoming

Next regular Commission meeting is June 18, 2018. See 'meeting details' in Legistar for list of other meetings and events related to Commission activities.

Accommodations

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Advisory Committee meeting, please contact the Advisory Committee staff liaison (contact number in the upper right corner of the agenda) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384. hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8244

Planning Commission
Approval of June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 6/18/2018
Agenda Item Number:
File Number: 18-0594

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title
Approval of June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Stacey Ray
360.753.8046

Monday, June 4, 2018

6:30 PM

Room 207

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cunningham called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 7 - Chair Rad Cunningham, Commissioner Tammy Adams, Commissioner Kento Azegami, Commissioner Joel Baxter, Commissioner Paula Ehlers, Commissioner Candi Millar and Commissioner Carole Richmond

Excused: 2 - Commissioner Jessica Blose and Commissioner Travis Burns

OTHERS PRESENT

City of Olympia Community and Development Planning staff:

Current Planning and Engineering Supervisor, Tim Smith
Senior Planner, Joyce Phillips
Senior Planner, Stacey Ray
Assistant Planner, Paula Smith

Verizon Wireless, Lelah Vaga
Wireless Policy Group, Kim Allen

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.A [18-0538](#) Approval of May 21, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Amy Pellegrini with AT&T Wireless Policy Group announced that she is available to answer any questions regarding small cell code amendments.

Matt Russo with T-Mobile distributed handouts to Commissioners of T-Mobile's small cell design.

5. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Commission thanked Ms. Phillips for her years of service to the Planning Commission. Ms. Ray made announcements.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

6.A [18-0528](#) Small Cell Zoning Code Amendments

Mr. Smith and Ms. Smith discussed the challenges to the proposed amendments from Verizon to the small cell code. Ms. Allen reviewed data needs and the employment of small cell.

The information was received.

6.B [18-0531](#) Missing Middle Housing Analysis - Deliberations

The Commission continued their deliberations.

Ms. Phillips discussed Missing Middle housing analysis and provided handouts. A motion was made to request staff provide code language to restrict triplexes and fourplexes to within 300 feet from transit routes in the R4-8 zoning district.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Commissioner Adams, Commissioner Ehlers, Commissioner Millar and Commissioner Richmond

Nay: 3 - Chair Cunningham, Commissioner Azegami and Commissioner Baxter

Excused: 2 - Commissioner Blose and Commissioner Burns

7. REPORTS

Commissioners reported on outside meetings attended.

8. OTHER TOPICS - NONE

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.



Planning Commission

Amendments to the Municipal Code related to Low Impact Development (LID)

Agenda Date: 6/18/2018
Agenda Item Number: 6.A
File Number: 18-0369

Type: information Version: 1 Status: In Committee

Title

Amendments to the Municipal Code related to Low Impact Development (LID)

Recommended Action

Information only, no action requested at this meeting.

Report

Issue:

Discussion of potential minor amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC). All amendments proposed intend to clarify or adjust language adopted in 2016 related to making Low Impact Development the common and preferred approach.

Staff Contact / Presenter:

Nicole Floyd, Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development, 360.570.3768

Background and Analysis:

The LID code revision project began in February of 2014 as a State mandate and was completed in December of 2016 as a community supported effort to change the paradigm of development towards a more environmentally sensitive approach to stormwater management. The update included revisions to a vast number of City codes, standards, and manuals in order to make LID the preferred and commonly used approach to site development. The strategy emphasizes careful site planning and small-scale stormwater management practices that integrate into project designs.

Now, a year and a half after the LID update, staff have identified a few areas in need of additional modification. These proposed amendments maintain the intent of the 2016 update. These proposed amendments are based on daily practical application and intend to refine and clarify specific sections that have been challenging to implement. These modifications are not substantive; for the most part, they simply clarify the code. Two of the proposed modifications are more complex; they relate to how impervious surface and hard surface coverage is calculated within the residential zoning districts as follows:

- Relax hard surface limits by approximately 10% within the residential zones; and
- Convert the impervious and hard surface limit calculation to a percentage in the RLI zone, as is consistent with all other zoning designations.

Hard surfaces (pervious pavement etc.) are a preferred alternative to standard pavement and as such, the amendments in 2016 intended to incentivize their use. Unfortunately, the 2016 adopted code language was far more restrictive than the previous code and the incentives intended to be applied across all residential zones were not as clearly articulated as intended. These limits have had unforeseen impacts on residents intending to install new decks, patios, and pathways. The proposed revisions intend to provide better incentives to using pervious materials while maintaining the fundamental purpose of the Low Impact Development codes.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Surface coverage limits are of interest to all residential property owners.

Options:

Briefing only - no action.

Financial Impact:

N/A

Attachments:

Amendment Matrix

MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENT MATRIX

The following matrix has been prepared by Staff to be used as to help identify the location, proposed amendment, and rationale for the changes proposed to the Olympia Municipal Code related to Low Impact Development. These changes reflect a desire by staff to provide further clarity and consistency to the Low Impact Development code amendments that were adopted in 2016.

Amendment Location	Proposed Amendment	Amendment Rationale
18.04		
18.02.180 Hard Surface Definition	Hard Surface. An impervious surface, a permeable pavement, porous concrete, decks, patio, or a vegetated roof, in contrast with vegetated permeable soils.	The definition comes directly from the Department of Ecology, however additional detail regarding the types of structures that are included within the definition of "hard surface" are proposed to reduce confusion and provide more clarity for the reader.
Table 4.04 Impervious and Hard Surface Limits	<p>Increase hard surface limits by approximately 10% in residential zones. This would set the hard surface limits for residential zones to allow about 20% above the impervious surface limit.</p> <p>Correct typos as appropriate within the chart.</p>	<p>Hard surface limits are a new addition to the municipal code as a way to regulate new technologies such as pervious pavement. Hard surfaces allow water to penetrate through the surface, rather than causing runoff as traditional pavements do. Until 2016 there was no limit for hard surfaces, the code only limited building coverage and impervious surfaces. Although well intended, the limits set are too restrictive and should be relaxed to allow for greater application of these more environmentally friendly alternatives.</p> <p>One of the main objectives of the 2016 update was to incentivize the use of hard surfaces (pervious pavement) instead of traditional pavement. To do this the allowed amount of impervious surfaces was decreased by about 10% within all residential zones. The new hard surface limitation was intended to be set 10% higher than the impervious surface limit to create a net result of no change in coverage. Instead the change would occur in materials use, incentivizing the environmentally friendly option.</p>

		<p>The code amendments in 2016, while well intentioned, fell short of achieving their intent. Many residential zones do not allow a greater amount of hard surface than impervious surface, which defeats the purpose. The new hard surface limits have been far more impactful to residential home owners than anticipated. The proposed amendments intend to refine code language to accomplish the intended modifications from the 2016 LID update.</p>																
<p>Table 4.04 RLI: Building, Impervious, and Hard Surface Limits</p>	<p>Change RLI impervious and hard surface limits to a percentage rather than the 2500sf limit currently in place.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="422 630 1121 1112"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Proposed RLI Surface Coverage Limitations to Replace 2,500sf</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Lot Size</th> <th>Building Coverage Limit</th> <th>Impervious Surface Limit</th> <th>Hard Surface Limit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Less than .25 acre:</td> <td>(no change) See impervious surface limit</td> <td>35% or 2500sf whichever is greater</td> <td>55% or 3,000sf whichever is greater</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater than .25 acre</td> <td>(no change) See impervious surface limit</td> <td>6% or 4,000sf whichever is greater</td> <td>25% or 7,000sf whichever is greater</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proposed RLI Surface Coverage Limitations to Replace 2,500sf				Lot Size	Building Coverage Limit	Impervious Surface Limit	Hard Surface Limit	Less than .25 acre:	(no change) See impervious surface limit	35% or 2500sf whichever is greater	55% or 3,000sf whichever is greater	Greater than .25 acre	(no change) See impervious surface limit	6% or 4,000sf whichever is greater	25% or 7,000sf whichever is greater	<p>Staff recommends changing the 2,500sf limit to a percentage as is found in all other zones within the City. Unlike a percentage, the 2,500sf limit does not allow for variation based on lot size. This means that a significantly larger portion of a small lot is allowed to be used than a larger lot.</p> <p>Until the 2016 code revisions there was no hard surface limit, therefore once the 2,500sf limit was reached, an unlimited amount of additional surface coverage could be added, provided it allowed water to penetrate through it (pervious pavement or similar). This, however, is no longer permitted. In fact, the current code does not allow for any type of surface above the 2,500sf limit. This new limitation prohibits homeowners from adding decks, patios, pathways etc. to their existing residences.</p> <p>The RLI zone has been significantly more impacted by the hard surface limits created in 2016 than any other residential zone. The technologies intended to have been incentivized have inadvertently been prohibited because there is no benefit to installing the more expensive (pervious) solution.</p> <p>The recommended revisions will achieve the intended results of the 2016 LID Update. The proposed percentages intend to maintain strict limitations on impervious surfaces in a more fair and practical way. They also allow for up to a 20% increase in</p>
Proposed RLI Surface Coverage Limitations to Replace 2,500sf																		
Lot Size	Building Coverage Limit	Impervious Surface Limit	Hard Surface Limit															
Less than .25 acre:	(no change) See impervious surface limit	35% or 2500sf whichever is greater	55% or 3,000sf whichever is greater															
Greater than .25 acre	(no change) See impervious surface limit	6% or 4,000sf whichever is greater	25% or 7,000sf whichever is greater															

		hard surfaces, which is significantly less than was previously allowed, but enough to provide incentive to use the more expensive, environmentally sensitive option.
18.04.??? Hard Surface Limit Exceptions	<p>New Language: Nonresidential uses such as, but not limited to schools, parks, places of worship, located in residential zones may increase their impervious surface coverage by up to ten (10) percent and hard surface limits by twenty (20) percent provided all of the following are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project site is greater than one (1) acre in size. • The increase is the minimum necessary. • The increase cannot be caused by a desire for increased parking above the +/- 10% established in the parking table in OMC 18.38. • The proposed improvement must comply with the current stormwater control standards. 	Impervious surface and hard surface limits have been challenging for schools, churches, and parks to meet within the residential zones. This exception recognizes that these uses do not reflect the typical residential development pattern and therefore need some increased flexibility. These increases allow a similar coverage limit as non-residential zones would provide for such uses. The proposed criteria is intended to ensure the increase is the minimum necessary and that the project adequately addresses stormwater requirements found in other sections of the City's regulations.
18.36.060(c) Landscaping Irrigation Requirements	<p>Irrigation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permanent irrigation is not required in areas where native and/or well adapted drought tolerant species are proposed. 	The 2016 update included significant modification in the landscaping chapter to encourage and require installation of drought tolerant species, however the code still allows for up to 40% of the landscaping areas to be planted with plants that require irrigation. Additionally, native and drought tolerant species often require irrigation in the dry summer months. Prohibition of irrigation is therefore inappropriate.
18.36.180(c)(2) Island Size	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Landscape Islands - Design. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Landscape Islands shall be a minimum of one forty-four (144) square feet and no more than five hundred (500) square feet in size. Islands shall be designed so that trees will be planted a minimum of four (6) feet from any hard scape surface. The minimum island size may be reduced, , if appropriate 'structural soil' (or similar engineered solution) is provided to ensure that trees can achieve maturity. The maximum allowable size of five hundred (500) square feet may be increased to 	The distance between the tree and hard surface was reduced in 2016 from 6' down to 4' to allow for more flexibility in design so that bioswales and other stormwater control features could more easily be placed throughout the parking lot. Staff has found that the reduction in size is not always necessary. This revision intends to maintain flexibility, but encourage larger planting area, which will aid in achieving tree canopy goals.

	allow for the preservation of existing trees and associated vegetation pursuant to OMC 16.60 or to accommodate stormwater infiltration/treatment/conveyance practices.	
18.36.180(c)(3) Trees in Islands	Landscape Islands - Materials. a. One tree shall be planted for every two hundred (200) square feet of landscape island area; provided that every landscape island must contain at least one (1) tree. Two (2) trees are required in islands at the end of a double row of parking, regardless of the island size. Planting areas shall be provided with the maximum number of trees possible given recommended spacing for species type, and the estimated mature size of the tree.	This revision adds clarity that two trees are required at the end of a double row of parking. As outlined above, the 2016 LID revisions allowed for minor reductions in landscape island width. The reduced width, does not always result in islands in excess of 200sf, which inadvertently reduced the total number of trees required. This additional language intends to clarify the intent of the code.
Urban Forestry		
16.48.040 Clearing and Grading – permit Required	No person, corporation, or other legal entity shall engage in land clearing in the city without having complied with one of the following: A. Obtaining approval of a soil and vegetation plan and obtaining a tree removal permit as provided for in this chapter;	The 2016 Low Impact Development update changed the language from just addressing trees to including the understory vegetation and soil as well. This modification was inadvertently omitted from this section and therefore needs correcting.
16.48.045 Tree Removal	No trees, as defined by Section 16.48.030 , shall be removed without first obtaining approval of a soil and vegetation plan and a tree removal permit pursuant to this chapter. Development plans may be required to be modified or changed when necessary to preserve individual trees or groups of trees.	As with the section above, the modification to change the terms to soil and vegetation plan was inadvertently omitted.
16.60.020(W) Definitions	W. "Remove or removal" is the act of removing a tree and associated soil and vegetation within the critical root zone of the tree by digging up, cutting down or any act which causes a tree to die, significantly impacts its natural growing	The definition of "removal" applies only to trees, and is not inclusive of what would constitute removal of soils or other vegetation within an SVPA.

	<p>condition and/or results in diminished environmental benefits or a hazard tree; including but not limited to, damage inflicted on the root system by machinery, storage of materials or soil compaction; changing the ground level in the area of the tree's root system; damage inflicted on the tree permitting infections or infestation; excessive pruning; paving with concrete, asphalt or other impervious material within the critical root zone, or any other action which is deemed harmful to the tree.</p>	
<p>16.60.080(A) Minimum Tree Density Requirement Established.</p>	<p>A. Minimum Tree Density Requirement Established. A minimum tree density of 30 tree units per acre is required on the buildable area of each site, except within the Green Cove Basin (see OMC 16.60.080(5) and in critical areas, see OMC 18.32. The tree density may consist of existing trees, replacement trees or a combination of existing and replacement trees, pursuant to the priority established in Section 16.60.070. For the purpose of calculating required minimum tree density in areas outside of green cove, critical areas, critical area buffers, city rights-of-way and areas to be dedicated as city rights-of-way shall be excluded from the buildable area of the site. For areas within the Green Cove, only City Rights-of-Way and areas to be dedicated as City Rights-of-Way shall be excluded from the buildable area of the site.</p>	<p>With the LID update, this language was adopted to apply to both Green Cove AND the remainder of the City, for purposes of calculating tree density.</p> <p>Original language in 16.54 did not specify what areas were to be excluded from buildable area. Instead, administration required referencing the definition of "buildable area" (16.54.020(B)), which stated "for the purpose of calculating required minimum tree density, existing and newly dedicated city rights of way shall not be included."</p> <p>The Urban Forester had been applying this section of 16.54 to include all critical areas and associated buffers as buildable area for purposes of calculating the project's minimum required tree density. A HEX decision confirmed this interpretation.</p> <p>A project applicant is currently challenging this interpretation, having vested under the old code language. If the intent is to include critical areas for purposes of calculating tree density (which results in a greater number of required tree units), the existing code language needs to be updated to reflect the Green Cove.</p>



Planning Commission

Missing Middle Housing Analysis - Deliberations

Agenda Date: 6/18/2018
Agenda Item Number: 6.B
File Number: 18-0586

Type: decision Version: 1 Status: In Committee

Title

Missing Middle Housing Analysis - Deliberations

Recommended Action

Continue deliberations on the draft Missing Middle staff recommendations. Recommend City Council adopt staff recommendations except #GP-4 (due to Public Works staff's clarification that it is already being implemented), and with #CYA-2b and T&F-1b revised to ensure separate action by Intercity Transit would not change where these provisions apply.

Report

Issue:

Should draft Missing Middle Housing staff recommendations be recommended to City Council for adoption? Which staff recommendations should be discussed further? What additional information is needed by the Commission to develop its recommendation to City Council on this matter? Should revisions or alternative approaches be considered?

Staff Contact:

Leonard Bauer, Deputy Director, Community Planning and Development, 360.753.8206
Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development 360.570.3722

Presenter(s):

Leonard Bauer, Deputy Director, Community Planning and Development

Background and Analysis:

The term 'Missing Middle' refers to a range of multi-unit housing types that are compatible in scale with single-family homes. In other words, they provide 'middle' density housing. There have been relatively few of these types of housing constructed in Olympia (and nationwide) over the past 40 years compared to single-family homes - thus, they are referred to as 'missing.' Some examples of missing middle housing types include tiny houses, modular units, cottage homes, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, small multi-family apartments, and accessory dwelling units.

The Missing Middle Housing Analysis has resulted in 43 staff-recommended revisions to the Olympia

Municipal Code, and a recommendation to develop a methodology for impact fees and general facilities charges (GFCs). The draft recommendations can be found on the Missing Middle web page on the City's website (Attachment 1). Also on the web page is all background information and issue papers considered in making the recommendations.

The recommendations directly implement several policies of the Olympia Comprehensive Plan. There are other policies in the Comprehensive Plan that also address issues directly or indirectly related to this project. The Plan calls for a balance of its goals and policies within context of the entire Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Chapter discusses low-, medium- and high-density neighborhoods. Corresponding zoning districts are defined in OMC 18.59.055.C. The Missing Middle analysis is focused on allowing for an appropriate variety of residential housing types in low-density neighborhoods and the corresponding zoning districts.

The Missing Middle analysis has reviewed existing city regulations - such as zoning, permit fees, development standards, utility connection charges, etc. - for potentially disproportionate effects on the ability to provide for a variety of housing types in the City's low-density (12 units or less per acre), residentially zoned areas.

The Missing Middle web page (Attachment 1) contains detailed information on the review process, public outreach, draft recommendations and Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) issued February 27, 2018, under the State Environmental Policy Act.

At its May 21 meeting, Commissioners completed initial discussion of the 43 Missing Middle staff recommendations. That initial discussion indicated three topic areas for which there was not initial concurrence among Commissioners:

- 1) off-street parking requirements
- 2) permitted uses in specific zoning districts
- 3) limitations on the number of townhouses per building.

While there are also other recommendations for which individual Commissioners expressed initial uncertainty, the Commission agreed to first focus additional discussion on these three areas of non-concurrence.

Townhouse units per building

At its June 4 meeting, Commissioners' further discussion appears to have resulted in general consensus on the staff recommendations related to #3 above.

Permitted uses in zoning districts

Attachment 2 summarizes current and recommended housing types considered as permitted uses in the two primary low-density residential zoning districts, along with current and recommended minimum lot sizes for each. Commissioners requested additional information regarding an alternative to staff recommendations #CYA-2b and T&F-1b that would limit areas within the R4-8

zoning district where triplexes, fourplexes and courtyard apartments would be permitted within 300 feet of existing transit routes. Draft code amendment text for this alternative is included in Attachment 3. Additional information requested by the Commission for this alternative will be provided at the June 18 Commission meeting.

Off-street parking

The Commission did not have sufficient time to discuss this topic at its June 4 meeting. A summary of existing and proposed off-street parking requirements for residential uses is included in Attachment 4 to this staff report, revised as discussed at the May 21 meeting to reflect current application to residential uses not explicitly listed in City codes. Attachment 5 provides a comparison of Olympia's current off-street parking requirements with those of other jurisdictions. The current Olympia off-street parking requirements can be generally summarized as:

- 2 spaces per unit for single-family homes, duplexes, townhomes and manufactured homes
- 1.5 spaces per unit for apartment buildings of three or more units of one bedroom or more
- 1 space per unit for ADUs, cottage housing, studio apartments, and group living facilities

The Missing Middle staff recommendations propose two changes to these requirements: 1) remove the requirement of 1 space per unit for ADUs; and 2) reduce the requirement for single-family houses less than 800 square feet in size to 1 space per unit. An additional recommendation would provide for a potential waiver when ADU's are proposed as garage conversions for single-family houses in which the garage currently serves as one of the two required off-street parking spaces for that house.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

The Missing Middle Housing Analysis has garnered significant community and neighborhood interest. There is a large e-mail list of interested parties, and the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations has had regular briefings and discussions monthly during 2017 and 2018. Staff have provided updates and taken comment at more than fourteen meetings with neighborhood associations and other organizations.

Options:

1. Continue deliberations on the draft Missing Middle staff recommendations.
2. Recommend City Council adopt staff recommendations except #GP-4 (clarified already being implemented) and with #CYA-2b and T&F-1b revised to ensure separate action by Intercity Transit would not change application of these provisions.
3. Recommend City Council adopt staff recommendations as described in Option 2 and with specific additional revisions.
4. Do not recommend adoption of any recommendations regarding Missing Middle housing.

Financial Impact:

The Missing Middle analysis is included as part of the adopted City budget. Draft recommendations may have long-term impacts to property tax revenues and infrastructure expenditures for the City.

Attachments:

Missing Middle web page

Existing and proposed housing types
Alternative code amendment
Existing and proposed off-street parking requirements
Parking comparison with other jurisdictions
Written Public Comment

Permitted Missing Middle Housing Types

	Current Zoning Housing Types Permitted	Missing Middle Recommendations	
		Housing Types Permitted	Minimum Lot Sizes
R4-8	Single-Family Homes Accessory Dwelling Units Manufactured Homes Cottage housing (including Co-housing) Townhouses	Single-Family Homes Accessory Dwelling Units Manufactured Homes Cottage housing (including Co-housing) Townhouses Duplexes Triplexes & Fourplexes (near transit or commercial services) Courtyard Apartments (near transit or commercial services)	4,000 SF NA 4,000 SF 2,000 SF/unit 2,000 SF min./3,000 SF avg. 7,200 SF 9,600 SF & 13,000 SF 17,500 SF
R6-12	Single-Family Homes Accessory Dwelling Units Manufactured Homes Cottage housing (including Co-housing) Townhouses Duplexes Triplexes & Fourplexes (in limited areas)	Single-Family Homes Accessory Dwelling Units Manufactured Homes Cottage housing (including Co-housing) Townhouses Duplexes Triplexes & Fourplexes Courtyard Apartments Single-Room Occupancies	3,500 SF NA 3,500 SF 2,000 SF/unit 1,600 SF min./2,400 SF avg. 6,000 SF 7,200 SF & 9,600 SF 17,500 SF 17,500 SF

Black = Permitted by current zoning.

Blue = Proposed as permitted use.

Planning Commission Proposed Alternative Code Amendment to:**Olympia Municipal Code 18.04.060 Residential districts' use standards****HH. GG. TRIPLEXES, FOURPLEXES, COURTYARD APARTMENTS**

1. Courtyard apartments are permitted in the R 4-8 Zoning District when the site is located within three hundred (300) feet, as measured in a straight line, of a transit route or a commercial zoning district boundary.
2. Courtyard apartments shall be less than two stories when located in the R 4-8 Zoning District.
3. Courtyard apartments are limited to two-story structures when located in the R 6-12 Zoning District.
4. Triplexes, fourplexes, and courtyard apartments in the R 4-8 and R 6-12 Zoning Districts are subject to the Infill and Other Residential Design Review provisions, Chapter 18.175.

Parking Provisions ~ Existing & Proposed

May 24 2018

Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements

Housing Type	Current Requirement	Proposed Requirement
Single Family Residence	2	2
Duplex (per unit)	2	2
Townhouse	2	2
Manufactured Home	2	2

Accessory Dwelling Unit (Up to 800 sq. ft.)	1	0
Tiny House* (Up to 800 sq. ft.)	2	1
Cottage (currently up to 1,600 sq. ft. each; proposed to reduce to 1,250 sq. ft. each)	1.0 <i>(1.5 if on-street parking not available along frontage street)</i>	1.0 <i>(1.5 if on-street parking not available along frontage street)</i>

Triplex & Fourplex (per unit)	1.5	1.5
Courtyard Apartment* (per unit)	1.5	1.5
Single Room Occupancy* (per unit)	1	1

Housing types that provide one to two units per structure typically provide 2 off street parking spaces per unit. Housing types that provide three or more units generally provide 1.5 off street parking spaces per unit. Smaller units or studio apartments generally provide 1 space per unit.

**Tiny Houses, Courtyard Apartments, and SROs are not addressed in the current parking code. The number of stalls shown as "current requirement" is how they would be treated under current provisions.*

Parking Provisions ~ Other Jurisdictions

May 24 2018

Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements, compiled from Missing Middle background issue papers

Jurisdiction/ Off-Street Parking Requirement	Each ADU	Each Cottage Housing Unit	Each Apartment Unit	Each Manufactured Home	SRO (per Bedroom)
Olympia	1	1 (1.5 where on-street parking NA)	1.5	2	1
Tumwater	1	2	1.5 per 1-2 bdrm units; 2 per 3+ bdrm units; + 1 guest space per every ten units	2	1 (plus 2 for operator)
Lacey	1	1 min.; 1.5 max.	1.5	2	1
Bremerton	1	2	≤ 1 bdrms = 1.5; 2 bdrms = 1.75; ≥ 3 bdrms = 2; MF in Center = 1	2	1 (plus 2 additional)
Vancouver, WA	1	1	1.5	1	1
Vancouver, BC	0	<i>Requirements vary by district – includes max. # of spaces</i>			
Seattle <i>Different standards for MF with income criteria</i>	1	1	1/unit or 1/each 2 small efficiency units	1	1 per 4 bedrooms
Portland, OR	0	1 / unit, except Single Room Occupancies exempt and in RH, where it is 0 / 1-3 units and 1 / 2 units for 4+ units			

Parking Provisions ~ Other Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction/Off-Street Parking Requirement	Tiny House (on foundation)	Each Town-house	Each Duplex Unit	Each Triplex Unit	Each Fourplex Unit	Studio Apt
Olympia	2	2	2	1.5	1.5	1
Tumwater	2	2	2	1.5 per 1-2 bdrm units; 2 per 3+ bdrm units; + 1 guest space per every ten units	1.5 per 1-2 bdrm units; 2 per 3+ bdrm units; + 1 guest space per every ten units	1
Lacey	2	2	2	1.5	1.5	
Bremerton	2	2	2	≤ 1 bdrms = 1.5; 2 bdrms = 1.75; ≥ 3 bdrms = 2; MF in Center = 1	≤ 1 bdrms = 1.5; 2 bdrms = 1.75; ≥ 3 bdrms = 2; MF in Center = 1	1
Vancouver, WA		1	1	1.5	1.5	
Vancouver, BC	<i>Requirements vary by district – includes max. # of spaces</i>					
Seattle <i>Different standards for MF with income criteria</i>		1		1/unit or 1/each 2 small efficiency units	1/unit or 1/each 2 small efficiency units	1/unit or 1/each 2 small efficiency units
Portland, OR	1 / unit, except Single Room Occupancies exempt and in RH, where it is 0 / 1-3 units and 1 / 2 units for 4+ units					

Joyce Phillips

From: Leonard Bauer
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 8:22 AM
To: John Tobin; Stacey Ray; Cari Hornbein; Joyce Phillips
Subject: RE: Associating My Comments with the Group

Thank you for the comments, John. They will be provided to the Olympia Planning Commission.

From: John Tobin <jctobin2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 5:39 PM
To: Stacey Ray <sray@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Cari Hornbein <chornbei@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Re: Associating My Comments with the Group

Leonard, Joyce, Stacey, Cari,

Please consider all comments on the Missing Middle Proposal previously submitted to the Planning Commission by me, John Tobin, to also be comments from the group, Olympians for Smart Development & Livable Neighborhoods, of which I am a member.

These would include, but not be limited to, all comments by me contained in material accessible via clickable links as they appear on the city's website at <http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/codes-plans-and-standards/missing-middle.aspx>

See Written Public Comments Provided to Planning Commission.

See Public Comments to Planning Commission received May 7-21, 2018.

Also Public Comments attached to 5-21-18 Planning Commission Agenda.pdf

Thank you for acknowledging my association with this group.

Regards,
 John Tobin

On Mon, Jun 4, 2018 at 12:19 AM, Walt Jorgensen <waltjorgensen@comcast.net> wrote:

Leonard Bauer, FAICP/Deputy Director
 City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
 601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
 360.753-8206 | www.olympiawa.gov

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 | www.olympiawa.gov

Stacey Ray, Senior Planner

City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.753.8046 | www.olympiawa.gov

Cari Hornbein, Senior Planner & SEPA Official for Lead Agency, City of Olympia
Phone: (360) 753-8048
E-Mail: chornbei@ci.olympia.wa.us
City of Olympia | Community Planning and Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967

Leonard, Joyce, Stacey, Cari,

Please consider all comments on the Missing Middle Proposal previously submitted to the Planning Commission by me, Walt Jorgensen, to also be comments from the group, Olympians for Smart Development & Livable Neighborhoods, of which I am a member.

These would include, but not be limited to, all comments by me contained in material accessible via clickable links as they appear on the city's website at <http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/codes-plans-and-standards/missing-middle.aspx>

See [Written Public Comments Provided to Planning Commission](#).

See [Public Comments to Planning Commission received May 7-21, 2018](#).

Also [Public Comments attached to 5-21-18 Planning Commission Agenda.pdf](#)

I would appreciate acknowledgment of receipt of this request and of the association of my comments with the parent group, Olympians for Smart Development & Livable Neighborhoods.

Thank you,

Walter R. Jorgensen
Member, Olympians for Smart Development & Livable Neighborhoods
823 North St SE
Tumwater, WA 98501-3526
waltjorgensen@comcast.net
360-489-0764 (home)
360-819-0678 (cell)

Joyce Phillips

From: CityCouncil
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 8:37 AM
To: Janae Huber
Cc: Connie Cobb; Councilmembers; Jay Burney; Joyce Phillips; Keith Stahley; Kellie Braseth; Leonard Bauer; Steve Hall
Subject: RE: More support for missing middle housing recommendations

Thank you for your comments. I will forward them on to all Councilmembers and appropriate staff.

Susan Grisham, Executive Assistant
City of Olympia | P.O. Box 1967 | Olympia WA 98507
360-753-8244 sgrisham@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Janae Huber <janae.huber@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 5:22 PM
To: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: More support for missing middle housing recommendations

Dear Mayor Selby and Members of City Council -

Whitney Bowerman, a former member of the Eastside Neighborhood Association and neighborhood leader, recently wrote [this letter to the editor](#) about her experience advertising a home for rent. After just three hours and with more than 50 inquires, it was gone.

Whitney's experience is a great illustration of how missing middle implementation can help alleviate these unhealthy market conditions.

Regards,
Janae Huber

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Missing Middle allows citizens to be part of solution

By Whitney Bowerman

Olympia

May 25, 2018 03:10 PM

Recently I advertised a home for rent that my husband and I purchased 10 years ago as a retirement investment. Within three hours of advertising, I had turned off my phone and pulled down the listing, having received over 50 inquiries via phone, text, and email. People shared their stories, advocated for themselves as amazing tenants, and offered to pay higher rent or sign multi-year leases. These are signs of a severely limited housing supply and a broken system.

Olympia's lack of available housing creates an environment where rents continue to increase until more supply is available. We need more inventory to meet the demand caused by population growth, or costs will reach higher levels of unaffordability. We need a variety of housing options that will accommodate a variety of income levels. A quick search on Craigslist will reveal that a duplex or accessory dwelling unit (if you can find one) rents for much cheaper than a single-family home. Our current exclusionary zoning limits our ability to build this diverse housing.

We need to start creating forward-looking solutions, from a variety of angles. Missing Middle housing is one piece of the puzzle, as indicated in the city's Comprehensive Plan. It allows local people to take action and be part of the solution, whether it be building an accessory dwelling unit in a backyard or a duplex on a vacant lot next door. These are small, feasible, neighborhood-scale changes to existing code that can begin to make a difference now.

Read more here: <http://www.theolympian.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article211955709.html#storylink=cpy>

<http://www.theolympian.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article211955709.html>

Joyce Phillips

From: Clay Shentrup <cshentrup@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2018 4:41 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Public comments

Hello,

I'm writing to express my strong support for the missing middle proposal.

My wife and I recently moved here with our four-year-old son, and are expecting a daughter in September. For many years we lived in the San Francisco Bay Area, where we struggled to thrive despite earning "high incomes"—primarily because of housing scarcity. This problem has hit especially hard in West Coast cities like San Francisco and Seattle, two epicenters of technology and the high salaries that accompany that industry.

In an ideal economic system, increased economic growth and density would be widely seen as positive. Increased density reduces total commute distances, and leads to economies of scale in everything from public transit to traffic enforcement. But American cities have done an incredibly poor job of building housing to meet this demand—particularly the kind of dense infill housing that's needed to get people out of their cars, and onto sidewalks, bicycle lanes, buses, and trains. This phenomenon has been widely covered by progressive organizations such as the Sightline Institute, so I won't rehash their verbose findings.

Anecdotally, I've seen an alternative to American sprawl and single-family housing. On our honeymoon, we ventured across Europe and experienced a radically superior model. In Berlin, we were able to walk, bike, or take pervasive underground train lines to virtually any place we wanted to go. Our trip to Prague was aboard a clean and speedy train that came regularly. In spite of having vastly more residents per square mile, Berlin and other EU cities seemed to have *more* (at least more vibrant) parks and recreational amenities. People mingled in public squares. There was such a strong sense of *community*.

We can do this here in America. In Olympia. We can provide ample housing that intrinsically reduces the cost of living for families, and decreases our reliance on cars. We can attract many more residents, to grow our tax base and keep our local businesses thriving and expanding. Keeping housing out of reach for the next generation—and keeping people reliant on the personal automobile while sea levels rise—is not an option.

Regards,
Clay Shentrup
Wildwood

415.295.2529

Joyce Phillips

From: Susan Grisham
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 3:16 PM
To: Connie Cobb; Councilmembers; Jay Burney; Joyce Phillips; Keith Stahley; Kellie Braseth; Leonard Bauer; Steve Hall
Subject: call from citizen re: Missing Middle

I received a call from Mr. Helmuth Endler who lives on Frederick Street. He asked that I share with the Council that he is against any of the Missing Middle proposals.

Joyce Phillips

From: CityCouncil
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 3:25 PM
To: MICHAEL O'NEILL
Cc: Connie Cobb; Councilmembers; Jay Burney; Joyce Phillips; Keith Stahley; Kellie Braseth; Leonard Bauer; Steve Hall
Subject: RE: Rezoning single family neighborhoods

Thank you for your comments. I will forward them on to all Councilmembers and appropriate staff. By way of copy I will ask Senior Planner Joyce Phillips to respond to your questions.

Susan Grisham, Executive Assistant
City of Olympia | P.O. Box 1967 | Olympia WA 98507
360-753-8244 sgrisham@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: MICHAEL O'NEILL <ONEILL2000@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 2:44 PM
To: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Rezoning single family neighborhoods
Importance: High

Would like to see a map of the city affected by this decision and timeline to implement. What are the people's options in regard to disapproval? Citizen of Olympia since 1951. Please respond as quickly as possible.

Michael O'Neill
360-464-5143

Joyce Phillips

From: CityCouncil
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 3:34 PM
To: Dani Madrone
Cc: Connie Cobb; Councilmembers; Jay Burney; Joyce Phillips; Keith Stahley; Kellie Braseth; Leonard Bauer; Steve Hall
Subject: RE: More Missing Middle support!

Thank you for your comments. I will forward them on to all Councilmembers and appropriate staff.

Susan Grisham, Executive Assistant
 City of Olympia | P.O. Box 1967 | Olympia WA 98507
 360-753-8244 sgrisham@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Dani Madrone <danimadrone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 3:30 PM
To: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: More Missing Middle support!

Hello Council,

Below is another letter to the editor in support of Missing Middle housing. I appreciate the point that Jim raises about property rights.

Best,
 Dani Madrone

<http://www.theolympian.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article211960639.html>

The Missing Middle is the best use of space

BY JIM BURLINGAME
Olympia
 May 26, 2018 04:07 PM

In my book “Building Ghosts: A Month of Empty Commercial Properties in a Capital City, and the History that Haunts Them,” I use the metaphor of a phantom palace to describe not just the columns of the hidden past that rise invisibly around us, but also the wasted potential present and future uses of the places we pass by every day. This is true of the residential parts of town, too. The Missing Middle proposals would go a long way towards remedying this.

It would be a shame to let the spaces in between single-family homes (and above garages, etc) continue to go to waste, when they could be used to house not just the many incoming Olympia residents, but also those already here who don't have enough housing options.

There is a third rail in the discussion of the Missing Middle that's in the shadows, yet powers opposition to the plan: property rights. However, in the inverse of its usual manifestation, here people are objecting to how their neighbors might make use of their own property. Not only do their neighbors have the right to make the most pragmatic use of their land and structures, but we also, as a society, have a vested interest in encouraging the best use of all the infrastructure across this fine city we share.

I hope the city of Olympia adopts the Missing Middle proposals, and we see more vibrant humanity where once there were simply ghostly empty spots.

Joyce Phillips

From: Pandora Touart <aptouart@netzero.net>
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2018 4:06 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: density

First, I understand the need to plan for growth as Puget Sound mimics the Bay Area. But the reality on the ground is often different from the lovely photos on the website.

After 25 years I just left Ballard, Seattle's fastest growing, densest neighborhood. Flee is more like it.

What we witnessed is that once developers get a foothold without stringent guidelines, scores of ugly, cheap and fast to build units go up. They bear no relationship to the neighborhood housing stock, they quickly eliminate neighborhood character, and 3 story town homes and row houses loom over single family whose occupants feel "raped." Then they sell, opening the door for more ugly.

Design review is very limited and it's hard to change designs. Look at the orange out of character structure on eastside. Pretty out of sync with the neighborhood.

Developers have no reason to consider character, the future of how these will look or much besides making a buck. There are exceptions but this housing boom brings out the quick and dirty worst.

I certainly hope the council and planners will look to see where other cities (Portland?) have managed to build and grow without sacrificing the quality and character of the neighborhoods. Olympia is too good to destroy.

Sincerely,
Pandora Touart

We Say Goodbye To Lara Spencer

risingstarnewspaper.com

<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3242/5b1b0bef19ec2bee4d6est02vuc>

Sponsored Links

Joyce Phillips

From: Michelle Burke <realtor.mburke@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2018 10:49 PM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Tiny house excitement ...with missing middle

To Whom it may Concern,

I am a North East Neighborhood home owner with a double lot in Olympia. We bought our home in this neighborhood because of its walk ability to down town. Being a home owner I am very interested in having the freedom and flexibility to be able to build and park a tiny home on our extra large lot.

I believe tiny house movement is important, it has a very low impact on neighborhoods, water, heating, building foot print.

Together my husband and I have 6 children and we want to be able to share with them the idea of building their own home and they could do that here on our big lot.

Maybe Missing Middle should have a few different categories and not put every one in the same general plan. How about if you have a certain size lot you can have an additional tiny home to accompany the house. But having a time frame with the building of the house.

People will be moving here, we need to be wise about growth, I believe less is more and that missing middle is an important step to housing in Olympia.

Thanks for your consideration.

--
Michelle Burke

Joyce Phillips

From: Carol <carol@reachone.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 10, 2018 10:02 AM
To: missingmiddle
Subject: Missing middle housing

There is a great need for affordable housing. As a senior, I know friends being forced out of mobile homes, houses and apartments when they change hands. As they search for safe, affordable housing, they find prices more than doubled. ADUs and tiny houses in existing, safe neighborhoods could provide much needed relief. There are often sidewalks, bus stops, shopping, and social organizations nearby. I support expanded opportunities for this type of housing.

Also, in the historic neighborhood of South Capitol in which I live, many of the large houses were converted into duplex, triplex, fourplex and even small apartment units in the 70s or 80s. We've been here for more than 30 years and know these smaller units don't stand vacant. They're close to the Capitol and other amenities. I'd rather see them rented than seeing lobbyists continue to buy up the houses in this neighborhood where they stand vacant while increasing numbers of individuals and families move farther out to find housing. This decreases diversity and increases costs in terms of commuting, financially, socially and environmentally.

One other problem with homelessness that is rarely brought up is the reticence to rent to individuals with criminal backgrounds. These individuals often wind up homeless and more likely to recidivate. The new law should help, but having upfront fees exacerbated the problem of getting into housing for them as well as others seeking housing.

Helping individuals with money for first, last and damage fees could help some folks get into housing they could afford, but they don't have the upfront money to move in. Sliding scale payments over time to repay some or all the amount for fees could be very helpful. In some cases, no repayment need be made.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in.

Carol Welch

Sent from my iPhone