

From: [Cynthia S.](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: ["Jean Borden"; "jerry berebitsky"; kyleleadon@hotmail.com; EMScholtz@comcast.net; sjohnski@comcast.net](#)
Subject: Comment - Housing Options
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 8:09:22 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

May 20, 2020

Council Members,

It is irresponsible of the City of Olympia to hold meetings on housing density during the COVID-19 pandemic, and doubly so while we are sheltering in place. The current structure of the process and situation does not allow for a transparent, free or open discussion to take place.

There is no justification for proceeding during the pandemic to address a topic with such significance. The density outcome is one that will affect us for the rest of our lives in Olympia. Therefore, I kindly request that the Council wait until the pandemic has passed in order to be fair to the public. Currently the attention of too many people is being drawn away from this matter to address hospital costs, death, food, jobs, income, expenses, schooling, etc., as well as daily health practices.

For the foresaid reasons, I strongly request the City of Olympia to delay the Housing Options part of the process as well as any other parts of the process that address density in Olympia until the COVID-19 pandemic is over.

Please add me to your housing options mailing list as well as any others that address the Missing Middle and housing density.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Stonick
3418 Donnelly Dr SE
Olympia, WA 98501

From: [Joel Carlson](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Affordable Thurston condos in a green urban village setting for under \$250,000!
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 1:43:42 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Home ownership is one of the best ways people build equity and move into the middle class. If people are stuck with rentals they could be evicted and become homeless. Affordable condos are being close in to Seattle for \$250,000 so they could be built for less in Thurston County, see <https://www.bizjournals.com/seattle/news/2018/05/16/condos-in-seattle-build-urban-affordability.html> . These condos need parks, plazas, trails, transportation, shopping, great walk-ability, etc. Let's get it done!

Thanks, Joel Carson, 3634 Loren St NE, Lacey, WA 98516

From: [Thad Curtz](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Neighborhood scale and character
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 8:29:55 PM
Attachments: [Ballard.png](#)

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Planning Commission:

This is what a four-plex in harmony with my neighborhood's scale and character would look like:



Not this:



These are about four blocks away from each other, on the same street in Ballard, which my wife and I happen to walk up and back on once a week, getting from the bus stop to my daughter's house.

Best wishes,
Thad Curtz

113 17th Ave SE
Olympia 98501

From: [marti walker](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: SEPA DNS for the Housing Options proposal, 20-0994, HB 1923 and HB 2343.
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2020 1:44:37 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Please accept this email as my official comments on the SEPA DNS for the Housing Options proposal, 20-0994, HB 1923 and HB 2343.

I am opposed to WA state laws HB1923 (passed in 2019) and HB 2343 (passed in 2020). Taking away citizens rights to address grievances as HB1923 and HB4323 has done, is a violation of Constitutional rights.

The City has issued through the "Housing Options Plan" a SEPA Determination of Non-significance; this is wrong. This SEPA determination of non-significance flies in the face of logic and known science. The development proposed by the city will:

1. Increase emissions and traffic in the city
2. Increase run off into Puget Sound and into fragile creeks and streams which will impact salmon restoration and other wildlife
3. Increase energy consumption
4. Increase the potential for flooding in our neighborhoods
5. Increase water into the already overwhelmed sewer system
6. Reduce the number of trees and green space, thus impacting migrating songbirds, and other species
7. Increase impacts on emergency services, schools, and health care
8. Increase taxes making Olympia unaffordable to many
9. Decrease sunlight by allowing buildings inconsistent with single story housing, casting shadows over neighbor's yards
10. Ruin the character of Olympia historic neighborhoods.
11. Increase light and glare at night due to additional street and housing lighting
12. Destroy single family neighborhoods
13. Increase taxes due to unmet infrastructure needs.

This unrestricted development will make Olympia as unlivable and unaffordable as Portland and Seattle. This unchecked, unprecedented growth in an area with a fragile ecosystem where city services and utility infrastructures are already overburdened will cause significant damage. The potential for environmental degradation as well as negatively impacting the livability of neighborhoods exists in these housing proposals as well as having a disproportional impact on lower income Olympians.

Regarding ADUs, it is disingenuous not to count additional ADUs as living units in

overall density. There should be at least one onsite parking space for each ADU to avoid overwhelming many of the already overcrowded streets in Olympia's neighborhoods. The owner should be required to live in the existing primary dwelling or the ADU. ADUs should not be split from the original lot and sold separately.

The Governor has issued a (second) proclamation of the Open Public Meetings Act. In it he states;

"Subject to the conditions for conducting any meeting as required above [meeting remotely], agencies are further prohibited from taking 'action,' as defined in RCW 42.30.020, unless those matters are necessary and routine matters or are matters necessary to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak and the current public health emergency, until such time as regular public participation under the Open Public Meetings Act is possible."

With the vast majority of Olympia citizens isolated and preoccupied by a historical pandemic the city council should postpone any decisions regarding the Housing Options proposal until such time as regular public participation under the Open Public Meetings Act is possible.

I am an advocate for increased density and affordable housing options in our city. I am not in support of the city's strategy for giving a green light on unbridled development and a great give away to developers.

Sincerely,

Martha Walker
619 Central SE
Olympia, WA 98501

From: [ROBERT VADAS](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Re: Written comment for June 15 mtg. (P.S.)
Date: Thursday, June 11, 2020 10:31:52 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

P.S. I must add that to stop the continuing exodus of apartment dwellers to (a) rent rooms in private homes or (b) live in surrounding forests, the Council needs to impose some sort of rent-control ceiling. When I was an Oly. apartment dweller a few yrs. ago, rent increases occurred every yr. that really stressed out my poorer, disabled neighbors. Such businesses also collectively ignored health & safety concerns like anti-mold protection (rather than 1-paned windows above heaters), replacement of rotting wood, & proactive hill safety for pedestrians & cyclists (via early-morning sanding, before people go to work in winter). New high-density dwellings would eventually experience the same problems w/o better regulations.

W/o rent control, new high-density dwellings will mostly become occupied by rich Central Sound transplants. Indeed, I once had "sticker shock" when my then-girlfriend & I tried to rent a duplex near downtown Oly., which was less economical than buying a small house nearby. Moreover, such shared dwellings don't typically incorporate progressive technology like solar panels or eco-gardens, which I couldn't enjoy until I bought my own home in E. Oly. Too much focus on high-density units also would put us at higher risk of pandemic spread, as the Central Sound is now experiencing.

The American dream is to own our own homes, which I've finally achieved along a bus route that allows me to commute to work by bus or bicycle, thus reducing smog & greenhouse gases. So why did a market-rate, high-density development next to me just get approved to have 2-car garages? Not very "eco" or attuned to public transit. The greater traffic congestion will likely make it more difficult for me to cross the road on foot or by bicycle, which is already a challenge. And our house taxes will rise in the process, which my poorer neighbors might have trouble affording. Let's not turn Oly. into Surrey, BC (aptly nicknamed "Slurry"), where my son lives & has personally witnessed the increased gang activity (which Oly. used to suffer from, too).

In sum, I hope that the Council rethinks its "Missing Middle" policy that hasn't pass GMA muster, esp. in this time of growing climate-change & pandemic concerns. As an ecologist who understands density dependence, I doubt that COVID-19 will be the last pandemic that we'll see in our lifetimes.

Dear Oly. Housing Options;

A big source of stress is the Oly. City Council's continued favoring of rich Central Sound people over its homegrown citizens in the face of climate-change & COVID-19 stresses (see <http://www.densitydoneright.org/media-spots.php>). Now is NOT the time for gentrification (including for our senior citizens), ignoring (muzzling) citizen concerns, alienation of the poor (often minorities), & favoring of the rich, which our incompetent Commander in Chief is already doing on a massive scale. Council subsidies should go to low-income, NOT market-rate housing, the latter of which (a) can take care of itself, (b) isn't adaptive now given the pandemic (which is worse in the Central Sound than here), & (c) isn't

consistent w/ the Council's recent vote to address climate change better in its decisions.

Sincerely,

Bob Vadas, Jr.
Aquatic ecologist, Ph.D.

Christie Masterson
1442 37th Ave. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

June 10, 2020

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Please consider the following comments on the "Infill and Other Residential" design standards.

Section 18.175.050 Windows

Throughout the documents there seems to be a preference for a certain type of architecture and Item #2 requiring multiple-pane windows is evidence of that. There are neighborhoods in Olympia that have designs featuring large windows, such as mid-century modern. Requiring a multiple-pane window would put the new structure out of character with the original neighborhood. I recommend that Item #2 be removed and the sentiment incorporated as an example with #1, such as:

"Use window patterns, proportions, and orientation consistent with neighboring residences, such as multiple-paned windows."

Section 18.175.100 Cottage Housing

The Figure 18.175.100 with this section illustrates a shortfall of the design standard. There is no limit to the amount of impervious surface as a percent of the lot. It also appears that the impervious surface takes up a lot more surface space than the housing structures themselves. Specific language to limit impervious surfaces should be added, either as a percent of the lot or a percent of the housing structures. In the example, all the neighbors on all three sides will see is driveway. The impervious surface on all three sides could cause flooding toward the existing structures, not to mention heat reflection. The figure had some nice trees illustrated. If vegetation near the property lines and public right-of-way is required, this should be specified. As written, there is no prohibition to structures or driveways abutting adjacent properties nor is there any requirement for landscaping.

Thank you for considering these changes.

Sincerely,

Christie Masterson

From: [Davenport Moore](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: more housing Trac 105
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2020 2:51:15 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Planning-

More housing in Olympia depends on the political will to make it happen. Planning and the City Council must take a stand to dis-allow sectors of our municipality to be protected from serving the greater good with more housing stock for renters and homeowners who are diverse socio-economically.

I support in-filling, courtyard, duplex, triplex, fourplex, multifamily and ADUs in all areas of the City. Incentives for private developers, preapproved ADU and other housing designs to reduce costs and putting the burden of infrastructure impact on those who get tax exemptions for larger development.

Susan Davenport
Westside
360-970-6302

From: [Alice Zillah](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: I support housing density
Date: Saturday, June 13, 2020 6:55:31 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear members of the Planning Commission,

As a 26-year resident of Olympia, I very much support more housing in existing neighborhoods. This includes duplexes, triplexes, ADUs, and courtyard apartments. I live in the Wildwood neighborhood, and on my street our home is directly across from three duplex units. We have owned our house and lived here for 19 years, and value the diversity of people who live in our neighborhood.

There's no excuse for single family home neighborhoods any more. Our environment and city services can't support them, and they do a disservice to the diversity that Olympians say they want.

Thank you for hearing my input.

Alice Zillah
2616 Otis St SE
Olympia, WA
98501

From: [Edible Forest Gardens EFG](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: edibleforestgardens@gmail.com
Subject: Support for your work on Housing Options
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 1:59:27 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

I am very supportive of your work on housing options. I was quite engaged in the Missing Middle process - I attended every meeting, citizens work group, Planning Commission meeting and hearing and was impressed by the City's work on it. I continue to support it and thank you for the legal challenge you are doing to see Missing Middle come to fruition - keep it up!

I am advocating for seniors - I'm 74, on social security. During the Missing Middle process I provided much detail and statistics that I hope you continue to refer to. The housing crisis for seniors has only worsened. Housing prices continue to rise.

The housing options you are proposing are good for seniors. ADUs are excellent as young families can have their parents or other seniors in their yard. Seniors get to be with their grandkids. Seniors paying a modest rent can help younger people afford their mortgage. Seniors can afford the rent.

Cottage housing is a good option as seniors can live together in the cottages, age in place and share caretakers when needed.

Duplexes are great since the owner can be in one side and seniors in the other at affordable rates, while helping the owner pay their mortgage and be a successful homeowner.

Triplexes and other multi-family units are affordable and comfortable for seniors.

Seniors can be in the neighborhood of their choice, near friends and family.

Greater housing options in neighborhoods offer more enjoyable living. Single family only neighborhoods are out of possibility for us. We're past that stage of life.

Housing options throughout neighborhoods also encourage diversity because blacks, Indians and People of Color can afford about what we can afford. Vitality increases.

Single family neighborhoods end up maybe 80% white - yes, in Olympia. Redlining is not good. It was designed to keep blacks and people of color out of the way of whites. It's way past time for that to end.

So, yes, keep up the good work and I will be with you all the way to our good endings!

Thanks,

Pat Rasmussen

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Amy Boos](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: requirements for ADUs and shops
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 2:04:53 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Planning Commission members,

I am a homeowner in Olympia and have a single family home on a double lot on the west side. My partner and I are planning to build a shop, and potentially an ADU on the property. We want to maximize the lot's potential, and also have options to create more living space in the future, whether for relatives, or as potential income when we retire.

The cost of building in Olympia is outrageous. It's not hard to see why people move out to the county when they need more affordable living. We love the city of Olympia, and all it offers, and cannot bring ourselves to abandon it. We are hopeful for changes to these restrictions that will benefit people like us. Specifically, the size and height requirements are much too restrictive.

I own a tall camper van that I want to be able to park, and work on, indoors, and also have the option to build a livable space above it. The current restrictions make this impossible.

Please consider easing these restrictions, and help working class people create more value in their property.

Thanks for considering my request.

Amy Boos
For the "Missing Middle"

From: [Pandora Touart](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: ADUs, and additional housing options comments
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 4:29:56 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

ADU's Olympia has a street parking problem already. A 1,000 SF ADU can accommodate 2 people> With limited to no residential transit and intermittent sidewalks, two cars per ADU are likely. Increased street congestion are very likely to result from eliminating a parking requirement! There should be a requirement for one parking space for each 500 SF of ADU housing.

Eliminating the on-site ownership requirement opens this up for a can of worms; AirB&B and more.

Sidewalks need to required for new construction. At a MINIMUM in five blocks for new construction near a school. Kids are constantly in the street where we live near Oly HS and it is not acceptable.

Duplex, triplex option: ALL construction including overhangs, stairs, and clerestories HAVE to be included in the total allowable SF – developers will add them in and go higher and wider.

WHAT are the height limits for triplexes?

WHAT is the design review for Established (not historical) neighborhoods?
Neighbors need to be alerted to new construction and allowed to comment on design.

Thank you, Pandora Touart

From: [John Gear](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Comments on new design standards
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 5:18:55 PM

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

I write to offer comments on the new proposed design standards for ADUs, duplexes and triplexes, and courtyard apartments:

1) We need to remove the arbitrary cap on ADU sizes and instead allow for bigger ADUs, up to 1600 ft² for a two-story ADU.

2) We need to get rid of the off-street parking minimum requirements for duplexes, triplexes, and courtyard apartments and let the market sort out how to allocate parking. Trying to build affordable housing but requiring minimum off-street parking — regardless of access to transit and walkability — is just another form of economic zoning that undermines the effort to provide more affordable housing options.

Until the end of the emergency caused by homelessness, all off-street parking minimums should be waived as an emergency response measure, which would allow significantly more housing for people.

We need to put the needs of actual humans over the needs of cars. Let the market work out the proper balance between habitation for people and parking for cars.

Cordially,
John Gear
Olympia, Washington

Begin forwarded message:

From: Olympians for People-Oriented Places <opopnow@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: June 15, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting
Date: 14June2020 at 15:28:45 PDT
To: undisclosed-recipients;

**All housing types described
below are subject to: design
review, set backs, stormwater**

regulations, tree protections, impervious surface percentages, etc.

Accessory Dwelling Units

- Eliminate the off street parking requirement.
- Eliminate the requirement that property owners live on site.
- Eliminate language that says the ADU can be no greater than $\frac{2}{3}$ the size of the primary dwelling.
- Cap size at 800 sq feet (same as current rules).
- Increase the height limit for a detached ADU from 17 to 24 ft.
- Attached ADUs have same

limit as the main dwelling,
two stories.

- ADU can be attached to an accessory structure like a garage and the ADU portion can be up to 800 sq ft.

Duplexes

- Allow duplexes on corner lots in all zoning districts that allow single family homes.
- Clarify that duplexes require 4 total parking spaces.
- Allow duplexes in zoning districts Residential (R)4, R4-8, and R6-12.

Triplexes

- Allow triplexes throughout

R6-12 zones. They are currently allowed only in some parts of R-16 zones.

- Clarify that they may only be two stories. They are currently allowed to be three.
- Require 5 total off street parking spaces per triplex.

Courtyard Apartments

- Define courtyard apartments. They are currently not defined in Olympia's municipal code.
- Allow courtyard apartments in R6-12 zones.
- Require 1.5 off street parking spaces per unit.