

From: [Allen Buckner](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Missing middle
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 8:00:48 AM

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 don't give away the character and "feel" of our town and neighborhoods to developers for a short sighted answer to a housing "problem". My wife and I saved for years and bought a small, modest sized home that we are proud of and in a neighborhood that's full of families that care for their homes. It's not easy to save money and to be disciplined for years and to make sacrifices for a goal, but it's part of becoming a member of a community and taking ownership of something valuable. I support helping people who are willing to work and make sacrifices to reach a goal, but I can't support opening the doors for developers to buy the marginally affordable housing the startup families could afford.

The missing middle might have its heart in the right place, but giving away our community for developer's profits is short sighted and will only grow the middle with time. In effect, this will help drive the working class out of town completely.

Thanks,
Allen Buckner
1039 Cardigan Loop NW
Olympia, WA 98502

From: [Bob Jorgenson](#)
To: [Carole Richmond](#); [Kento Azegami](#); [Rad Cunningham](#); [Tammy Adams](#); [Travis Burns](#); [Paula Ehlers](#); [Candi Millar](#); [Stacey Ray](#); [Joyce Phillips](#); [JUDITH BARDIN](#); [Walt Jorgensen](#); [Torguson, Beverly](#)
Subject: Direct Mail-Public Notice/Kento Azegami?/Planning Commission Meeting 1/27/2020
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 12:11:16 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.jpg](#)
[city_of_oly_mailers.jpg](#)

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,

At the planning commission meeting Kento Azegami posed the question about direct mail as it relates to the Housing Options Code Amendments and public notice. I wanted make you aware that the city does have the ability and is currently mailing to property owners, residents, current residents and utility customers. Below you will notice addressee's as "RESIDENT" and "CURRENT RESIDENT" on previous mailers by Public Works Department. These were not sent to those who's name is on a utility bill but physical addresses for those using city water. There were 15,736 notices sent to Olympia water customers to inform them of a change in the PH for city water. If there is an interest in notifying Olympia residents of the proposed zoning changes this should not be a problem.

Thanks for your time,

Bob Jorgenson

From: outlook_42AB9574166072C5@outlook.com
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Housing Options - all good
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 9:56:16 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Hello,

I'd like to write in support of all three ideas for increasing density.

My particular interest would be to create a 2 story ADU from what is now a garage. I live in an area with strong demand for housing for teachers. .

Callie Wilson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Christa Lenssen](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: code changes
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:38:04 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.

Hello,

I'm writing to voice support for increased housing density through the proposed zoning changes to allow duplexes, ADUs, and duplexes, triplexes, and courtyard apartments. I work in the City of Olympia and have been a City of Olympia resident for 24 of my 34 years. Our community is facing a shortage of housing, in general, and particularly more affordable housing options. I currently live in a ADU about a block inside the border of Tumwater and Olympia. It is scarcely visible from the street and I don't believe there is any negative impact whatsoever on my surrounding neighbors. The next street over is all duplexes. It still feels like a neighborhood, where we walk our dogs, play in the park nearby, and live our daily lives. In the midst of the current housing crisis, it is not just prudent to plan for the future, it is essential we act now to address the housing shortage and create more affordable options.

Thank you,
Christa Lenssen

From: [Christie & John Masterson](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: RE: City of Olympia - Proposed Housing Options Code Amendments
Date: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 1:12:00 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.

Thank you for sending me this information.

As I understand it, the Council has directed the Planning Commission to recommend at least two of these options. I don't have any real concerns about the ADU option. However, I have concerns about both of the other options.

Allowing duplexes on every corner lot in the city is interesting. Would there be design limitations so that the houses appeared to be single family on the street front? It's an interesting idea, but would definitely need design review requirements in order to maintain the character of current neighborhoods.

My least favorite is the third option. It sounds like this can be approved zone by zone, not necessarily by type of zone. Due to the large size of some of the zones, I don't believe that multifamily rental units would be in the best interest of our citizens. Although the current wording wouldn't require these uses in each zone, it sounds very much like one of the problematic issues in the Missing Middle proposal. If I was on the Planning Commission, I would not vote for this proposal.

I'm sorry that I have conflicts on both of the Info Sessions on this proposal.

Sincerely,
Christie Masterson

From: Housing Option Code Amendments [mailto:housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us]
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 2:31 PM
Subject: City of Olympia - Proposed Housing Options Code Amendments

You are receiving this email as a “party of record” for the Missing Middle Infill Housing proposal.

The City of Olympia is considering amendments to the zoning code regarding housing types allowed in residential areas. These potential amendments are not specifically related to the Missing Middle Infill Housing Ordinance but are of a similar enough nature that we wanted to bring it to your attention and offer an opportunity for you to request becoming a “party of record” for these Housing Options Code Amendments.

What options are included in the Housing Options Code Amendments?

Late in 2019 the City Council made a referral to the Planning Commission. The Council identified three options to increase residential building capacity in Olympia, as provided for in the recently amended Washington State Growth Management Act. The Council directed the Planning Commission to develop an ordinance to implement two or three of the following options, as summarized:

- Allow duplexes on corners lot in most zoning districts
- Allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) with certain requirements and potential discretionary options
- Allow a duplex, triplex, or courtyard apartment on each parcel in one or more zoning districts that permit single-family residences (unless the city documents a specific constraint that would make this unfeasible for a particular parcel)

How can I learn more about it?

Information is available on the City's website at olympiawa.gov/housingcode.

Updates on this proposal and other planning efforts will be provided periodically to subscribers of the City's "Planning & Development" E-Newsletter. To subscribe to this or other City E-Newsletters, please visit olympiawa.gov/subscribe.

How can I become a party of record for this proposal?

Send an email to housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us or call 360.753.8314 to be added to the parties of record for this proposal. Parties of Record will receive a notice before the Public Hearing is held.



WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

2/4/20

Written Public Comment to the Olympia City Council

You may use this form or any sheet of paper to submit written comments to the Olympia City Council. Turn in your comments at the security/information desk in the City Hall lobby or at the staff table in the Council Chambers.

Other ways to comment in writing:

- By Mail: Olympia City Council, PO Box 1967, Olympia, WA 98507-1967
- Email: citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us

cc: COUNCIL
JAY
KEITH
KELVE
LEONARD
CARY R

Once submitted, the information and comments on this form public record and subject to release.

PLEASE PRINT or WRITE CLEARLY

NAME: COLLEEN BRADFORD

ADDRESS: PO BOX 2474

ZIP CODE: 98507

E-MAIL: c_brad@comcast.net

COMMENTS: See attached

Colleen Bradford

Eastside Neighborhood

Olympia WA

February 4, 2020 City Council Meeting *Comments*

(360) 970-8634

c-brad@comcast.net

First I want to thank all of you for opposing any change to the current rural residential zoning of the Rocky Prairie/Maytown site in the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan. I, along with many others, do not want to lose this important Prairie to commercial development and use.

Next, I want to comment on items 4.G. and 4.J. of your Agenda in which you have approved or will be approving Resolutions authorizing a Multifamily Housing Tax Agreement between the City and The Easterly LLC and the 3rd Generation Group 2 LLC. My biggest fear about these and other exemptions you are granting is the loss of tax revenue over an eight-year period of time and the probability that you will pass the liability on to property owners. If this happens not only will property and home owners have to take on an additional financial burden but renters will feel the pain as well. If landlords end up paying more in property taxes they will surely pass this cost on to their renters through rent increases.

The last thing I'd like to cover is the ongoing concern that many people have regarding communication from the City to its residents about the Missing Middle issue. I feel that over the past two years outreach has been limited and information is still somewhat difficult to find on your website, such as how to sign up as a Party of Record for the Housing Options Code Amendments.

I did recently become a Party of Record for the Housing Options Code Amendments to receive periodic e-mail with updates on the topic so this should help me keep up to date. I was not able to find this resource on your website but had received information through an e-mail from a friend. I did more easily find and sign up on Engage Olympia to receive surveys, provide ideas, and give feedback, etc., because this portal is highlighted on your main web page.

However, I still think there needs to be more direct and widespread outreach on a topic that will affect so many people. It appears that your previous outreach focused mostly on neighborhood associations, Master Builders, and other groups such as South Sound Senior Services, OPOP, etc. Not everyone belongs to these groups or receives information from them or is able to attend City Council meetings.

Like the letters and notices you sent out to residents about glass recycling, picking up Christmas trees, and the 976 Initiative, the same could be done to more fully educate the public in advance about issues that will have widespread impacts on everyone who resides in Olympia.

From: [CityCouncil](#)
To: [Daniel Cole](#)
Cc: [Connie Cobb](#); [Councilmembers](#); [Jay Burney](#); [Joyce Phillips](#); [Keith Stahley](#); [Kellie Braseth](#); [Leonard Bauer](#)
Subject: RE: Letter to The Mayor and City Council - parking considerations
Date: Monday, February 10, 2020 11:04:26 AM

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

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

[Sign up for a City of Olympia Newsletter](#)

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Daniel Cole <coledaniel@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 08, 2020 7:03 AM
To: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Cheryl Selby <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Paula Ehlers <pehlers@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Travis Burns <tburns@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Carole Richmond <crichmon@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Tammy Adams <tadams@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Rad Cunningham <rcunning@ci.olympia.wa.us>; JBaxter@ci.olympia.wa.us; Candi Millar <cmillar@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Kento Azegami <kazegami@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Jessica Blöse <jblose@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Letter to The Mayor and City Council - parking considerations

External Email Alert!

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

If you still believe that changing the zoning without considering parking isn't an issue, see the Seattle Times article:

<https://www.seattletimes.com/business/real-estate/a-tower-of-luxury-condos-with-almost-no-parking-this-experiment-seems-to-be-failing>

It won't be long before our streets are so congested with streetside parking that the ordinary functions of street cleaning, mail delivery and garbage collection can't happen. Package delivery is becoming more prevalent and those vans will be blocking the roadways. While rare, important emergency services will find it difficult to negotiate congested streets. Parking in Seattle's Wallingford district and Capital Hill are great examples of the future you are providing.

You need to reconsider your plans and the impact on the infrastructure of the city. Without a

comprehensive mass transit system people need their cars. We will need to have cars to travel for recreation, family, jobs, schools and shopping until there is a transportation system more like those in the major cities of the US and Europe. You need to keep the requirement that citizens park their cars on their property.

Daniel Cole

From: [Deane Shellman](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: I support Missing Middle and density
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 11:45:25 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Thank you for the work you're doing to provide housing options for Olympia. I fully support this work and the move towards density and away from single-family homes only in our neighborhoods. I cheered when a duplex recently went up in an empty lot on my street and look forward to seeing more diversity in the future. My family lives in a single family home, but I know this option may well be out of reach for my daughters and that they will require affordable, secure housing near jobs, public transport, and conveniences. I understand that the opposition to this work is fierce and organized - but I believe there are many more who support you.

Thank you, again.

Deane Shellman
NE neighborhood

From: [LN LN](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: yes, sign me up pls read.
Date: Monday, January 27, 2020 4:56:48 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.

Hello

Ok great... you signed me up. However, how about the tens of thousands of other people who do not know anything about this?

I am appalled that the city allows nightly rentals for homes, ADUs and or single rooms? Why not START with NOT allowing that and see how many more units you will get. There are many of them, this should not be allowed nightly rentals in residential areas.

I have put well over 100K into my home. If this happens to the south side of me I will be forced to sell and move! I will get no light whatsoever. You lose 11% when you sell. Maybe a very small fraction of what I put into my house/property will I ever get out. The rest I will not.

I can't believe the city thinks this is just fine! For every percentage of light you lose the builders who are building on each lot should at a minimum reimburse you tons . This is NOT democracy. So the city emails the few people signed up? You mail out things about recycling glass or x mas trees but do not a do an major all out city notification making sure everyone knows about this?

The planning commission and city council are incorrectly saying to people (because someone is either paid by developers or is believing the BS they say) that bldg. more units lowers the price? Really? In seattle prices went up in 5 years either double or some areas tripled and they are building units faster in Seattle than possibly any other city in the US! SF, CA or any big city LA, SD they keep adding tons and tons and prices keep going thru the roof! This is wanted by developers and real estate people!

So insane and so undemocratic. A few people on the planning commission and/or city council are deciding for the lives of all the residents for now and all time!

Ellen Dorfman and

Shayne Geiger and Craig Geiger

From: Housing Option Code Amendments <housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 4:41 PM
To: LN LN <gingerdog@live.com>
Subject: RE: yes keep me on this email list

Thank you for your email. You have been added as a party of record for the Housing Options Code Amendments and will receive periodic email with updates on the topic.

Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner

360.570.3722

From: LN LN <gingerdog@live.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 4:02 PM
To: Housing Option Code Amendments <housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Housing Option Code Amendments <housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: yes keep me on this email list

External Email Alert!

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

From: Housing Option Code Amendments <housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 2:31 PM
Subject: City of Olympia - Proposed Housing Options Code Amendments

You are receiving this email as a “party of record” for the Missing Middle Infill Housing proposal.

The City of Olympia is considering amendments to the zoning code regarding housing types allowed in residential areas. These potential amendments are not specifically related to the Missing Middle Infill Housing Ordinance but are of a similar enough nature that we wanted to bring it to your attention and offer an opportunity for you to request becoming a “party of record” for these Housing Options Code Amendments.

What options are included in the Housing Options Code Amendments?

Late in 2019 the City Council made a referral to the Planning Commission. The Council identified three options to increase residential building capacity in Olympia, as provided for in the recently amended Washington State Growth Management Act. The Council directed the Planning Commission to develop an ordinance to implement two or three of the following options, as summarized:

- Allow duplexes on corners lot in most zoning districts
- Allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) with certain requirements and potential discretionary options
- Allow a duplex, triplex, or courtyard apartment on each parcel in one or more zoning districts that permit single-family residences (unless the city documents a specific constraint that would make this unfeasible for a particular parcel)

How can I learn more about it?

Information is available on the City's website at olympiawa.gov/housingcode.

Updates on this proposal and other planning efforts will be provided periodically to subscribers of the City's "Planning & Development" E-Newsletter. To subscribe to this or other City E-Newsletters, please visit olympiawa.gov/subscribe.

How can I become a party of record for this proposal?

Send an email to housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us or call 360.753.8314 to be added to the parties of record for this proposal. Parties of Record will receive a notice before the Public Hearing is held.

From: [Joyce Phillips](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: FW: Olympia City Planning
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 4:58:19 PM

From: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2020 4:39 PM
To: Ellen Silverman <Ellen_Silverman@msn.com>
Cc: Connie Cobb <ccobb@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Councilmembers <Councilmembers@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Jay Burney <jburney@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Keith Stahley <kstahley@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Kellie Braseth <kbraseth@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Olympia City Planning

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

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

[Sign up for a City of Olympia Newsletter](#)

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Ellen Silverman <Ellen_Silverman@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2020 11:59 AM
To: CityCouncil <citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Olympia City Planning

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 City Council members,

As a long-time resident of Olympia, I am incredibly concerned about three of the provisions in Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1923. I believe we all want a vibrant Olympia, one that is diverse, safe, affordable, and a pleasure to live, work, and play in.

However, before discussing each of the provisions, it is imperative that any large-scale changes to zoning have comprehensive and extensive notification to all property owners and anyone who is paying for utilities. As it stands, the city is making unilateral decisions about what and where development should be happening before Olympia residents even know that it is happening. Very

few people are aware of the war being waged on their neighborhoods and around their homes. The city needs to slow down and notify everyone who is impacted. If the city can notify everyone about glass recycling and Christmas tree recycling, then the city can notify everyone about these massive proposed zoning changes.

It is also interesting to note that there is absolutely no requirement to implement and adopt ESSHB 1923. Please reconsider other options. Maybe there are some opportunity zones in Olympia in which some of these options make sense. Right now, a whole cloth approach, one-size-fits-all is bad for communities, neighborhoods and property owners. These changes will disproportionately impact low and middle-income neighborhoods which also impacts the diversity that we seek in our community.

It is also a mistake of epic proportions to implement this bill for many reasons. There are already smart choices available to Olympians. This latest, newest pre-decided proposal is only good for developers who are able to “pencil out the costs” to their benefit. It is not good for neighborhoods. Olympia is already building up the downtown core, why not wait to see what impacts this has on traffic, housing and rental costs, already crumbling roads, bad sidewalks, housing costs, emergency services, an overwhelmed LOTT system, and polluted run-off into the delicately balanced Puget Sound, just to name a few concerns?

Specifically, allowing a duplex, triplex or courtyard-apartments on each lot in a single-family zoning district as well as allowing a duplex on every corner lot in a single-family zoning district makes no sense.

Since Olympia already has policies and already allows for duplexes in some single-family neighborhoods and other in-fill, such as townhomes and cottages, it might be good to ask why hasn't growth happened? It could be that Olympia lacks basic infrastructure. I own several vacant lots, none of which have utilities. The cost to homeowners for development is prohibitive. So instead of incentivizing people who have invested in Olympia to consider building on their land, adopting these provisions panders only to developers and large corporations who have no interest nor have invested in the health and well-being of our community.

The city already has provision for accessory dwelling units. And most people don't even know about those. Testimony provided at City Council and to the Planning Commission, shows that people think this is all a new idea. The City needs to be transparent. ESSHB 1923 creates unhealthy density and does not take into consideration a whole host of concerns. Environmental, traffic, parking, lack of greenspace and privacy, density that makes no sense, unfair burden to schools, emergency services, water runoff, just to mention a few issues.

These options are not good for neighborhoods and there are no protections for homeowners and residents from encroaching development and out-of-proportion design. And there are no appeal rights for neighbors being impacted by development.

Specifically, the following provisions are just not sound public policy.

- Allow a house and 1 ADU on lots larger than 1/14th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about half the size of a standard lot now)
- Allow a house, an attached ADU, AND a detached ADU on lots larger than 1/10th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about 4/5ths the size of a standard lot now)
- No owner is required onsite
- No extra on-site parking is required
- Each ADUs can be up to 1000 square foot
- ADU can be sold separately from the house

All of these “new and marketed” housing options are designed only to benefit developers. These will not result in affordable housing and will not prevent urban sprawl. What it will create is more traffic, poor construction with no infrastructure improvements, increased taxes, displaced residents, increased rents and absentee landlords just to mention a few issues.

We all want a vibrant Olympia – a place we can all be proud to call our home, a place which is affordable to its citizens, where we live work and play. Also, Olympia should a place where historic preservation and neighborhoods with single family homes are respected and not seen as an obstacle to rampant and unhealthy development. Adopting the ESSHB 1923 will not result in a vibrant Olympia. Please do not be mis-lead. This is bad policy.

Sincerely, Ellen Silverman

1212 Olympia Ave NE
Olympia 98506

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Ellen Silverman](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Olympia City Planning
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2020 6:16:51 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.

As a long-time resident of Olympia, I am incredibly concerned about three of the provisions in Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1923. I believe we all want a vibrant Olympia, one that is diverse, safe, affordable, and a pleasure to live, work, and play in.

However, before discussing each of the provisions, it is imperative that any large-scale changes to zoning have comprehensive and extensive notification to all property owners and anyone who is paying for utilities. As it stands, the city is making unilateral decisions about what and where development should be happening before Olympia residents even know that it is happening. Very few people are aware of the war being waged on their neighborhoods and around their homes. The city needs to slow down and notify everyone who is impacted. If the city can notify everyone about glass recycling and Christmas tree recycling, then the city can notify everyone about these massive proposed zoning changes.

It is also interesting to note that there is absolutely no requirement to implement and adopt ESSHB 1923. Please reconsider other options. Maybe there are some opportunity zones in Olympia in which some of these options make sense. Right now, a whole cloth approach, one-size-fits-all is bad for communities, neighborhoods and property owners. These changes will disproportionately impact low and middle-income neighborhoods which also impacts the diversity that we seek in our community.

It is also a mistake of epic proportions to implement this bill for many reasons. There are already smart choices available to Olympians. This latest, newest pre-decided proposal is only good for developers who are able to "pencil out the costs" to their benefit. It is not good for neighborhoods. Olympia is already building up the downtown core, why not wait to see what impacts this has on traffic, housing and rental costs, already crumbling roads, bad sidewalks, housing costs, emergency services, an overwhelmed LOTT system, and polluted run-off into the delicately balanced Puget Sound, just to name a few concerns?

Specifically, allowing a duplex, triplex or courtyard-apartments on each lot in a single-family zoning district as well as allowing a duplex on every corner lot in a single-family zoning district makes no sense.

Since Olympia already has policies and already allows for duplexes in some single-

family neighborhoods and other in-fill, such as townhomes and cottages, it might be good to ask why hasn't growth happened? It could be that Olympia lacks basic infrastructure. I own several vacant lots, none of which have utilities. The cost to homeowners for development is prohibitive. So instead of incentivizing people who have invested in Olympia to consider building on their land, adopting these provisions panders only to developers and large corporations who have no interest nor have invested in the health and well-being of our community.

The city already has provision for accessory dwelling units. And most people don't even know about those. Testimony provided at City Council and to the Planning Commission, shows that people think this is all a new idea. The City needs to be transparent. ESSHB 1923 creates unhealthy density and does not take into consideration a whole host of concerns. Environmental, traffic, parking, lack of greenspace and privacy, density that makes no sense, unfair burden to schools, emergency services, water runoff, just to mention a few issues.

These options are not good for neighborhoods and there are no protections for homeowners and residents from encroaching development and out-of-proportion design. And there are no appeal rights for neighbors being impacted by development.

Specifically, the following provisions are just not sound public policy.

- Allow a house and 1 ADU on lots larger than 1/14th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about half the size of a standard lot now)
- Allow a house, an attached ADU, AND a detached ADU on lots larger than 1/10th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about 4/5ths the size of a standard lot now)
- No owner is required onsite
- No extra on-site parking is required
- Each ADUs can be up to 1000 square foot
- ADU can be sold separately from the house

All of these "new and marketed" housing options are designed only to benefit developers. These will not result in affordable housing and will not prevent urban sprawl. What it will create is more traffic, poor construction with no infrastructure improvements, increased taxes, displaced residents, increased rents and absentee landlords just to mention a few issues.

We all want a vibrant Olympia – a place we can all be proud to call our home, a place which is affordable to its citizens, where we live work and play. Also, Olympia should a place where historic preservation and neighborhoods with single family homes are respected and not seen as an obstacle to rampant and unhealthy development. Adopting the ESSHB 1923 will not result in a vibrant Olympia. Please do not be misled. This is bad policy.

Sincerely, Ellen Silverman

1212 Olympia Ave NE
Olympia 98506

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Ellen Silverman](#)

Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2020 11:59 AM

Subject: Olympia City Planning

Dear City Council members,

As a long-time resident of Olympia, I am incredibly concerned about three of the provisions in Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1923. I believe we all want a vibrant Olympia, one that is diverse, safe, affordable, and a pleasure to live, work, and play in.

However, before discussing each of the provisions, it is imperative that any large-scale changes to zoning have comprehensive and extensive notification to all property owners and anyone who is paying for utilities. As it stands, the city is making unilateral decisions about what and where development should be happening before Olympia residents even know that it is happening. Very few people are aware of the war being waged on their neighborhoods and around their homes. The city needs to slow down and notify everyone who is impacted. If the city can notify everyone about glass recycling and Christmas tree recycling, then the city can notify everyone about these massive proposed zoning changes.

It is also interesting to note that there is absolutely no requirement to implement and adopt ESSHB 1923. Please reconsider other options. Maybe there are some opportunity zones in Olympia in which some of these options make sense. Right now, a whole cloth approach, one-size-fits-all is bad for communities, neighborhoods and property owners. These changes will disproportionately impact low and middle-income neighborhoods which also impacts the diversity that we seek in our community.

It is also a mistake of epic proportions to implement this bill for many reasons. There are already smart choices available to Olympians. This latest, newest pre-decided proposal is only good for developers who are able to “pencil out the costs” to their benefit. It is not good for neighborhoods. Olympia is already building up the downtown core, why not wait to see what impacts this has on traffic, housing and rental costs, already crumbling roads, bad sidewalks, housing costs, emergency services, an overwhelmed LOTT system, and polluted run-off into the delicately balanced Puget Sound, just to name a few concerns?

Specifically, allowing a duplex, triplex or courtyard-apartments on each lot in a single-

family zoning district as well as allowing a duplex on every corner lot in a single-family zoning district makes no sense.

Since Olympia already has policies and already allows for duplexes in some single-family neighborhoods and other in-fill, such as townhomes and cottages, it might be good to ask why hasn't growth happened? It could be that Olympia lacks basic infrastructure. I own several vacant lots, none of which have utilities. The cost to homeowners for development is prohibitive. So instead of incentivizing people who have invested in Olympia to consider building on their land, adopting these provisions panders only to developers and large corporations who have no interest nor have invested in the health and well-being of our community.

The city already has provision for accessory dwelling units. And most people don't even know about those. Testimony provided at City Council and to the Planning Commission, shows that people think this is all a new idea. The City needs to be transparent. ESSHB 1923 creates unhealthy density and does not take into consideration a whole host of concerns. Environmental, traffic, parking, lack of greenspace and privacy, density that makes no sense, unfair burden to schools, emergency services, water runoff, just to mention a few issues.

These options are not good for neighborhoods and there are no protections for homeowners and residents from encroaching development and out-of-proportion design. And there are no appeal rights for neighbors being impacted by development.

Specifically, the following provisions are just not sound public policy.

- Allow a house and 1 ADU on lots larger than 1/14th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about half the size of a standard lot now)
- Allow a house, an attached ADU, AND a detached ADU on lots larger than 1/10th acre in a single-family zoning district (this is about 4/5ths the size of a standard lot now)
- No owner is required onsite
- No extra on-site parking is required
- Each ADUs can be up to 1000 square foot
- ADU can be sold separately from the house

All of these "new and marketed" housing options are designed only to benefit developers. These will not result in affordable housing and will not prevent urban sprawl. What it will create is more traffic, poor construction with no infrastructure improvements, increased taxes, displaced residents, increased rents and absentee landlords just to mention a few issues.

We all want a vibrant Olympia – a place we can all be proud to call our home, a place which is affordable to its citizens, where we live work and play. Also, Olympia should a place where historic preservation and neighborhoods with single family homes are respected and not seen as an obstacle to rampant and unhealthy development.

Adopting the ESSHB 1923 will not result in a vibrant Olympia. Please do not be misled. This is bad policy.

Sincerely, Ellen Silverman

1212 Olympia Ave NE
Olympia 98506

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Emmett O'Connell](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#); [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Housing Options
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2020 9:09:25 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 support the expansion of ADUs Duplexes, triplexes and courtyard apartments in single-family home neighborhoods.

The appearance of a monoculture single-family home neighborhood in Olympia is really a historical anomaly. Only in the past 40 years have we begun an experiment with requiring that all homes in a section of town being single-family homes. In fact, oddly enough, throughout the 80s, we downzoned neighborhoods that at one point allowed the construction of various housing types. This is evidenced by the dozens of duplexes, quadplexes and cottage apartments that currently exist in Olympia, but would be illegal to build under today's rules.

By offering a variety of housing options we will in fact reduce sprawl and help make housing more affordable across incomes. But we should also recognize that we will also return to a historic pattern of growth that cities (including our city) have always followed. This same pattern predates the domination of cars on our society, and therefore is more walkable and liveable.

Thanks,
Emmett O'Connell
360-561-9116

--

twitter.com/emmettoconnell
olympiatime.com

From: [Bettyfug](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Duplexes in Housing areas
Date: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 2:57:52 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.

I do not believe that duplexes should be combined in areas of single family housing. I have seen in other areas where this combination has brought unkempt property by the occupants of duplexes and a general run down look to the single family housing area.

Property owner,
Fugazi family

From: [Gregory Quetin](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Housing Code Amendments - More Housing
Date: Saturday, February 01, 2020 1:28:42 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Hello City of Olympia,

Thank you for your work in finding ways to welcome more neighbors to Olympia. I support the three proposed amendments and encourage the City of Olympia to go further with all possible haste. Allowing people to live closer to jobs, community and amenities is critical in reducing vehicle miles driven (reducing carbon emissions), reducing (or sharing) infrastructure burdens, and building a close knit, resilient, and happy community. Additionally walking, biking, and public transit thrive with more neighbors.

Please continue creating more options for a diversity of home types - duplexes, triplexes, 8-plexes and beyond. The benefits far outweigh even the large perceived costs of single family zoning defenders. We can not continue to sprawl and expect to meet our goals of supporting small businesses, resilience, economy, environment health, and carbon emission reduction.

Thank you for your consideration and all your efforts on this matter.

Best,
Greg

From: [Harold Spencer](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Proposals
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:31:08 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.

Hello,

All three options seem very reasonable. I hope you can overcome the no-growthers and nimbies and get moving on behalf of people struggling to have a place to live.

Hal Spencer
Olympia WA

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Holly Davies](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Additional housing options
Date: Wednesday, February 05, 2020 8:10:50 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'm a resident of Olympia and I'm writing in support of the three proposed ordinances to allow duplexes on corner lots, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and duplexes, triplexes, and courtyard apartments.

I support the city's efforts to increase housing in already developed areas and increase the supply of affordable housing. Affordable housing is important to build communities where people can live near where they work, go to school, shop, pursue their hobbies and where multiple generations can live in the same neighborhood.

This range of housing options included in the proposed ordinances are sometimes referred to as the missing middle, since they are in the middle between single family homes and large apartment buildings. Missing Middle Housing refers to a range of housing types that can provide more than one housing unit per lot in a way that is compatible in scale with single-family homes. Neighborhoods with this mix of housing types used to be more common. I live in the South Capitol neighborhood that has a lot of these types of housing, especially duplexes, courtyard apartments, and accessory dwelling units.

I am also the Chair of the Olympia Heritage Commission, although this comment is not from the Commission, and I live in a historic district. The Commission hasn't analyzed the effect of these housing options on historic districts, but we currently review permits for new buildings like these in historic districts based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. These housing types are compatible in scale with the buildings that are in our historic district. They allow more housing in historic districts without demolishing existing buildings.

Sincerely,

Holly Davies
Olympia, WA

From: [Ilene Le Vee](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Units
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:20:24 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.

To whom it may concern:

I am certainly in favor of various housing options occurring in current single family zoned areas. For example, my previous home was in the Newcastle development located off Boulevard Rd. Those homes are larger and there is a homeowners' association with established requirements for home/landscape care/maintenance, etc. The same applies in my current home in McAllister Park, located in the county southeast of Lacey. The one thing we learned from our current association is that the larger homes provide excellent opportunities for senior/disabled homecare settings for individuals unable to care for themselves in their own home. They make wonderful neighbors and the McAllister Park retains the single family home appearance and all other association regulations apply. If that option is not currently available in Olympia's single family-zoned neighborhoods I think it should be considered as an option, plus, it's an economic opportunity for some homeowners with care-giving skills. The same could be said for single family homes that are large enough to accommodate individuals/couples as boarders/renters.

I'm not certain that any of the older Olympia lots are large enough to affectively accommodate accessory homes without completely compromising the single family home appearance of a neighborhood. I personally could see why some folks would totally oppose this option, but I think corner lots would be particularly appropriate for duplexes.

The other 'wild card' is consideration that must be given to potential additions to on-street parking. Can the current street configuration accommodate additional vehicles beyond those of the neighborhood single family homeowner?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and good luck!

Ilene Le Vee

From: [John Gear](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: [#99997] Comment on Housing Code Amendments
Date: Saturday, February 08, 2020 11:15:19 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.

From: John Gear, Olympia resident
To: Olympia City Council and Planning Commission
Subj: Housing Code Amendments
Date: 8 February 2020

Please accept and consider my comments as being fully supportive of all possible changes to the code that will result in substantially increasing the supply of housing, especially multi-family and infill, within the existing urban growth boundary and that will break the stranglehold that existing single-family homeowners have over housing policy, which is a root cause of our homelessness crisis.

I have moved around enough (lived in five state capitals now) to have a sense of what things are systemic factors and which ones are not (when they are facing the same problems).

And the most important factor I observe a phenomenon described by STRONG TOWNS founder and president Chuck Marohn, who hit the nail on the head squarely when he said that people cry out for “solutions” to problems such as homelessness, but then refuse to enact any possible solutions. Chuck said he was finally forced to accept that most people crying for “solutions” actually mean something very different by the term “solution” than the usual meaning.

In difficult public policy problems, such as the crisis of skyrocketing housing and rental prices and the corresponding rise in homeless people, when people say they want solutions, what they mean is this:

How can other people change what they're doing so that I don't have to change anything that I'm doing.

This is certainly true in America. Everyone in America will at least pay lip service to the idea that they would like there to be plenty of housing available to everyone at all income levels so that there is affordable housing available for everyone . . . BUT, but the hidden caveat that goes with that is this “ . . . ***so long as the value of my house keeps going up, I don't have to pay more taxes, and nobody builds anything near me that costs less to live in than mine does.***”

Which, of course, explains why a city with such shattering levels of homelessness as Olympia has so little housing being built at any price that a family making the wages prevalent in the area could possibly afford.

What planners and policymakers must engage with with is that our property tax system rewards land speculation (holding land off the market) and sprawl, not housing development.

Indeed, our property tax system, as in countless other cities and towns, is managing to produce both sprawl and housing shortages at the same time, depleting public funds while aggravating the demand for public services. It's a pretty perverse system when you think about it.

People discussing this crisis often refer to the homelessness crisis as a result of a “market failure.”

The problem with this is that, when considered carefully, housing markets don't fail. Rather, housing markets optimize for total profitability, not housing. That is, when we leave necessities to be provided entirely by private markets, we should not be surprised that the markets converge on the amount of housing that is most profitable, not the most supply. To the contrary, our system punishes those who want to develop more housing and rewards those with sufficient resources to speculate in land for decades, ensuring that housing supply will always be constrained to be less than demand.

Unless we're going to invest public resources in the direct provision of housing, if we want there to be more housing, we have to adjust our property taxing system so that providing more housing is more profitable than the land speculation that housing competes with.

Until we do that — until we stop ignoring the gravitational force that our tax code provides that pushes cities all over America to have both unused and underused land AND lots of homeless people — we're just wasting time imagining that Chuck's definition of “solutions” can be found.

Cordially,
John Gear
2208 Crestline Blvd NW
Olympia WA 98502

From: [Jonathon Turlove](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Housing Options amendments
Date: Friday, January 31, 2020 7:11:03 AM

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 in full support of the proposed Housing Options amendments. Thanks,

Jonathon Turlove
2204 Beacon Ave SE
Olympia, WA

From: chela2@O.com
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: mailing list for housing density ordinance
Date: Sunday, January 26, 2020 5:24:24 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.

Hello,

Please add me to the mailing list for the upcoming housing density ordinance.

Also, I reviewed your public participation plan, which states that the public involvement would be in the first quarter of 2020. This time frame needs to be extended, because already 1/3 of the quarter is over and the process hasn't been publicized yet.

Also, what kind of outreach is planned? Is this only for people who already are aware of this process or are you going to do some sort of general outreach?

Thanks

Joyce Mercuri

804 Milas Avenue NE

98506

From: [Kathy McCormick](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Comments in Support of Zoning Changes for More Mixed Housing Types
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:37:38 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.

The proposals will take an important and crucial step toward achieving the additional housing needed in Olympia. Twenty six years ago Olympia adopted its new Comprehensive Plan to comply with the State Growth Management Act. A major foundation principle of that plan was to provide a mix of housing types in neighborhoods throughout Olympia. More dense housing types built within the already developed area was understood to be the key to curbing sprawl, meeting the needs of a full range of households and was the best hope for using land wisely, preserving farm and forest land and reducing car dependence. Over 25 years our community has grown to understand how crucial these original foundational principles and key achievements are - and will continue to be. Over 25 years our city - not unlike many others - has discovered how difficult it is to build the housing needed to accommodate our growing population. We now have a housing crisis that has become so apparent that the State Legislature has taken action. It is imperative that Olympia take action to rectify years of not meeting housing goals.

Consequently I support:

1) Duplexes on corner lots as proposed. This is a “must do” and an easy call. There are plenty of standards that would remain to result in smooth transitions on these opportunity sites. The idea for using corner lots for duplexes is not new and has proven to be a great way to take advantage of street orientation that will add to walkability by adding housing frontage on two streets.

2) Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's). This housing type can help achieve the goal of increased density in existing or planned new neighborhoods (another 25 year foundation principle of Olympia Comprehensive Plans). The proposals make sense and are necessary in order to result in the additional housing units needed in Olympia. The existing City requirements have severely constrained development of ADU's. Requirements for owner occupancy is a huge deterrent when considering the cost of developing ADU's that meet City development standards. Very few ADU's were built over 20 years - I believe - because of this constraint. I strongly approve of eliminating the requirement for on-site parking. One estimate noted that there were at least 7 asphalt parking spaces available in an average city for EACH car owned within a city. This proliferation of unused asphalt is a major problem for both the environment (impervious surface issues) as well as efficient use of land within already developed areas. Use the asphalt that is already there!

Don't add more with each housing unit! Another important advantage to on street parking is that it slows traffic through the advantageous constraint on the edges of any street!

3) Duplexes, Triplexes and Courtyard Apartments where single family residences are permitted. This too is a must do if Olympia is to achieve its density, housing, transportation and sustainability goals. I support the addition of these types of housing in as many areas as possible. This proposal is already constrained by Conditions, Covenants and Requirements in most suburban developments built over the last 50 years. Given that available lot sizes and city standards will restrain the resulting possibilities I support extending all three of these housing types in as many zones as possible.

We've got a housing crisis in our community. The State and Federal Governments are not going to save us. The addition of these housing types is essential if we are to dig ourselves out of an unsustainable situation where we'll continue to push housing into county areas, losing additional farm and forest land, increasing household dependence on cars, increasing vehicle miles traveled and destroying any hope of evolving into a more sustainable community.

Sincerely,
Kathy McCormick

From: [Kim Murillo](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Support for more housing density
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 10:26:33 AM

External Email Alert!

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

To City Staff and Honorable Councilmembers and Mayor Selby,
I am in support of higher density in urban infill areas. We need more housing and we need affordable options while protecting farm and forest land. Thank you for all you have been doing to try to make this a reality in Olympia!

Best,
Kim Murillo
222 Central St. NE

From: [Larry Leveen](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#); [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Maintain Standards While Addressing Housing Issues
Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 1:32:23 AM

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 writing to encourage that important standards in the development code that help ensure quality infrastructure, sustainability, and public safety are maintained as the City Council, staff, and Planning Commission look for solutions to provide affordable housing options.

Requirements for frontage improvements that provide complete streets, energy efficiency of structures, and (fire) safety do indeed increase costs of housing. But sacrificing them in the name of affordability would be wrongheaded. Low income people, desperate for housing, are especially dependent on active modes and transit for mobility around Olympia. They do not have the privilege of wealthier members of the community who can drive to their destinations. These people deserve a quality built environment that provides safe and convenient travel choices. The same streets that people who walk and bike (and drive) on in Olympia are as narrow as they are partially because the City struck a deal with fire safety authorities to require sprinklers in new construction. Without that requirement, a rollback of narrow street standards that are calmed-by-design might occur, resulting in higher speed traffic and public desire for retrofitted traffic calming, which is expensive and cumbersome for city staff to administer. Moreover a loss of required fire suppression sprinklers would affect the needed response times of firefighters and put pressure on the City to provide more fire stations and increase staffing, which will only be expressed as higher taxes passed on to renters. And while lower rents resulting from more affordable housing reforms are desirable, higher utility costs, potentially from deregulated energy efficiency requirements in new construction will disproportionately affect lower income people. Such a trade would also undermine city goals for sustainability and combating climate change, the effects of which especially impact less wealthy individuals.

I imagine that these are but a few of the potential pitfalls that you might encounter when tackling the issue of affordable housing. I sympathize with the difficulty of your task and acknowledge that I am asking you to remove certain items from consideration in your pursuit of reducing cost of housing construction. Please stay mindful of what if any requirements you waive and think carefully about their potential effects on the community, particularly those you are trying to help by making housing in Olympia more affordable.

Thank you for your consideration and I wish you the best of luck in this endeavor as it is one of the most crucial challenges of our time.

Larry Leveen
Former Olympia Planning Commissioner 2003-2013
360.357.3871

From: [Leah Melvoin](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Your plan will destroy our neighborhoods
Date: Monday, February 03, 2020 4:54:15 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.

The ordinance to allow developers to remove single family homes and create duplexes and triplexes will destroy Olympia neighborhoods. I've seen it firsthand in Seattle and it's only lined the pockets of developers. It did not make housing more affordable and it's reduced the quality of life for everyone. It makes me incredibly sad that the city planners are this naïve or corrupt.

I moved here to get away from that kind of politics and here it is on my doorstep, literally, again. I don't even know why you seek feedback. No one there is really interested in any.

Leah Melvoin

From: [Linda Malanchuk-Finnan](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Put me on the list
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 9:17:01 AM

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 put me on the list to receive information about Olympia housing options and process.

Linda Malanchuk-Finnan

3122 28th Avenue SE

Olympia QWA 98501

360-357-7272

lryh@hotmail.com

From: [Linda Panowicz](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: ESSHB1923
Date: Thursday, February 06, 2020 4:50:03 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.

This bill is VERY concerning to the future of our city of Olympia. It is imperative that Olympia residents are aware of of this bill and how it will affect our community. It is only fair that the planning sessions be widely advertised.

There must be a way to achieve a goal that is beneficial to all concerned.

Best regards,
Linda Panowicz

Sent from my iPad

From: [Sandler & Seppanen](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: I am writing in support of the proposed amendments to city zoning codes regarding where certain housing types are allowed
Date: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 8:31:30 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.

Joyce Phillips,

I have reviewed the proposed amendments to the zoning code regarding where certain housing types are allowed. I support the proposals to allow duplexes on corner lots in all zoning districts where single family homes are now allowed. I also support amending requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and considering allowing duplexes, triplexes, or courtyard apartments in some zoning districts. These changes will help the City of Olympia continue to increase density and do so with the inclusion of some more affordable housing units.

Loretta Seppanen
2919 Orange Street SE
Olympia, WA

From: [Max Gordon](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Housing Options Code Amendments
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2020 4:11:47 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.

Hello,

I wish to register my support for the amendments. I want Olympia to situate future housing in developed areas. Such development will limit the need to build additional infrastructure while saving our natural areas, one of the main draws for the population growth in the first place. This city also needs a variety of options for all kinds of people. Thank you for opportunity to comment!

- Max Gordon, downtown resident

From: [Mike McCormick](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Housing and Missing Middle
Date: Monday, February 03, 2020 3:58:47 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.

The City of Olympia is facing a housing crisis of multiple proportions—a situation shared with many areas of our country. It is complex, has been building for decades, is expensive to remedy and will take time. The Olympia City Council (with their city's staff's support) have appropriately responded to these challenges. Many of us living in Olympia have been involved in various activities, both publicly and privately initiated, to help respond.

One of the efforts has been to address the lack of Missing Middle housing. Here the focus is providing a greater variety of housing types and sizes throughout our city—particularly in the vast majority of our city zoned for single family housing. This is absolutely needed if we are going to be able to provide the needed housing for our growing population within our urban growth area. If we don't, any hope of a sustainable future is lost as clearly shown in the Thurston Region's Sustainability Plan. We have the capacity to do it. And we should.

A vocal minority of NIMBY's and neighborhood activists seem organized to fight our city's best efforts. Your initial efforts have been unnecessarily delayed by an ongoing court fight—both expensive and time-consuming. Your continuing court fight is absolutely the right thing to do.. In the meantime, your current steps to adopt some minimum improvements based on recent state legislation face continuing opposition from these same people.

You need to persevere and move ahead as quickly as possible. The City is doing the right thing. It will not solve all our problems. It will not immediately resolve our housing affordability challenges but it will help with the severe shortage of smaller homes. It will not provide housing for these to whom housing isn't affordable without subsidy and financial support. And it won't solve our homelessness problem.

But it will help and may prevent even more households from falling into homelessness. It is the right thing to do. And I believe a significant majority of our citizens understand that it is and support the city's efforts.

Onward - without additional angst and delay!

Mike McCormick
360.754.2916

Kathy McCormick
360.791.7547

From: [Old Growth Construction and Remodeling](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Request to become party of record
Date: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 8:19:03 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.

Hello,

I would like to be a party of record for the housing proposals.

Increasing density is amongst the top priorities for environmental responsibility and social equity. Thanks for your work!

Sincerely,
Jeff Thomas

--

Old Growth Construction & Remodeling
General Contractors

Jeff Thomas (360) 239-7564
James O'Keeffe (253) 376-0199

OLDGRGC820Q9

From: [Paul Knox](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Olympia needs more affordable and diverse housing!
Date: Monday, February 03, 2020 11:46:35 AM

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 want to share my full support for the proposed zoning changes now under consideration to provide more affordable housing options in Olympia's neighborhoods. The facts are clear that housing supply and affordability are in a crisis in our region. As a homeowner and landlord, I support all three proposed changes that will allow and inspire more diverse options for renters. I am very disappointed that some homeowners (who have their housing set) are against these changes. Cities and states across the nation are taking the courageous action necessary to increase density and I look forward to Olympia doing the same. I appreciate your service to Olympia and your commitment to taking action on these three proposals.

Paul Knox
KnoxWorks Consulting
360.790.4464
knoxworksconsulting.com

From: [Paul E Williams](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Re: City of Olympia - Proposed Housing Options Code Amendments
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:26:06 AM

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 no longer live in Olympia but I am in full support of this. Congrats on going bold.

Any chance of requiring moderate affordability on some units?

Here in Chicago (where I work for the Dept of Housing) we require 10-20% of new residential to be affordable at 60%AMI, but some of those units can be built off-site, such as scattered site 4-unit townhomes.

Opponents here have also been quelled with some slightly stricter design guidelines for 2-4 unit buildings that encourage thoughtful architecture.

Paul Elliott Williams
360-628-4776
pshmell@gmail.com

On Mon, Jan 27, 2020 at 4:30 PM Housing Option Code Amendments
<housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

You are receiving this email as a “party of record” for the Missing Middle Infill Housing proposal.

The City of Olympia is considering amendments to the zoning code regarding housing types allowed in residential areas. These potential amendments are not specifically related to the Missing Middle Infill Housing Ordinance but are of a similar enough nature that we wanted to bring it to your attention and offer an opportunity for you to request becoming a “party of record” for these Housing Options Code Amendments.

What options are included in the Housing Options Code Amendments?

Late in 2019 the City Council made a referral to the Planning Commission. The Council identified three options to increase residential building capacity in Olympia, as provided for in the recently amended Washington State Growth Management Act. The Council directed the Planning Commission to develop an ordinance to implement two or three of the following options, as summarized:

Allow duplexes on corners lot in most zoning districts

- Allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) with certain requirements and potential discretionary options
- Allow a duplex, triplex, or courtyard apartment on each parcel in one or more zoning districts that permit single-family residences (unless the city documents a specific constraint that would make this unfeasible for a particular parcel)

How can I learn more about it?

Information is available on the City's website at olympiawa.gov/housingcode.

Updates on this proposal and other planning efforts will be provided periodically to subscribers of the City's "Planning & Development" E-Newsletter. To subscribe to this or other City E-Newsletters, please visit olympiawa.gov/subscribe.

How can I become a party of record for this proposal?

Send an email to housingoptions@ci.olympia.wa.us or call 360.753.8314 to be added to the parties of record for this proposal. Parties of Record will receive a notice before the Public Hearing is held.

From: sdavenportmoore@gmail.com
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: infilling
Date: Monday, February 10, 2020 10:12:30 AM

External Email Alert!

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

This is in support of the efforts to encourage infilling by individual private developers. It would be prudent to follow the lead of Lacey Planning Commission that proposes to provide pre-approved ADU designs that may save private builders on design costs and the time in front of the Planning design review panels.

sdavenport

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Shannon Beigert](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Yes!
Date: Monday, February 03, 2020 5:28:43 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.

We are underserved with housing options. Please move forward with ADU and other housing related housing options so that my children will be able to secure affordable housing in our community. I greatly appreciate and applaud your efforts.

This is a significant strategic move and I cannot thank you enough!

Shannon Beigert
1817 Allegro Drive SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Sent from my iPad

From: [Stephen F. Austin](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Citizen Comment: support for ADU change
Date: Wednesday, February 05, 2020 11:12:38 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Greetings P+Z or City Council,

My name is Stephen Austin and I moved to Olympia roughly five years ago upon graduating with my masters from Texas State University. Since moving to town, I have severed on the City's preservation commission and taken a full-time job with a state agency. In addition, I had my first child in December 2019 and recently purchased my first home. Very few of these milestones would have been achievable without the cost savings provided by both legal and illegal ADUs.

When we first arrived in 2015, my wife and I were the stereotypical millennial; broke, over-educated 20-somethings who resorted to renting our parent's basement in East Olympia. We eventually moved into an illegal ADU (a detached garage under 200 sq. ft. with an unpermitted kitchen) as the rent was far more affordable than a traditional house or apartment.

It was because of these affordable dwellings that my wife and I were able to pay off our student loans and save to purchase our first home. Without the affordability and stability of these ADUs, we would have left Olympia for greener pastures long ago.

Now as taxpaying homeowners, we wish to provide the same opportunity to other people who are faced with high rents and barriers to home-ownership. **Thus, I support the proposed changes to the existing Olympia code regarding Accessory Dwelling Units as more ADUs will allow more economic and social mobility within our community.** If Olympia is sincere about making up for its lack of affordable housing than it seems that the City Council along with the Planning and Zoning Commission would do everything feasible to improve the opportunities of its citizens who are of middling incomes.

That said, we also know from first-hand experience that people will do whatever is necessary to improve there living situation which makes the current restrictions on ADUs and other alternative housing by the City seem counter to its espoused goal of boosting the "missing middle". Based on my experience as a pirate renter and a new home buyer, I can say that the shortage of affordable housing will continue to drive a black market of illegal ADUs that could pose a safety risk to all involved.

As the number of people moving to Olympia increases, the illegal ADUs will proliferate despite regulations to the contrary. In the interests of both community well-being and public safety, increasing the number of available ADUs seems like a realistic way to start making Olympia an affordable place for common people to live.

I am by no means excited to be someone's landlord but I know from personal experience that a little help from someone in a position to do so can go a long way. Thank you for your

consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephen F. Austin

From: [Davenport Moore](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us
Date: Sunday, February 09, 2020 10:49:15 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Friends,

This is another letter to support planning and the council creating infrastructure in policy and procedures to facilitate infilling and diverse housing options for Olympia.

This could follow Lacy's in taking on Portland's lead providing acceptable ADU plans so that individual property owner/developers save on design costs and time in front of design review boards. It could create citizen review boards for neighborhoods where projects are proposed for citizen input and opportunities to request amendments and changes.

Diverse housing could be further encouraged with private developers with the same tax exemption incentives provided to large commercial developers. And those large commercial developers disincentivized by adding impact fees to address the needs of the community for roads, other infrastructure and schools' support.

I have objections to large commercial developers who have no personal involvement in a neighborhood coming in with multifamily designs that do not fit a neighborhood or the character of a neighborhood's 'flow' in several dimensions: traffic, children walking pets, neighbors enjoying knowing neighbors and relative quiet for other outdoor activities.

I believe individual infilling project and small community based developer projects should be given the highest priority and incentives before commercial developers projects are considered.

The city could survey and solicit community involvement with project proposal in a more intensive and transparent manner to ameliorate NIMBY fears before large wheels are in motion that are difficult to turn back.

The city and planning have work to do to overcome mistrust and fears about project approvals for infilling and more diverse housing options.

Thank you,

Susan Davenport
115 Sherman St. NW
Olympia, WA 98502

From: [Tessa Smith](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#); [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: I support the missing middle
Date: Wednesday, February 05, 2020 10:34:14 AM

External Email Alert!

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

Hello,

I am a civilly active resident of Olympia, and I passionately support any and all efforts to place housing in already developed areas. Please don't let the vocal minority make Olympia a center for exclusivity and NIMBY'ism.

Thankyou,
Tessa



Tessa Smith | Principal AIA CPHC LEED AP
cel: [\(360\) 870-6280](tel:3608706280)
tessa@artisansgroup.com
ArtisansGroup.com
The Artisans Group, Inc.
1508 4th Ave E Olympia WA 98506

From: [Thera Black](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Subject: Housing Options
Date: Sunday, February 02, 2020 4:37:33 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.

Greetings! I'm interested in this work and would like to be added as a Party of Record.

Thank you for ushering this important piece of code through the process. I'm excited about the updates as I understand them and look forward to learning more.

Best,

Thera Black
1905 Conger Ave NW

From: [Tyrell Bradley](#)
To: [Housing Option Code Amendments](#)
Cc: [CityCouncil](#)
Subject: Missing Middle Housing Issues
Date: Wednesday, February 05, 2020 2:05:08 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.

To whom it may concern,

As a member of the Olympia Community for my entire life, I support any and all efforts to place housing in already developed areas.

Thank you,

Tyrell Bradley, PE

SCJ Alliance

Project Manager

o. 360.352.1465, ext. 136

m. 360.878.0678

www.scjalliance.com

This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.