



Missing Middle Work Group - Notes July 27, 2017

In attendance: Chair: Carole Richmond
Denise Pantelis, Bob Jacobs, Yicheng Gu, Dennis Olson,
Mike Matlock, Rick Walk, Roussa Cassel

Staff: Leonard Bauer, Director
Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - a. Chair Richmond welcomed the group to the meeting.
2. Review of Today's Agenda
 - a. Chair Richmond gave an overview of the current agenda.
3. Overview of *Scope of Issues for Review* Identified at Previous Meetings
 - a. Mr. Bauer reviewed issues discussed so far, by type of housing.
4. Discussion of Accessory Dwelling Unit Issues on the *Scope of Issues for Review*

Issues on the *Scope of Issues for Review* for detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs):

- a. Should property owner be required to live on-site? Should requirement be different for non-profit housing providers?
 - i. Other cities have found that to be a deterrent in the number of ADUs being built.
 - ii. Vancouver, B.C. and Portland recently removed this requirement and saw an increase in ADUs.
 - iii. The City of Lacey has never had an owner occupy requirement and has had no known issues.
 - iv. The City of Tumwater eliminated the main house size requirement and owner occupancy requirements.
 - v. If the goal is to increase housing, the City should get rid of this requirement.
 - vi. Fees: if the existing house is already paid for and the owners want to add an ADU, why should they have to pay fees again?
 - vii. Is the number of people factored into the calculation of impact fees?
 - viii. The City has the ability to change impact fees but changing impact fees would require a study that supports the change.
 - ix. The City should reduce fees where they can at this time, which means look at reducing permit fees.
 - x. To really promote ADUs, what if the city reduces fees by 25%?
 - xi. Reducing fees may not decrease unit cost – the value of land is not fixed – it is reflected in market value.

- xii. More inclined to consider it for non-profits than for private ADUs.
- b. What should the requirement be for off-street parking space? Should it be different in certain areas?
 - i. Can we eliminate the requirement as an incentive?
 - ii. The City of Lacey's parking requirements can be met with on-street parking, when present on both sides of the street. This is tougher to do for a garage conversion.
 - iii. The City of Tumwater requires one off-street parking spot. On-street parking does not count. Mostly not an issue – typical single-family homes have two parking spots in garage and two in driveway.
 - iv. If you didn't have the requirement and someone built the ADU, the market will determine the outcome as to how popular it would be to rent.
 - v. Portland has no requirement for a parking space for ADUs
 - vi. Seattle still has parking requirements for ADUs.

Issues on the *Scope of Issues for Review* for detached ADUs?

- a. Whether additional design guidelines are needed, and whether those should be prescriptive or incentive-based.
 - i. Current ADU design guidelines require the ADU reflect architectural character of the primary residence and provide a clearly defined entry.
- b. Whether to increase the current 16-foot height limit.
 - i. In the City of Lacey, if ADU is detached, the height must be less than or equal to the height of the existing house. If ADU is over a garage, the height may be up to the district height.
 - ii. 18 or 20 foot height limit would really help in allowing ADUs over existing garages.
 - iii. May also want to discuss the building square foot total (800 square feet for entire accessory structure, e.g. including a garage and an ADU above it), as well as height.
 - iv. 800 square feet is okay for the ADU portion; should be allowed to have additional space for garage or storage as well.
 - v. The City of Lacey looks at just the ADU portion to determine size, not the whole structure.

5. Next Meeting

- i. The next meeting will be held on August 24, 2017 in Council Chambers at Olympia City Hall.
- ii. Topic: continue to discuss issues for next housing types on the *Scope of Issues for Review* – tiny homes, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes.

For more information on the Missing Middle Project, please visit our web page:

olympiawa.gov/missingmiddle