

Suggestions from Arlingtonians for a Sustainable Future (ASF)

On to how to consider filling out the online

Missing Middle Housing Study Phase 2 Feedback Form

As with previous surveys on this topic conducted by Arlington County, this one is flawed (biased), especially because the initial questions about which house forms 'fit' on certain lot sizes don't allow for detailed responses. After an introductory page, the feedback form commences with a set of questions relating to graphic examples that do not explain the land use implications of indicating "how much you like" each of the housing types. ASF recommends that you consider filling out this portion of the survey as shown here:



On a scale of 1-5, where 5 is greatest, how much do you like each of the following housing types for Arlington's neighborhoods, given the provided lot size parameters? Required

	1	2	3	4	5
2-unit buildings on lots 5,000–8,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3-unit buildings on lots 5,000–8,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Townhouse grouping (max of 3) on lots 8,000–12,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4-unit buildings on lots 8,000–12,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6-unit buildings on lots larger than 12,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8-unit buildings on lots larger than 12,000 sq ft	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Do you think any of the housing types should be excluded?

Required

- Yes
- No

Which of the following housing types would you exclude?

- Townhome
- Duplex
- Triplex
- Fourplex
- 6-plex
- 8-plex

The images above were crafted to depict good proportions, shared architectural character, and uncut mature trees, which could be far from the case in actual eventual “by-right” infill projects – that is projects allowed to proceed without government design review. The perspective used in the drawings is skewed to reduce the appearance of the height of the Missing Middle buildings. This is why ASF recommends that you check button ‘1’ for each size of multiplex listed. It is not that these building forms would necessarily be bad neighbors, nor that your concerns about multi-family buildings mean that anyone would consider you a “not in my backyard” (NIMBYite). Rather, ASF believes that if you claim that you “like” the addition of a certain building form into allowable zoning, that the County will use that information to claim that you support up-zoning throughout the county. Such increases in allowable residential density will have negative impacts, including reducing the availability and affordability of *existing* “missing middle” housing like townhouses and garden apartments! ASF also recommends that you answer ‘Yes’ to whether any of the housing types – especially those larger than duplexes - should be excluded. Later in the survey you will have a chance to articulate that higher-density housing types ought to be administratively reviewed through a special exception process that takes into consideration the design and specific circumstances of adjacent properties, lot configurations, geography, and existing vegetation.

For the rest of the survey, we urge you to keep in mind ASF's standard requests for the budget, environmental, infrastructure, and quality of life implications to first be evaluated in significant depth before Missing Middle unit sizes are approved:

For which of the following reasons do you think these housing choices should be excluded from the framework? Please select up to 3 options.

- Ability of stormwater management infrastructure to manage runoff
- Ability of County facilities (schools, parks, etc.) to support additional residents
- Increase in on-street parking and general number of cars
- Addition of residents to single-household zoning districts
- Need for tree canopy conservation at single-household development levels
- I do not think there is a need for missing middle housing options in Arlington.
- I do not think the potential benefits of expanded housing options outweigh the potential impacts.
- I do not support expanding missing middle housing options under any circumstances.
- Other

Other (Please Explain):

3 reasons are inadequate to capture all the ways that housing forms should be excluded.

The following question has no desirable choice offered, and requires a longer discussion regarding minimums vs. maximums and perviousness of paving, so it would be better not to answer it at all:

What is your preference for parking location requirements for missing middle housing types?

- Only in the rear
- Only in the front
- Limited number of spaces in the front
- Do not regulate parking locations

	Very Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable	Very Uncomfortable
On sites adjacent to areas that already allow heights taller than 35 feet?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On sites within a 10- to 15-minute walk of Metro stations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On sites within a 5-minute walk of frequent bus service?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Along higher capacity streets (e.g., Walter Reed, George Mason Drive, Glebe Road)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In all locations where missing middle housing would be allowed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

How comfortable would you be with reducing the required front yard setbacks, and increasing rear yard setbacks, for missing middle housing?

- Very Comfortable
- Somewhat Comfortable
- Somewhat Uncomfortable
- Very Uncomfortable

How important do you think it is for Arlington County to review and revise its standards for single-household development as another way to address the impacts of teardown development?

- Very Important
- Somewhat Important
- Unimportant
- Very Unimportant
- I don't know/I need more information

Please share any other feedback you have about the Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Framework.

The budget, environmental, infrastructure, and quality of life implications of MM house types must be assessed before MM unit sizes are adopted for existing SFH areas. This could happen via a special exception process that takes into account lot configuration, tree cover, design, & ownership criteria (requiring 51% onsite ownership).

Maximum 500 characters (164 remaining)

This link should take you right to the survey. The deadline is May 27th:
<https://us.openforms.com/Form/294ae95f-06f8-4121-b76e-6ec35d2a7624>