

Online Feedback Opportunity: **Housing Typologies**

The study team has collected input on key priorities and concerns to enable more housing supply and choice. The next step in the [Missing Middle Housing Study](#) is to narrow its focus and determine which housing types should be further studied. Your feedback will help guide recommendations on which housing types to study in Phase 2.

To get started, view an introductory video on Housing Typologies:

Video not linked here

1. How would you prioritize the following housing types for further analysis? Click for example photos. Then rank your choices with 1 as most important.

- [Accessory dwellings](#)
- [Cottage clusters](#)
- [Duplexes, stacked](#)
- [Duplexes, side-by-side](#)
- [Fourplexes](#)
- [Small lot single detached](#)
- [Small multiplexes \(5+ units\)](#)
- [Townhouses, single side-by-side](#)
- [Townhouses, single stacked](#)
- [Triplexes](#)

Accessory dwellings

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Townhouses, single side-by-side

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Duplexes, stacked

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Triplexes

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Cottage clusters

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Small lot single detached

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Townhouses, single stacked

N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Duplexes, side-by-side

- N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.
Fourplexes
- N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.
Small multiplexes (5+ units)
- N/A - I do not support studying this housing type.

Question Title

2. In addition to locational factors, Phase 2 of the Missing Middle Housing Study will consider the following:

- **Design and dimensional standards (e.g., massing, setbacks, lot coverage, etc.)**
- **Energy and sustainability**
- **Equity**
- **Housing costs (sales prices or rents)**
- **Housing size (square footage/bedrooms)**
- **Open/green space**
- **Parking**
- **Retaining/retrofitting existing housing**
- **School enrollment**
- **Stormwater management**
- **Transportation**
- **Tree canopy and preservation**

Are there any other considerations that should be studied for missing middle housing types?

- Yes, additional considerations should be studied.
- No, this list addresses the considerations that should be studied.
If yes, what other issues should be studied?

Please see detailed ASF response to the February Missing Middle survey [here](#). Other items to be studied, PRIOR to any up-zoning, include:

- long-term (10-year) operating budget impacts, including need for and specific locations of new schools, police/fire stations, parks, recreation facilities, traffic/transit systems
- impact on property values in single family and multi-family residential neighborhoods, as well as tax consequences;
- environmental impacts, to include loss of mature tree canopy, increase in impervious surfaces, air pollution, urban heat island effects, mental health consequences of increased density and net loss of greenspace;
- demographic impacts, with projected population by 2045 by quintile and racial/ethnic distribution and projected impact on displacement of current residents at 60% of AMI and below
- results of Missing Middle zoning in Minneapolis, and ADU's in Los Angeles, in terms of how they affect those areas' stated fiscal, environmental, and demographic/diversity objectives for those up-zoning initiatives.



Community engagement is essential to guide the study process. Please share more about your experience engaging with the Missing Middle Housing Study.

3. Was the information you needed to participate in this engagement clear and complete?

The information was **not clear** in the following ways:

- It did not divulge the extent to which entities which stand to profit from the proposed new up-zoning were involved in the MM study design.
- It did not disclose that even a new County board member was on the board of an organization (the Alliance for Housing Solutions (AHS)) that was lobbying the County to adopt missing middle up-zoning, until that information became public and was pointed out as a conflict of interest
- The video accompanying this survey did not attempt to indicate the relative impact of each housing type on the various concerns expressed in the previous resident survey or the May 10, 2021 email from Housing Arlington. Although survey questions were not objective, feedback did disclose a relative emphasis on affordability and the environment, followed closely by school crowding and traffic, topped residents' concerns. Why didn't the County rank each of these housing types in terms of their impact on areas of concern, to ensure feedback properly assesses preferences on housing types?
- It did not make clear that the County was withholding key data and interfering with key processes that had a substantial impact on how the County deals with new growth, while this process was unfolding (i.e., the County Manager essentially neutered the Joint Facilities Advisory Commission (JFAC), which is charged with long-term planning for new infrastructure that should precede new upzoning. Additionally, the County thus far has rejected ASF's calls for a 10-year operating budget up front, and after 2019, it ceased publication of multiyear operating budget forecasts, which means these zoning and growth decisions cannot be made transparently by residents. These are just two of many instances.
- It has omitted any consideration in survey questions for outcomes other than missing middle, for conclusions that middle housing is not missing, even though its own survey concluded that 50% of housing outside the Metro corridors is already of a middle type.

The information provided was **not complete** in the following respects:

- It did not provide any case studies or readouts of early results of Missing Middle up-zoning in Minneapolis or Portland. How did the markets react, how do residents view progress thus far, did tax assessments rise and what has been the early impact on diversity?
- It worded its most important survey tool in extremely subjective fashion, leaving no alternative to its own interpretations on important substantive questions (i.e., regarding alternatives to McMansions, regarding "missing middle shortages," regarding "alternatives" to current zoning, rather than whether tools other than zoning could be more effective.)
- It embedded its first major public forum into a framework that allowed Missing Middle advocates to host the event on its platform. While the forum did allow questions from opponents, the very fact that a lobby group hosted a County event poses ethical questions about the County's ability to foster impartial outcomes.
- It did not discuss how Missing Middle links into and affects housing for upper- and lower-income households, or link into the Affordable Housing Master Plan. As specific examples, study documents and outreach repeatedly cited upper-income housing, especially large homes on single-family lots, as an obstacle, but it CONSIDERED Missing Middle -- rather than new zoning that would moderate the size and thus cost of those large homes -- as the only tool to resolve this problem. The most egregious flaw, in ASF's estimation, is that the study has entirely eclipsed any review of CURRENT Missing Middle housing being built in seven Arlington neighborhoods, outcomes of which ASF -- with Arlington Analytics -- believes disprove most if not all of the County's claims of fiscal, diversity, environmental, and affordability gains from expanded Missing Middle plans. Note the example of [Towns of 24](#), Towns of Glebe, in Green Valley. As another glaring example of incompleteness, the information omitted a gargantuan planning exercise along almost the entirety of Lee Highway by carving out a separate Missing Middle element for future zoning in this area, effectively ensuring a "divide and conquer" process that requires those who may oppose the concept to engage on multiple fronts.
- It did not address the regional housing context, elements of which have been addressed by the company Arlington Analytics in a recent Committee of 100 presentation. https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=311433307161930&ref=watch_permalink
- It has omitted the very likely effect that higher base values of Arlington property will drive owners of current market rate housing to redevelop and displace tenants who do not currently need to rely on complex, often flawed, subsidized housing programs, meaning diversity will take a hit, and not improve, as the County continuously claims. Even more troubling is that it appears the County makes these claims hypocritically, by pursuing MM and other programs (such as higher AMI thresholds for builder-provided affordable units) to attract households who can afford an \$850,000 home (overwhelmingly white), which is what most analysis and current market prices show are the realities for new MM homes.
- The County -- according to its summary --received 352 replies to its last missing middle survey. This compares to a population of approximately 235,000 individuals, or approximately

110,000 households. Statistically speaking, therefore, the feedback is not meaningful. We do not know the number of replies received in a foreign language, but note that 29% of households speak a language other than English. Zoning will have large impacts on lower-income households and diversity, and diversity is often cited as a goal and an aspiration by the County and residents, so it is important the survey responses be representative.

- The information did not include, nor did it provide answers to serious questions raised about the many concerns noted in the process to date, including those posed by ASF or others who question the basic need for missing middle at all. We refer you to [the County board's non-replies to public speakers on points researched and publicized by ASF](#), with but one example here. While reams of studies and reports and reference materials have been provided by county staff, County board members have opined extensively on the benefits of Missing Middle, and the county has infused Missing Middle into the work of JFAC, Plan Lee Highway, and the Multifamily Reinvestment (or HCD) effort, members continue to pass off critiques by noting "it is only a study" and "there are no foregone conclusions." Very few residents would agree with this if they have been tracking this process.

4. Have you participated in previous engagement opportunities with this study? (public meetings, online feedback opportunities, community conversations, etc.)

- Yes.
- No, this is my first time participating in the Missing Middle Housing Study.

Question Title

5. How can we make it easier for you to stay engaged with the study?

Answer the questions I keep submitting

What is your connection to Arlington? Select all that apply.

- I live in Arlington - I rent.
- I live in Arlington - I own.
- I work in Arlington.
- I own a business in Arlington.
- I visit Arlington for recreation, retail, cultural, and/or service activities.
- None of the above.

Question Title

7. What is your zip code?

Question Title

8. What civic association, neighborhood, or City/County do you live in?

9. What is your age range?

Question Title

10. What is your race or ethnicity?

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Pacific Islander
- White or Caucasian
- Other
- Prefer not to answer