



Missing Middle Housing Study: Responses to Phase 2 Questions

#	Question	Staff Response
Topic: Housing Types		
A1	I was glad to see that Small Lot Development was included in earlier Study documents, but is missing from the Phase 2 document, why is this? Small Lot Development will allow newly affordable housing utilizing existing small lots in Arlington and represents a win for the county in activating a new tax and service base, and a win for residents by allowing a new option for desperately needed housing within the beltway. As a life-long Arlington resident I fully support Small Lot Development.	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>The Phase 2 analysis included consideration of single-detached homes on lots as small as 3,000 sq. ft. While developing zoning provisions that would allow detached housing on smaller lots could bring existing lots that do not meet minimum requirements into conformance, financial analysis indicates that price points for new small lot single detached homes would be significantly higher than other choices, thus less responsive to community priorities for reduced housing costs as compared with other options. It is also important to note that several options already exist to support owners of nonconforming properties, including Board of Zoning Appeals use permits to obtain relief from setback requirements, by-right ability for owners of non-conforming single and two-family dwellings to build additions and expansions, and by-right development options for owners of non-conforming lots that were recorded under one ownership prior to 1950.</p>
A2	Why was the small lot home not included in the Draft Framework? This was the best proposal for increasing housing supply and attainable housing while maintaining the character of existing neighborhoods. We already have so many small single family homes on small lots, why not simply formalize this and allow a single family house on all platted lots that are zoned for single family? Currently it is the minimum lot size requirement that precludes building houses on these lots.	<p>Additional response:</p>
A3	I joined the meeting late but heard that Small Lot Development was addressed and seen as a "too expensive" option. I would politely and respectfully disagree. In fact, Small Lots are everywhere in the county, and can be purchased and built upon in a green way for much less than any traditional single family home, and by younger people who would otherwise have to move farther away and commute long distance by car in order to have a home. They also provide a perfect opportunity for tiny homes to become real homes, as well as other modern and ecologically sound new types of constructions, including ADU	<p>For lots that could be split to allow two or more single-detached homes if lot width and size requirements were reduced, other housing types, such as a side-by-side duplex or a row of three townhouses, would likely result in more housing supply. Single detached houses would still be subject to setback requirements between each house that would provide less flexibility for a more compact building design.</p> <p>As a recent example, an ~11,500 square foot single-detached property in Waverly Hills was subdivided into three ~3,800 square foot lots. This</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
	<p>style small houses. Such Small Lots exist nationwide and only need current set back and other zoning restrictions to be updated to include provisions for them as a new type of buildable lot. Arlington has a great opportunity before it to become a leader in the struggle for affordable housing, and could really go a long way in solving the missing middle problem by allowing Small Lots to be activated. Change to allow dignified and affordable housing requires some imaginative and structural evolution in planning philosophy, what area is more up to this challenge than world class Arlington?</p>	<p>subdivision was allowed because the lots had been recorded prior to 1950. The older house on the property was torn down and replaced with three 4-bedroom houses that each sold at prices ranging from \$1.45 million to \$1.68 million. Under the draft framework, a similar property with a more compact design could accommodate more, smaller units, with lower prices and open space that is consolidated rather than located between individual houses.</p>
A4	<p>single-detached housing on smaller lots would very likely not be the most expensive option if the houses were proportionately small relative to the size of the lot. Think mini-house</p>	
A5	<p>Why limit townhouses to groups of 3, as the study recommends?</p>	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>The Draft Framework is seeking to permit housing types that are comparable in scale with other housing types already present in Arlington’s neighborhoods and less costly than current options. A grouping of three townhouses, limited in building size to support smaller, less costly units, is comparable in building width to a large single-detached house, side-by-side or stacked duplex, or multiplex with 3-8 units.</p>
A6	<p>8 units is an apartment building and these would only fit on the larger lots of north Arlington and would create dramatic shifts in activity, parking and feel of the entire neighborhood. Why not insist on limiting to duplexes for these high dollar neighborhoods?</p>	<p>New housing types, regardless of the number of units, would be limited to the current lot size, building height, setback, and lot coverage requirements as single-detached houses. The only thing that would change is the number of households allowed to live in a building. Providing opportunities for a variety of housing types, with the potential for smaller one- to three-bedroom units creates opportunities for residents with different housing</p>
A7	<p>Your own graphic shows that the only places where the lots are 15,000 sq ft or more, are the most expensive, this is where your</p>	<p>needs to access more Arlington neighborhoods.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
	highest value homes are for property taxes, why burden these neighborhoods with 8 unit apartment bldgs.	
A8	Why aren't the thousands of condos and apartments buildings being built all over Arlington 'the missing middle' housing? Why tear up single family neighborhoods with 8 unit apartment buildings?	<p>Mid- and high-rise residential developments are an important part of Arlington's housing supply. However, these housing types are much larger than the smaller-scale missing middle housing types that would fit within the same building envelope as a single-detached house.</p> <p>An important component and goal of this study is enhancing housing choice. Providing a broader variety of housing opportunities in more areas of the County would be beneficial to homebuyers as renters as they make decisions about where to live.</p>
A9	I live in N Arlington and I rarely see existing townhouse communities identified on what maps I see. Yet they do exist. Do you have a map that shows what townhouse areas there are? or cluster homes similar to those you seem to advocate for. I happen to think TH developments are useful and proven - although not very affordable in Arlington - but it may help you get your density. But these TH should not be plopped on a lot in the middle of a SFH area - have you considered minimum lot sizes and in # of THs development? Maybe like those just built near 29 and Rte 66 intersection at FC line, or like those in between Glebe and Old Dominion or further north at Tazewell St?	<p>The Missing Middle Housing Study's Research Compendium Bulletin 3 includes a map of existing missing middle housing in Arlington (p. 7). Within the areas zoned R-5 to R-20 in Arlington, 1.7% of the housing units are townhouses. These developments were either built prior to zoning restrictions that prohibited townhouse developments or were approved as Residential Cluster Developments, a provision in the Zoning Ordinance that is intended to preserve natural features on larger sites, without increasing the overall number of dwellings that would be allowed through a traditional single-detached development. Residential Cluster Development require site plan approval by the County Board.</p>
A10	What is the distribution of housing units by housing type in Arlington?	<p>The Missing Middle Housing Study's Research Compendium Bulletin 3 includes a breakdown of existing housing units in Arlington by housing type. As of 2019 when the data was compiled, there were 116,000 housing units. Countywide, approximately 47% of Arlington's housing stock is considered mid- or high-rise multifamily housing, while single-family detached housing makes up approximately 24%. Low-rise multifamily makes up 23% of the</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		total, mostly located in garden apartment complexes. Only 0.5% of Arlington’s housing is stacked duplex, 1.7% is side-by-side duplex, and 3.7% is townhouse.
Topic: Locations		
B1	Can we see a more detailed map or where the changes would apply?	From the FAQ : The draft framework proposes to permit new housing types within the zoning districts that only allow single-detached development today, which are the R-5, R-6, R-8, R-10, and R-20 zones. See a map of these zones.
B2	Why would you not use the FBC overlay zoning to help create Missing Middle options? Missing Middle housing options is the next generation of housing for the Columbia Pike area. Areas with the highest concentration of housing wealth want homogeneity as a general rule, not diversity. This is why 22204 would be a natural and obvious area to do this versus the entire County.	Areas along Columbia Pike that are located within one of the County’s two Form Based Code areas would continue to have development options as envisioned in adopted plans. The Missing Middle Housing Study is focused on enabling more housing supply and diverse housing options, as an alternative to large single-detached replacement homes that are being built throughout Arlington.
B3	Are any neighborhoods in Arlington being considered for exemption from this awful plan?	Areas that are currently zoned for housing options such as duplexes, townhouses, and multi-family apartments or condos are not proposed to change under the draft framework. This includes all or parts of neighborhoods that currently have a range of housing options, such as Green Valley, Penrose, and Arlington Mill.
B4	How will the County ensure the new housing is distributed geographically?	The draft framework proposes to allow new housing types in R-5, R-6, R-8, R-10, and R-20 lots. As shown on the map of these zones, zoning districts are located throughout Arlington. While the consultant's financial feasibility analysis acknowledges that land values and market rates for housing vary between neighborhoods, and for different lot sizes, within Arlington, the draft framework proposal to allow 2-8 units on all lots within these districts means that lots of different sizes could feasibly support a range of different

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>housing types. The larger lots would more feasibly support larger buildings with more units and smaller lots would support smaller buildings with fewer units, regardless of a lot’s geographic location or zoning district.</p>
B5	<p>Placing greater density closer to transit corridors would be consistent with Arlington County’s longstanding smart growth policies. Also, it would be inline with an ostensible goal of the MMHS to create walkable neighborhoods, i.e., from the MMHS website: “Support walkable neighborhoods and locate enough residents nearby needed to support neighborhood retail and transit options.” What are existing options for Missing Middle housing enabled through Arlington’s Zoning Ordinance? How does the MMHS align with Arlington’s smart growth goals?</p>	<p>Please refer to The Missing Middle Housing Study Research Compendium Bulletin 3 for an explanation of how density close to major transit corridors, including options for Missing Middle housing, is already promoted through Arlington’s adopted sector plans and associated Zoning Ordinance provisions that enable these housing choices. Examples include the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Plan, which allows medium density housing options including Missing Middle housing types close to the Columbia Pike corridor.</p> <p>The MMHS recognizes that strategies to support density close to major transit corridors already exist and have been successful in advancing the County’s land use and transportation goals. While not located necessarily adjacent to major transit corridors, the County’s lower density residential areas are also well served by other transit options (e.g. bus lines) and are well-connected to regional employment centers where job growth is occurring. However, these areas limited by zoning from being able to meet demand for increased housing supply and options. New zoning tools allow additional housing choices in lower density areas can support housing production and provide a wider range of options that complement and build upon Arlington’s smart growth goals to support higher density development in areas that with the highest level of transit service.</p>
Topic: Lot Sizes and Setbacks		
C1	<p>Might the framework include permitting lot splits to enable construction of smaller-scale multifamily housing? This might allow smaller developers to be more active.</p>	<p>The draft framework does not consider lot splits except in cases where lots could be subdivided under current the current Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. This approach encourages consolidated curb cuts, driveways, and parking areas, and also encourages development patterns that are more in context with the existing neighborhoods, which was a priority of many residents in Phase 1. With the existing lot sizes in Arlington, nearly all</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		infill development is expected to be smaller scale redevelopment with a single building on a single lot, rather than large subdivisions.
C2	If these changes are being considered county wide with what looks to just be lot size requirements, are you considering restrictions on the by-right ability based on lot width or lot frontage? or will it just be a free for all if you meet the lot size requirements (which is essentially every lot in the county)?	The current lot width and size requirements for each zoning district would still apply to new development. For example, properties zoned R-6 would have a minimum lot width of 60 feet and minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. Properties zoned R-10 would have a minimum lot width of 80 feet and minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet.
C3	What would the maximum building sq ft be for a typical 5,000 or 6,000 sf lot? Could a co-living or studio apartments still be feasible for these lots?	<p>The consultant’s analysis indicates that duplexes and triplexes would be the most likely missing middle housing types that could fit on a 5,000 or 6,000 square foot lot. It is possible that buildings with more units could be achieved on lots of these sizes, particularly if the units are smaller than the assumptions in the consultant’s analysis.</p> <p>The square footage for housing that can be achieved on any lot will be determined by multiple factors, including the lot’s dimensions, minimum setback requirements from all property lines and maximum lot coverage, main building footprint, and building height requirements. Because the draft framework would duplicate the current standards for single-detached homes, the size of a missing middle development on a 5,000 or 6,000 square foot lot would be comparable to the size of a single-detached house that could be built on the lot.</p>
C4	Evidence from Minneapolis (https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2020/9/2/what-if-they-passed-zoning-reform-and-nobody-came) shows that legalizing missing middle without removing setbacks results in a failure to actually construct new housing. Why have you suggested a policy that prioritizes grassy lawns over housing?	<p>Private yard spaces in Arlington’s neighborhoods are a critical component of the County’s stormwater management systems. They provide space for stormwater management facilities that are required to mitigate the impacts of increases in impervious surfaces. Private yards also provide opportunities for tree canopy.</p> <p>While the draft framework proposes to duplicate the same setbacks (minimum distance from buildings to the property lines) as required for</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>single-detached houses, there could be tree canopy and stormwater benefits to reducing front yard setbacks and increasing rear yard setback requirements. The Phase 2 online feedback form asks a question about the tradeoff of adjusting setbacks to further support environmental goals, without negatively impacting the economic viability of missing middle housing development.</p>
C5	<p>Will additional density allow for tighter set back requirements to better utilize lots efficiently if a higher construction type and storm water management strategies?</p>	<p>The draft framework proposes to duplicate the same setbacks (minimum distance from buildings to the property lines) as required for single-detached houses. Stormwater management and mitigation requirements would also be the same as for single-detached development.</p>
C6	<p>Will it be possible to densify by building around existing houses - e.g., lot splits to create flag lots, or combining setbacks?</p>	<p>Flag lots, or pipe-stem lots, are currently only allowed through County Board approval of a Unified Residential Development (URD). URD projects require large minimum site areas and wide frontages. This is not proposed to change.</p> <p>A detached accessory dwelling is an option that is currently available for homeowners who want to add a housing unit to their lot while preserving the existing house. Detached accessory dwellings are not proposed to be allowed in combination with middle housing types.</p> <p>Under the draft framework, it would be possible to add dwellings to an existing house through interior alterations or additions.</p>
C7	<p>There are references to “expected viable lot sizes” of 8,000, 12, 000 and 15,000 square feet, yet most of Arlington's single-family lots are zoned R-5 and R-6 with actual lots averaging below 7,000 square feet. Unless there is an expectation of lot consolidation and re-subdivision there seems to be a mismatch. Shouldn't appropriate building types and their sizes be based upon the existing predominant lot sizes in Arlington?</p>	<p>From the FAQs:</p> <p>Would it be possible to combine lots to build a larger development?</p> <p>The draft framework proposes to maintain the same single-detached main building footprint standards for missing middle housing. Lot consolidation would not be prohibited, but it may not be likely due to these maximum</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>building footprint requirements. Because of these requirements, a builder can almost always build more total square footage on two lots than on a single lot.</p> <p>In review of development over the past ten years, staff could not find an example of two houses being torn down and replaced with a single house. In a small number of cases, a vacant lot was combined with an adjacent single-detached lot to create a larger lot for a larger replacement house. The proposed limitations on townhouses to groups of three units would also likely discourage lot consolidation.</p> <p>Additional Response:</p> <p>There is no mismatch between existing lots in Arlington and the expected viable lot size for different housing types. Arlington has a wide range of R-zoned lots, from older, smaller lots that pre-date zoning and minimum lot sizes to very large lots that exceed the minimum lot size for their zone. Some existing lots, particularly those in R-10 and R-20 zones with minimum lot size requirements of 10,000 and 20,000 square feet, are large enough to accommodate housing types such as a townhouses (up to 3 units) or small multiplexes (up to 8 units) while maintaining the same height, setback, and lot coverage standards as a single-detached house.</p>
Topic: Lot Coverage		
D1	What is the current lot coverage limit?	The draft framework proposes to apply the same maximum lot coverage for single-detached development to missing middle housing development. Lot coverage includes areas covered by buildings, parking and driveway areas, and some other paved areas, such as patios that are eight inches or higher above finished grade and in-ground swimming pools.
D2	What changes, if any, are you proposing to lot coverage requirements as compared to single family homes?	The Zoning Ordinance sets a maximum percentage of a lot's area that can be covered by these features. The percentage varies by zoning district.

#	Question	Staff Response																	
		Zoning District	R-5	R-6	R-8	R-10	R-20												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zoning District</th> <th>R-5</th> <th>R-6</th> <th>R-8</th> <th>R-10</th> <th>R-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Maximum lot coverage</td> <td>53%</td> <td>48%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As a reference, the draft framework lot coverage maximums are lower than the 56% maximum for duplexes, townhouses, and multi-family housing in zoning districts where those uses are allowed today.</p>						Zoning District	R-5	R-6	R-8	R-10	R-20	Maximum lot coverage	53%	48%	43%	40%	33%
Zoning District	R-5	R-6	R-8	R-10	R-20														
Maximum lot coverage	53%	48%	43%	40%	33%														
D3	Does the framework propose to preserve lot coverage requirements? If so, why do the drawings in the presentation show huge off-street parking lots for the larger units? How do you reconcile that?	Parking and vehicle maneuvering areas (i.e. driveways) count toward lot coverage. If large areas of a lot are paved for parking spaces and driveways, that reduces the amount of land that is available for buildings. The massing model drawings in the presentation conform to the draft framework’s proposed lot coverage requirements.																	
D4	The proposal says MMH will not impact stormwater runoff. Is that because it will not change lot coverage requirements?	Stormwater impacts would be comparable to the current impacts of single-detached redevelopment. This is due to the proposed limits on lot coverage and maintaining current land disturbance and stormwater mitigation requirements for new development.																	
D5	Is it correct that lot coverage restrictions only apply to driveways *upon new construction?* There appears to be nothing in the ZO preventing an owner of an otherwise-conforming SFH from paving up to the entirety of the lot. I hope that, if follow up studies are going to evaluate SFH size limits, they also evaluate establish coverage limits as an *ongoing* obligation for property owners.	<p>This is not correct. The Zoning Ordinance’s lot coverage restriction is always applicable, not just for new construction, and it is an ongoing homeowner obligation. If the lot exceeds the coverage limits – at any time – the property is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Most paving projects do not require a permit. However, the County’s standard practice for driveways and paving projects is to allow homeowners to submit a plat with the driveway and coverage calculations for review by the Zoning Division. This is not a requirement but serves as due diligence to ensure that lot coverage requirements are met and provides peace-of-mind for homeowners/builders.</p>																	

#	Question	Staff Response
D6	What percentage of lots in R-10 and R-20 that have been redeveloped from 2000 to the present have been built to maximum lot coverage standards for each category (i.e. with detached garage, with front porch, with both detached garage and front porch, or with none of those qualifiers?)	The County does not maintain a database of lot coverage for individual developments. To respond to your question, staff would have to research hundreds of individual building permit applications. Further, the lot coverage on a property at the time of a building permit may not capture the full picture, as homeowners sometimes add features post-development, such as a deck or patio, as long as the lot coverage maximum is not exceeded and stormwater management requirements are met.
Topic: Maximum Building Size		
E1	Thank you for this bold and sensible framework. The Framework references "maximum building size for new housing types" and "maximum square footage"? Does this mean there would be restrictions or guidelines for Missing Middles housing size, beyond the current standards for single-family homes?	From the FAQ :
E2	Why are there maximum building sizes beyond the existing restrictions on building size that apply to single family houses? I don't understand why we would allow a 6000 sq ft single family home, but not a 6000 sq ft total building size for a duplex (3000 sq ft per unit). Why should multifamily homes be restricted further in the name of fighting "luxury development" when there are no such strictures on SFH?	As indicated in the chart below, the proposed maximum total building floor area (i.e. total square footage of all floors) would vary based on the number of units provided, ranging from 4,800 square feet for a duplex, to 8,000 square feet for a building with 5-8 units. While the sizes of individual units would not be capped, this proposal effectively sets an average unit size that decreases as the number of units increases. This requirement would support the creation of more 1, 2, and 3-bedroom housing options. A goal of the study is to examine how to allow alternatives to 6,000 square foot homes while avoiding unintentionally creating a market for 4,000 square foot duplexes that would not appreciably reduce housing costs.
E3	Please publish the max sq ft being considered. Would these apply to single-detached homes too?	
E4	In tonight's presentation to the planning committee, a slide was shown in response to commissioner Schroll's question that showed maximum building floor area in missing middle developments. This slide does not appear in the presentation on the website. Does the feedback cover this slide? This information is critical to understanding the implementation and	

Number of Units	Max Total Building Sq Ft	Housing Type	Avg Sq Ft Per Unit (Gross)	Typical Number of Bedrooms (Per Unit)	Expected Viable Lot Size
2	4,800	Duplex	2,400	4	5,000 - 8,000 SF
3	6,000	Triplex	2,000	3	5,000 - 8,000 SF
3	6,000	Townhouses	2,000	3	8,000 - 12,000 SF
4	7,200	Fourplex	1,800	2-3	8,000 - 12,000 SF
5-6	8,000	Small Multiplex	1,333 - 1,600	2-3	12,000 - 15,000 SF
7-8	8,000	Small Multiplex	1,000 - 1,142	2	12,000 - 15,000 SF

#	Question	Staff Response
	<p>I would hope you intend to publicize it much more widely if you are expecting the feedback form to capture the community's thoughts on this issue. I think that implementing these maximum building sizes, especially at the very constricting levels shown in the slide, would be an absolute disaster, as it would mean that home builders around my neighborhood would be able to build 6500 sq ft single family homes, but be capped at 4800 sq ft of buildable space if they wanted to make that building a duplex instead. I cannot imagine builders would give up 1700 sq ft of buildable area without much more incentive than building a more complicated home. I hope this will be reconsidered, or at the very least, not hidden away in an unpublished appendix.</p>	<p>The table above also shows the expected viable lot size for each of the missing middle housing types in the draft framework. The lot sizes shown on this table would not be required minimums. However, the current minimum lot size and width requirements (e.g. minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet and minimum lot width of 60 feet in the R-6 zone) would still apply. The expected viable lot size is based on staff's and the consultant's estimate of the land area that would be likely be needed for each housing type, based on the proposed height, setback, lot coverage, and on-site parking requirements. It could be possible to achieve a building on a smaller than expected lot, particularly if the building and housing units were smaller than the maximum allowed.</p>
E5	<p>Why will there be a maximum building size for new housing types? Are there maximum building sizes for SFH? How will this shift future redevelopment mixes if SFH have more buildable area?</p>	
E6	<p>are you saying that you would try to authorize even larger single-family dwellings than the McMansions already being built?</p>	<p>No. No changes to current development standards for single-detached houses are proposed. Staff has heard concerns from the community about the size of impacts of large single-detached replacement homes. One area of future study, following the Missing Middle Housing Study, could be to consider amendments to the zoning standards for single-detached houses. A potential objective of this study could be to consider the impacts of single-detached redevelopment, such as increased impervious cover and loss of tree canopy.</p>
E7	<p>Are you concerned that the limit on unit square footage size will depress the number of new Missing Middle homes that will be built?</p>	<p>The proposed maximum building sizes in the draft framework are set at typical sizes for new single-detached development. Only single-detached houses larger than 8,000 square feet would exceed the size limit proposed for missing middle housing.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
E8	Given that missing middle housing is already at the disadvantage of having higher construction costs, why is the additional restriction of maximum building sizes being proposed that would further disadvantages of missing middle housing by allowing SFH to have additional buildable sq ft?	
E9	Are you worried that maximum building sizes will inhibit the feasibility of missing middle housing? How many units would be expected to not pencil out every year because of maximum building sizes beyond the lot coverage requirements that apply to SFH?	
E10	In the maximum building size slide, there is no anticipated development on lots greater than 15000 sq ft. Does this mean that no missing middle development would be anticipated in R20 zones with minimum lot size of 20000 ft?	This slide indicates the minimum estimated viable lot size for different housing types. Lots larger than 15,000 square feet, including R-20 lots, would likely be able to accommodate all of the housing types in the draft framework, depending on the specific characteristics of the lot.
E11	What allows the County limit the size of missing middle housing?	The Code of Virginia authorizes localities to regulate the “size, height, area, bulk, location” of buildings through a Zoning Ordinance.
Topic: Lot Consolidation		
F1	Has the county considered that setback requirements provide an incentive to combine adjacent lots to make one giant single family home rather than two smaller homes because the setback requirements will restrict the smaller houses to less than half the size of giant single family home?	The draft framework proposes to maintain the same single-detached main building footprint standards for missing middle housing. Lot consolidation would not be prohibited, but it may not be likely due to these maximum building footprint requirements. Because of these requirements, a builder can almost always build more total square footage on two lots than on a single lot.
F2	I have a question about the latest missing middle draft. Does it allow developers to combine lots to meet the minimum land requirement to build multi-family housing? For example, can a developer buy and consolidate three 5000 SF lots to build an 8 plex? Or must those lots remain separate for 6 duplexes? Or	In review of development over the past ten years, staff could not find an example of two houses being torn down and replaced with a single house. In a small number of cases, a vacant lot was combined with an adjacent single-detached lot to create a larger lot for a larger replacement house.

#	Question	Staff Response
	could they slice and dice the lots any way they wish to maximize their profit?	The proposed limitations on townhouses to groups of three units would also likely discourage lot consolidation.
F3	<p>I attended the Tuesday Q&A and had a question about some information that was discussed. Someone said that lots would be able to be combined - for example, if two homes next to each other were sold at the same time, they could be treated as one larger lot for missing middle housing. The person who answered the question said that this would be the same as currently allowed for single family zoned homes. However, I don't think that currently two single family home lots can be combined to form one building lot with a larger building than what is allowed on each individual lot without a special exception or some other process. Is that correct?</p> <p>Is it the intent of the missing middle zoning changes to allow combining of lots? For example, two adjacent 6,000 sq ft lots could be viewed as one 12,000 sq ft lot by right?</p>	
Topic: Parking		
G1	The framework proposes to reduce off-street parking requirements? By how much?	<p>The draft framework proposes to reduce minimum parking requirements for missing middle housing to 0.5 spaces per unit. As a comparison, single-detached development and duplexes are required to provide a minimum of 1 space per unit, except for lots in the R-5 zone and lots fronting on a cul-de-sac (2 spaces per unit).</p> <p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>Arlington's Master Transportation Plan includes a policy to “provide the parking supply to meet community demands cost efficiently and equitably while being careful not to create inducements to more driving or to reduce the community’s walkability”. The rationale for reducing parking</p>
G2	What are the current off-street parking requirements for single family homes, and what changes are you proposing?	

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>requirements is that some areas have good transit access, and residents may be more likely to choose not to own a vehicle. Other areas that are further away from transit typically have low-utilization of on-street public parking. Reducing parking requirements encourages use of existing parking areas rather than paving over green space. The proposed parking standards can also help reduce housing costs by reducing the size of a lot needed for a viable development.</p>
G3	Why require parking spaces at all?	<p>Many communities, including Raleigh, NC, Minneapolis, MN, St. Paul, MN, Portland, OR, and Berkeley, CA, have eliminated parking requirements for some or all land uses. The draft framework includes a minimum requirement of 0.5 spaces per unit in response to concerns heard during the Phase 1 engagement process about potential impacts on the availability of on-street parking spaces. One of the questions in the Phase 2 online feedback form provides respondents an opportunity to express a preference for lower or higher parking requirements. Staff and the County Board will consider this feedback as the framework is refined.</p>
G4	Any parking requirement is a subsidy for fossil fuel consumption. Why do you suggest parking minimums?	
G5	Has there been any study of whether requiring excessive off-street parking will bias redevelopment towards single family homes over Missing Middle homes?	
G6	I really like the direction this project is heading and I appreciate the proposed reduction in parking requirements. To maximize the environmental benefit, will the County consider eliminating parking requirements, particularly for lots in areas that are within a relatively short walking distance from mass transit options?	
G7	Have you given any consideration to whether requiring off-street parking for the smaller houses will prevent their construction or bias redevelopment towards larger single-family homes?	
G8	Why have parking requirements at all if the market will likely provide them as needed?	

#	Question	Staff Response
G9	There are no specifics as to how reduced parking will be accomplished. As part of the Missing Middle program, will limitations be set on allowable parking? How will this be enforced?	The draft framework does not propose to set a maximum number of parking spaces that can be provided. However, parking and driveway areas count toward the maximum lot coverage requirement, which effectively sets a limit on the number of parking spaces that can be built without impacting the development footprint.
G10	Please help us understand how parking on small residential streets isn't impacted?	From the FAQ :
G11	In the Draft Framework you talk about lowering the parking requirements for MMH. In many neighborhoods, parking is already an issue. Why is any discussion of parking left out of your study and how do you intend to incorporate parking so that neighborhoods aren't overwhelmed? A new four-plex building could add more than 8 cars to a neighborhood already struggling with parking issues.	Arlington's Master Transportation Plan includes a policy to "provide the parking supply to meet community demands cost efficiently and equitably while being careful not to create inducements to more driving or to reduce the community's walkability". The rationale for reducing parking requirements is that some areas have good transit access, and residents may be more likely to choose not to own a vehicle. Other areas that are further away from transit typically have low-utilization of on-street public parking. Reducing parking requirements encourages use of existing parking areas rather than paving over green space. The proposed parking standards can also help reduce housing costs by reducing the size of a lot needed for a viable development.
G12	If you are permitting e.g. 8 plexes, albeit with .5 car spaces per unit, won't you still have 4 times more parking spaces than with the prior single family unit and 4 times more impervious surface and runoff? By permitting up to 8 units per parcel while reducing onsite parking, aren't you guaranteeing overwhelming increases in onstreet parking as well as more traffic and safety concerns?	Additional response: According to MWCOC's 2017/2018 Household Travel Survey Report, 51% of Arlington households have only one vehicle, and 12% have no vehicles. Most households in Arlington do not have a need for two parking spaces, and it is likely that households with multiple vehicles will not choose housing options that do not meet that need. Lots that can accommodate the missing middle housing types at the higher end of the range (e.g. 5-8 units) would likely be built on larger lots that would be able to accommodate parking on-site. In most cases these larger lots would have opportunities for additional on-street parking spaces due to the wide lots.
G13	For these missing middle units - who is to provide the occupancy permit? The developer? A rental property owner? Will that include a commitment to honor the 1/2 car per unit? Who will enforce that? 2 adults and 2 children pretty much need 2 cars these days at least in my neighborhood. Is the 1/2 car allowed required to be off street parking? If not why not?	For example, an 80-foot wide lot with a 10-foot wide curb cut could fit

#	Question	Staff Response
G14	even with a four plex, wouldn't you have twice as many parking spaces as the original single family dwelling and therefore twice the impermeable area and more runoff?	<p>three vehicles along the lot's frontage, in addition to parking spaces provided on-site.</p> <p>It is possible that some missing middle housing developments would provide more total on-site parking spaces than single-detached development. However, restrictions on lot coverage would mean that the total impervious area would be no higher for missing middle than for single-detached. Because both parking/driveway areas and buildings count toward lot coverage, a site with more parking would require a smaller building footprint to maintain the same lot coverage standard.</p>
G15	Can the required parking spaces be tandem spaces?	<p>The Zoning Ordinance currently allows tandem spaces only for one- or two-family dwellings or townhouses. Changes to this provision are not being considered at this time.</p>
G16	You suggested a parking requirement of .5 spaces per unit. Does that count on street parking? How did you arrive at that figure?	<p>The standard parking requirement in "R" zones, with some exceptions, is 1 parking space per unit. In evaluating Missing Middle housing types and balancing County policies and community concerns, staff has included a parking requirement of .5 spaces per unit, which is responsive to concerns regarding lot coverage, tree canopy, and stormwater management. Setting a parking minimum does not preclude the builder from providing more parking, subject to lot coverage and stormwater management requirements. Builders will likely consider proximity/access to transit and on-street availability in deciding what is most marketable for each site.</p> <p>According to MWCOC's 2017/2018 Household Travel Survey Report, 51% of Arlington households have only one vehicle, and 12% have no vehicles. It is likely that households with multiple vehicles will not choose housing options that do not meet that need, and different housing opportunities in different locations may trigger different decisions about car ownership.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
G17	Have you estimated the needs of senior citizens for parking? Those needs may exceed those of other residents.	A .5 minimum parking requirement does not preclude a builder from creating more parking on the site, subject to lot coverage and stormwater management requirements.
G18	It seems from Table A-8 of the PES report that most of the new missing middle housing will not be Metro accessible. Do you propose the same parking limit for that housing?	The Draft Framework has one parking requirement for all sites. Sites that are close to transit may be able to capitalize on the transit access and residents may not be as car dependent. Sites that are further away from transit may have more on-street parking availability.
Topic: Adaptive Reuse		
H1	Will the inclusion of duplex be allowed for existing buildings that can accommodate such a configuration with minor renovation work? What level of requirements might that entail? My hope is to avoid the more onerous requirements that the early ADU regulations stipulated (parking requirements, dictating location of entry, etc)	<p>If the County Board eventually adopts Zoning Ordinance amendments allowing Missing Middle housing, existing homes could be modified to increase the number of units, so long as the zoning requirements (height, setbacks, lot coverage) and the Building Code are met.</p> <p>The Building Code cannot be explained simply because the requirements, which promote health and safety, are highly dependent on the particular details of the project being proposed.</p>
H2	Can you please discuss changes to existing structures that are single-family but amended to become a multi-plex	
H3	Can you talk more about the changes needed to allow conversion of existing Single Family Homes into Missing Middle buildings?	
Topic: Accessory Dwellings		
I1	Will an accessory dwelling add or subtract from a possible duplex, triplex or other more dense missing middle housing type?	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>Detached accessory dwellings would not be allowed in combination with a 2- to 8-unit building or a grouping of 3 townhouses.</p>
I2	How does the proposed plan mesh with requirements for auxiliary dwelling units? Are additional units required to be in the same structure?	The Zoning Ordinance currently allows one accessory dwelling on a lot containing one-family dwellings. Current rules that accessory dwellings are

#	Question	Staff Response
		not allowed on duplex, townhouse, or multi-family lots are not proposed to change.
I3	Can you find out and let us know, in the time since Arlington revised the Zoning Ordinance in 2019, how many building permits have been issued for accessory dwelling units, as well as how many total ADs there are in Arlington?	According to County permitting records, 68 accessory dwelling permits have been issued since May 1, 2019, when the Zoning Ordinance was amended to allow ADs in attached buildings.
Topic: Homeownership		
J1	Will arlington require that these new multi unit homes be owned by the individuals living in them or will people be allowed to rent these properties? If renting is allowed, then how is this plan actually helping the “Missing Middle”?	From the FAQ : Just as single-detached housing can be occupied by either an owner or a renter, missing middle housing types could be either. There could also be situations where a homeowner lives in one unit within a building and rents the other unit(s) within the same building.
J2	So what form of ownership would these new homes be? Single-ownership town homes, condos? coops? Would it vary?	<p>The County’s zoning regulations cannot “discriminate by tenure,” which is discrimination based on whether housing is ownership housing or rental, it is a violation of federal Fair Housing laws.</p> <p>The County is initiating a comprehensive study of homeownership programs to clarify and better define the community’s homeownership values and goals. This study will also evaluate the effectiveness of the County’s existing programs. Community engagement on this study is expected to begin later this year.</p> <p>Additional response:</p> <p>New rental housing would also contribute to housing supply; which is a goal of this study. Missing middle refers to the housing types, not to the characteristics of the occupants.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
J3	<p>If a property has a single family house on it, and it is torn down and replaced with a side by side duplex, what happens to the lot? Is the lot still owned by one owner? Or is the lot divided by 2 owners?</p> <p>Same question for 3- or 4- plexes? If the land that the building sits on belongs to one owner, then does that mean that the other units in the building will be rental, and the owner will either occupy one unit on site, or be an off-site land lord?</p>	<p>Side-by-side duplexes may be subdivided into two lots if the lots meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance. Most existing side-by-side duplex dwellings in Arlington are on individual lots. The provisions for subdividing side-by-side duplexes and townhouses, if enabled, will be considered as part of the Zoning Ordinance amendments in Phase 3.</p> <p>Housing types with vertically stacked housing units, such as 3-plexes and 4-plexes could be built as either a condominium with ownership of individual units or as a multifamily rental building under single ownership with rental of individual units. The Draft Framework does not propose requirements for ownership of individual units or the building itself. See response above for additional information.</p>
Topic: Economic Analysis		
K1	<p>You estimate that a household would require an income of \$244,000 to buy a unit in a side-by-size duplex. This is certainly not affordable to middle-income families of any race or ethnicity. So how does this increase housing choice except for more wealthy residents?</p>	<p>The goals of the study are to increase housing supply and increase housing diversity. Missing middle refers to the housing types that are between single-detached houses and mid- and high-rise development, not to a specific income range.</p> <p>The primary community priority heard in Phase 1 of the study was to reduce housing costs. Phase 2 of the study has considered what the likely costs for new construction would if missing middle housing types were allowed in Arlington neighborhoods that do not allow them today.</p> <p>The draft framework includes a variety of housing types, from two to eight units within a building, to provide a wider range of options for households with varying housing needs. The income needed to attain a side-by-side duplex would be relatively high because the per-unit land costs and the interior square footage would be much higher than for a fourplex of eightplex unit. However, a newly-built duplex would still be attainable to more households than a new single-detached house.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
K2	You are assuming the pace of redevelopment will not increase, but you are giving developers a additional number of options they can use if they tear down an older house. Why do you believe that the creation of these extra options will not encourage more teardowns?	From the FAQ : Developers/builders have an established track record with building single-detached housing within Arlington, and builders who are unfamiliar with housing types that are not allowed today may be less willing to take on the added complexity and risk. Additionally missing middle housing has inherent economic disadvantages, compared to single-detached, including:
K3	As a property developer, the chart on page 20 shows that the least profitable use of land is for a single family house. It shows the price to be about 2.3 million for a large single family house (the average of the 1.8 and 2.8 million dollar figures on the page). In comparison, the "Side by Side" duplex and "6-plex/8-plex" options are far more profitable...both of which equate to between 4.5 million and 5 million dollars per lot (again, using average price numbers on page 20). Even if building multiple units per lot is slightly more expensive than a single unit per lot, I doubt that the difference is enough to change the basic calculation that my expected return would be much higher building a high density option. why would I choose to build a SF house when I could produce a much higher return on investment by building one of the higher density units?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased costs due to building code, interior common areas; • Increased complexity for ownership and sales; and • Learning curve in the market for new regulations and housing types. <p>The experiences of other jurisdictions that have allowed for missing middle have indicated that even with incentives to build missing middle housing, builders have continued to primarily build single-detached houses.</p>
K4	I think there is a significant (100K?) difference in the cost of a buildable lot between the northern most and southern most parts of the county. That is a knowingly over-simplified observation but.....Did the recent study use county-wide lot cost averages in their calculations? How would the variance in prices for similar sized lots impact where the 20 projects predicted annually are located?	The consultant's financial feasibility analysis acknowledges that land values and market rates for housing vary between neighborhoods, and for different lot sizes, within Arlington. The draft framework indicates a range of expected sales prices and rents for each housing type to account for these differences. For example, the estimated sales price for a single dwelling within a 6-plex or 8-plex is estimated to be within a range of \$520,000 to \$670,000.
K5	What inflation rates were utilized by the consultants in their various analyses/charts and also in assessing the percentages of various minority groups who could afford MM housing?	The consultant's financial feasibility analysis of missing middle housing types was based on 2022 development and construction costs and market prices for housing.

#	Question	Staff Response
K6	Why do you presume that developers will build affordable options in highly desirable neighborhoods? If developers logically seek to maximize their returns, they will develop to the highest and best use of their capital - luxury offerings in a highly desirable, supply-constrained market - what makes you think that these won't be \$1.5 - \$2M townhomes geared to empty nesters, high-income childless couples, or high-income young families?	The Framework proposes to limit overall building size, which will constraint individual unit sizes and should moderate housing costs. On a per-square-foot basis, there will be a limit to what a developer can charge, regardless of the finish level that might be included.
K7	Can you provide an overview of recent New Construction, in terms of size and price?	Research Compendium Bulletin 2 (p. 8) found that single-detached houses built in Arlington between 2009 and 2019 averaged 4,750 square feet with an average sales price of \$1.7 million. Since the Research Compendium was published in 2020, the sizes and prices of single-detached houses have increased. In the last 12 months (ending May 2022), there have been 87 sales of newly-built single-detached homes. The average sales price was \$2.1 million and the average size was 5,257 square feet. (Source: redfin.com). These sales only capture the market for houses built to be sold. Roughly half of single-detached construction in Arlington is custom-built homes, for which prices are not available.
K8	Have you consulted with local housing developers to gauge their interests and/or economic concerns?	As described in the Phase 1 report (p. 32), the study team has consulted with subject matter experts in housing design, construction, and development to receive feedback on the consultant's technical analysis, potential barriers to expanding housing choice, and their sense of the market for new housing options in Arlington.
K9	How will the proposed zoning changes support the purchase of existing single family homes by individual buyers, as opposed to being bought out/increasing competition between current and potential residents and developers?	The share of homes that are put on the market that are purchased by individuals versus builder/developers is not anticipated to change. However, a portion of the teardown/redevelopment that is already occurring is likely to be built as missing middle housing types rather than very large single detached. These new missing middle housing types will

#	Question	Staff Response
		ultimately provide a greater number of opportunities for future homebuyers.
K10	The new Pierce condo building in Rosslyn, whose units go for as much as \$3M per unit, has all by itself more units than what you think will be provided by MM housing per year. Given this, isn't it obvious that high-rises along the transit corridors would both better meet the MM study goals, and still preserve SFH neighborhoods? And, given that Pierce clearly hasn't lowered housing prices, isn't the reasonable conclusion that your MM proposal will be ineffective at lowering costs?	<p>The Peirce condominium (1559 Wilson Boulevard) illustrates the need for missing middle housing. Concrete and steel high-rise buildings are much costlier to build than smaller scale housing and are typically targeted to the highest end of the market. While the Peirce has a total of 104 units, only 8 units are 3-bedroom units with the remainder being 1- and 2-bedroom units. This is typical of high-rise multi-family developments – both rental and ownership. Countywide, only 4% of apartments in high-rise developments are 3-bedroom units. Meanwhile, new single detached houses replacing older homes are typically 5-bedrooms or more.</p> <p>The number of missing middle housing units anticipated to be produced annually is unlikely to have an impact on overall housing prices. The goals of the missing middle housing study are to increase housing supply and diversify housing types. The objective of Phase 2 is to provide for more housing options for more people at more income levels and more stages of life distributed throughout Arlington. Missing middle housing types will provide new housing at a significantly lower price point than the single-detached housing currently being built in neighborhoods throughout the County.</p>
K11	What data was used by the county for the data identified in footnote 1 on P. 8 of Research Compendium Bulletin 2 ?	<p>The data referenced in this footnote is available on the County's Open Data portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arlington County Development Tracking Database • Real Estate Assessments Data • Master Housing Unit Database
K12	I've just started reading (the consultant analysis), and I'm somewhat surprised/confused by some of the assumptions.	The consultant's analysis included financial models of large single-detached houses on varying lot sizes. Because single-detached housing is the only

#	Question	Staff Response
	<p>For example, on page 6, you write about "large single-family units on the same sized lots"....</p> <p>A unit greater than 4,000 square feet would be roughly in the top 4% of unit sizes nationally, hardly a typical size. (This is per the 2019 American Housing Survey data, as I generated off of a quick run from the AHA table creator.) I'm also curious if you controlled for the fact that such a unit may be too large for the 5,000 sq ft lot given the Arlington County rules.</p>	<p>type of development currently allowed in the R-5 to R-20 zones, by-right, these financial models provide a baseline for comparing the relative attractiveness of missing middle housing for a developer.</p> <p>It is correct that single-detached houses larger than 4,000 square feet are not typical when looking at national data. As another data point, the average size of the single-family houses built in the U.S. in Q4 2021 was 2,561 square feet (data includes both attached and detached units). In Arlington, the average new single-detached home sold over the past year was 5,257 square feet, more than double the national average (see response to Question K7 above).</p> <p>The consultant's analysis for assumed a single-detached house size of 4,200 square feet on a 5,000 to 5,500 square-foot lot. This square footage is consistent with recent construction on lots of this size that have complied with zoning regulations.</p>
K13	<p>Have you considered how housing prices will change in the next few years?</p>	<p>It is difficult to predict how prices will change in the future. It is likely that housing prices will continue to rise due to the relative short supply and continuing attractiveness of the Washington, DC metro area job market. However, the impact of rising interest rates, if sustained, could slow the rate of increase compared to recent years of low interest rates.</p>
K14	<p>You have found that a number of factors will limit the amount of missing middle housing built in response to the change in zoning. Have you considered whether those factors will continue to limit missing middle housing five years from now? Ten years from now?</p>	<p>As builders become more familiar with the construction of Missing Middle housing types, and a market is developed, a greater percentage of the teardown lots may be redeveloped with Missing Middle housing. At the same time, there may be a diminishing supply of lots with teardown potential (where the size and cost would allow sufficient profit for the teardown builder).</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
K15	Table 4 of the Partners for Economic Solutions (PES) report indicates the bulk of units in the additional missing middle housing will be less than 1300 square feet. How does that compare to the size of apartments going up in the new apartment buildings being built in Arlington?	New apartments in high rise development tend to be smaller, about 900 square feet on average. One consideration for the MMHS is encouraging modest family-sized units (2-4 BR), which typically does not happen with high rise development because of higher per-square-foot construction costs.
K16	Would the new options offered by missing middle housing primarily be apartments very similar to those that are primarily being constructed now? (According to slide 7, “Arlington’s new housing construction is primarily 1- to 2- bedroom homes in high-rise apartments along commercial corridors and 5- to 6-bedroom replacement homes in single household neighborhoods”)	See K15 above. Also, more modest-sized units that could be built under the draft framework and would provide more options in neighborhoods where this type of housing is not allowed. This could provide options for younger households to live near family members, or allow older adults to remain in their current neighborhood if they choose to down-size.
K17	According to slide 19, “Based on the financial feasibility and study of other jurisdictions, only approximately 20 lots per year would become “missing middle” (94 -108 units)” Based on that and Table A-8 of the PES report, would it be fair to say that the additional missing middle housing would average around 5 units a building and would almost all have 4 units or more?	It would be more accurate to say that 2-8 units would be permitted, and builders may choose to build different housing types. Due to variations in lot size and market demand/feasibility, a range of housing types is expected. The study consultants have provided an estimate, considering that some housing types are more familiar to builders (townhouse, duplex) while other housing types could be more profitable, if built (6-plex, 8-plex).
K18	A number of large apartment buildings are being built in Arlington. Did you consider ways to get these new complexes to include more family-friendly apartments?	The County does not have the authority to mandate or dictate unit size or unit mix. Developers build what can be financed, which, in most cases is what sells or leases within an acceptable time period to meet their financial obligations. Because of the County’s involvement in financing committed affordable housing, the County has more influence to encourage family sized units, in line with County policy, than it does with market-rate developers.
K19	Slide 24 suggests that “Households who need smaller housing options (1-3 bedrooms)” would benefit from more missing	No. The market currently produces larger new single-detached (4-6BR) housing.

#	Question	Staff Response
	middle housing. Wouldn't it follow that people who need larger housing options would suffer?	
K20	Slide 7 indicates that Arlington has significant construction of one- and two-bedroom options in new apartment buildings. How much of the missing middle housing that is to be built would have three bedrooms?	Preliminarily, the consultant's analysis shows that, at first, more multi-unit buildings would be constructed than duplexes or townhouses, based on relative profitability.
Topic: Affordable Housing		
L1	This framework contemplates allowing up to as many as 8 units on a larger lot. It seems that requiring that 1 or 2 of the eight units to be CAFs would fit in with the Arlington's overall affordability goals. Has this been considered or factored into the framework?	From the FAQ : Adding an affordability requirement, such as requiring that some units be sold or rented at prices below market rate, would negatively impact profitability and create a strong economic disincentive for homebuilders to choose missing middle development over single-detached development.
L2	The least expensive of the different MMH options would require an income of \$108K which is about 85% of AMI. I think that means about 60% of Arlingtonians could afford the least expensive unit? How could the MMH strategy be modified to provide housing opportunity to a wider range of citizens? Could 5,6,7&8 plexes be treated more like commercial development and include CAFs or AHIF contributions?	This would likely result in little to no missing middle housing would be built and would not contribute towards the study goals to increase the housing supply and expand the range of housing options available. Missing middle housing types, if allowed, might create opportunities for non-profits focused on homeownership models (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) to develop homeownership products for households at lower incomes.
L3	What about incentives for including committed affordable units? Eg density bonus or height etc	Separately, the County is beginning an affordable homeownership study that will explore how the County can best support affordable homeownership in the future.
L4	Can there be incentives for one or more of the units to be committed affordable or set aside in a community land trust?	
Topic: Other Housing Arlington Initiatives		

#	Question	Staff Response
M1	With few public employees able to buy any duplexes, quadriplexes, or triplexes in Arlington will there be special County employee programs to make MM housing feasible?	The County will be initiating a Homeownership Study later this year with the goal of clarifying “vision and values,” better understanding of who is served through current programs and how the County may be able to better serve potential homebuyers and current owners. Part of this work may include discussion of incentives/programs specifically geared toward County employees; with a tie-in to the County’s Employee Housing Initiative .
M2	The Amazon purchase or donation of land in Crystal City area for housing - this got a lot of news coverage - but I am not sure how that will be used and how that effects available housing when completed. Do you have a map and building plans and how many of what economic category are housed?	Crystal Houses project information is available on the County website.
M3	Do you have a map and can quantify which of each of the County Housing efforts do alone and then those efforts over laid so we can get a better picture of where these efforts are going and quantify them? Can you provide the efforts - there are 6 I believe you manage.	There are 6 sub-initiatives under Housing Arlington . Housing Arlington includes land use and zoning studies that have either been completed or are underway, but it also includes efforts related to housing policy, financial resources, and innovative local and regional public-private partnerships. It would be difficult to “map” all of these efforts, but the link above provides more information.
M4	Arlington low-cost housing subsidies to make space available for renters in the lowest tier - I believe this get 6% of our annual budget. Is there a map of how this increases housing availabilities for how many across the county?	
Topic: Property Values		
N1	How does Arlington County government intend to mitigate the land value inflation and consequent displacement of existing residents that blanket missing middle up-zoning will induce?	In Arlington, “teardown” lots intended for single-detached redevelopment typically sell for less than \$1 million and recent new detached houses sell for greater than \$2 million. As an alternative, Missing Middle housing options, if built on a lot, may sell for about the same (i.e. two duplex units

#	Question	Staff Response
N2	The consultant's report did not include any inflationary factor to land values tied to missing middle upzoning. Won't approving MM radically raise the cost of land?	@ \$1M+, or three triplex units @ approx. \$700K+ /unit) so the profitability of these options may be <i>on par with</i> typical single detached development, not substantially or overwhelmingly higher. In the same way, the resulting land value for lots that have redeveloped would be about the same, in the end, across the various options.
N3	Slide 25 discusses those burdened by this proposal. Notably missing are existing homeowners. What about those who chose a single-family neighborhood for a reason and don't want to live next to an 8-family 8-plex? What about owners already being pushed out by high property taxes? If land values rise from \$1M single-family lot to \$4M 8-plex lots, they may be pushed out by the added taxes. How are you addressing concerns of existing, tax-paying residents relative to potential future residents?	The consultant analysis indicates that when teardowns occur, there will be competition between large single-detached home development and missing middle housing options, but that overall redevelopment within single-detached neighborhoods will remain fairly constant. In other words, the addition of Missing Middle housing options is not predicted to induce more redevelopment demand; just provide more options within the change that is already occurring.
N4	The neighboring property to my home is a single family detached home on a large lot. What benefits would I see, as a next door neighbor, if that property was converted to an 8-plex? Would my property increase in value or potentially decrease?	Land prices may continue to rise, not due to new development pressures, but rather because of the overall demand for housing and the continued lack of housing supply. The benefits of Missing Middle housing for existing homeowners may be:
N5	Does Arlington plan on compensating existing homeowners when their property values decrease because of this poorly conceived and short-sighted middle housing plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living in a more economically diverse neighborhood; • Ability to move within the neighborhood to a smaller, less expensive housing option when family dynamics change.
N6	what about value decrease in a R6 zone that suddenly now has a 4Plex next door? Does their property value go down as a "market value" for sale (not county assessment value)?	Staff has reviewed the impact of new small-scale (duplex, townhouse, small multiplex) development on real estate assessments for adjacent single-detached houses in Arlington. This situation is uncommon in recent years due to current zoning restrictions, and the limited number of missing middle developments. However, staff could not find an instance where single-detached assessments decreased following the construction of missing middle housing. This finding is consistent with academic research on this topic:

#	Question	Staff Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examining the Impact of Mixed Use/Mixed Income Housing Developments in the Richmond Region (Sturtevant, McClain, 2010) • The Impact of High-Density Apartments on Surrounding Single-Family Home Values in Suburban Salt Lake County (Eskic, 2010)
Topic: Incentives and Regulatory Barriers		
O1	What policy recommendations will the team explore to incentivize development of MM housing and ward off further development of single-family homes? Increased property taxes for single family homes?	<p>No incentives are being offered at this time.</p> <p>The consultant’s analysis indicates that the return on investment for missing middle housing development, in some instances, would be higher than a typical replacement detached home. Builders will have to weigh potential additional profit against additional risk (unfamiliar building type(s)/complexity, additional project costs, etc.). Despite the additional risk, the consultant team believes there will be some interest in building Missing Middle housing.</p>
O2	Thank you for the work that went into this - it's a great vision for Arlington's future. The report notes that these reforms aren't a silver bullet, and that large SFH will still often be more profitable to develop than MMH. What kinds of things could the county do to encourage more MMH (changing other regulations, incentivizing MMH, subsidies, etc.)?	
O3	What incentives will the County offer to developers who may realize a smaller profit?	
O4	Is the county considering policies or incentives to encourage builders to build more missing middle housing than the baseline estimate?	
O5	I'm curious about the remark that missing middle housing would be at an economic disadvantage. Given that, will builders have enough incentive to create this kind of housing?	
O6	Are there other County financial or administrative measures that could be considered which might reduce the extra costs,	

#	Question	Staff Response
	<p>complexities and market uncertainties that are anticipated to limit MMH building activity? The anticipated very limited (only about 20 lots per year) construction of MMH housing seems to imply that if the County wants to achieve its stated goals of meaningfully expanding housing choices and addressing current housing inequity then more measures will be needed.</p>	
O7	<p>How will the County handle permitting for new Missing Middle housing? Will permitting restrictions on these types of buildings be eased?</p>	<p>Missing Middle housing development, like all other development, must meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (height, setbacks, lot coverage, etc.) and the Virginia Building Code. Designers, homeowners, and contractors can request a code consultation with code officials to discuss elements of a construction project before final construction documents are submitted. There is no cost for this service, which is offered as a courtesy to encourage early contact with code officials.</p>
O8	<p>How will the framework guard against regulatory barriers to developers actually constructing duplex and multiplex housing? Potential pitfalls might include new types of paperwork for builders to fill out.</p>	<p>See response above. There would be no <i>additional</i> paperwork for builders. However, all development must meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and Building Code.</p>
Topic: Stormwater		
P1	<p>Have options such as requiring pervious pavement for driveways been considered as a way to mitigate stormwater impacts?</p>	<p>From the FAQ:</p>
P2	<p>Has any consideration been given to requiring pervious pavement driveways for both large single-family homes and Missing Middle as a method for mitigating stormwater issues?</p>	<p>Missing middle housing types would be subject to the same lot coverage and setback standards as single-detached development. As a result, impacts on stormwater management would be comparable redevelopment that would occur through teardowns, regardless of the type of housing being built. Missing middle development would also be subject to the same land disturbance and stormwater requirements as single-detached</p>
P3	<p>In order to improve stormwater management and prevent flooding, will you require that buildings do not have basements and that sites include retention areas?</p>	<p>development. Reduced parking requirements, as proposed in the Draft Framework, can support stormwater management by not requiring more impervious area than necessary.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>It is acknowledged that current teardown trends are creating challenges to our stormwater systems. Recent Capital Improvement Plan investments in stormwater infrastructure and upcoming policies from the Flood Resilient Design Guidelines and the Forestry and Natural Resources Plan will be addressing these challenges.</p>
Topic: Tree Canopy		
Q1	Would this be expected to produce a different tree canopy than single family teardowns?	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>Staff recognizes that current teardown trends are creating challenges for Arlington’s tree canopy. The state code allows only a 20% minimum tree canopy for single-detached housing in Arlington’s R-5 to R-20 zoning districts.</p>
Q2	Does the draft recommend requiring tree preservation? Or would MFH development result in the same clear-cutting of lots developers currently employ?	<p>The Draft Framework proposes a by-right approval process for missing middle housing types to support construction of these new choices rather than the lucrative single household development option. As a result, because state code sets minimum tree canopy requirements based on the number of dwelling units per acre, the minimum canopy requirements for missing middle housing types would likely be 10% or 15%. However, the missing middle housing type building design analysis demonstrates that tree canopy of 20% to 50% is achievable.</p> <p>Requiring tree preservation or planting of additional trees is only possible through a special exception development process in which projects are approved by the County Board. While a special exception development process could support tree conservation goals, production of missing middle housing would become less feasible. The result would be continued production of large single-detached replacement homes and continued challenges for Arlington’s tree canopy.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>Through the Forestry and Natural Resources Plan, the County will investigate all tools, from regulation to incentives, to realize the tree canopy goals of 40% across Arlington. The capacity of missing middle housing to provide the potential tree canopy of 50% retains the ability to continue to meet that canopy target through conservation of existing trees and planting beyond the regulatory requirements.</p>
Q3	<p>The report states “minimum canopy requirements set by state code would be 10% or 15%, compared to 20% minimum for single detached.” (Slide 23) Given that the state code sets a lower minimum for “missing middle” housing, isn’t it likely that if lots are redeveloped with that housing rather than single detached, tree canopy will be reduced? How do you propose that effect be offset?</p>	<p>The Forestry and Natural Resources Plan (FNRP), which is currently in development, may have insights on this point. It is anticipated that the draft FNRP will be out for community review later this year.</p>
Topic: Schools		
R1	<p>The slide a "net" increase of 9-13 students. What would be the actual number of students generated by the new MM units per year? How does 100 new units per year translate into only 9-13 additional students?</p>	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>Arlington Public Schools (APS) projects that the Draft Framework would result in a net increase of 5 to 7 elementary students, 2 middle school students, and 2 to 4 high school students (total 9 to 13 K-12 students) per year. This estimate is based on the consultants’ estimated pace of housing growth applying APS’s Fall 2021 Countywide student generation rates for different housing types (Fall 2021 Enrollment Projections Report, see Attachment C). Because there are very few buildings with 3-8 housing units in Arlington, the student generation rates for market-rate garden apartments and garden condominiums were used for these housing types.</p>
R2	<p>What is the board’s plan to address school overcrowding if the current proposal passes? How will the county board effectively utilize citizen tax dollars to improve teacher-student ratios, reduce building overcrowding, etc.?</p>	<p>Additional response:</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
R3	You estimated that the net increase in school enrollment would be 9 - 13 students per year. Could you share that calculation with us?	<p>The net increase in student generation is based on an increase of 18 to 22 students living in the estimated 94 to 108 missing middle housing units built per year. This increase would be offset by a <u>decrease</u> of 9 students estimated for the 19 to 21 single-detached houses that are redeveloped, resulting in a net increase of 9 to 13 students per year.</p> <p>APS considers projected changes in school enrollment and capital projects to accommodate these changes through regular updates to its Arlington Facilities and Student Accommodation Plan and Capital Improvement Plan.</p>
Topic: Transportation		
S1	The draft framework states a priority is "Maintain and expand valued neighborhood features: diversity, connection with neighbors, walkability." Are the areas proposed for rezoning walkable? What is their walkability rating? Most single-family homes are not in the immediate vicinity of community amenities, so what will the team do to make those communities more walkable?	<p>Almost every transportation trip includes a portion taken by foot or wheelchair, making pedestrian safety, access, and mobility critical to success of the entire transportation system. The Pedestrian Element of the Master Transportation Plan emphasizes on the movement of people rather than only vehicles, which is greatly affected by land use, street design and transportation system management. Providing an exemplary local walking environment is critical to achieving Arlington's many community goals for effective transportation, clean environment, healthy citizenry, and vibrant economy.</p> <p>The County funds pedestrian improvements to address safety and access problems, including sidewalk construction, through the Arlington Neighborhoods Program (formerly Neighborhood Conservation Program) and the Neighborhood Complete Streets Program.</p>
Topic: Infrastructure		
T1	Impacts to sanitary sewer capacity could be significant when changing lots designed for a 4-bath home to an 8-unit townhome complex with 36 bathrooms (3/unit). What is the plan to address sanitary sewer capacity and overflows that strain the system and pollute neighborhoods?	<p>Existing water and sanitary sewer capacity is adequate to accommodate housing and population growth under the draft framework.</p> <p>Water usage continues to decrease throughout the County despite consistent population growth. This is a result of the gradual replacement of</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
T2	Does the study include on the impact of a duplexes/triplexes, 3-unit townhouses and 4+ unit multiplexes, as well as extremely large single family home on existing water and sewer infrastructure compared to current housing types.	<p>older plumbing fixtures and appliances with newer ones that use significantly less water. Consequently, the County is seeing decreased wastewater flows being conveyed to the Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). Additionally, the teardown of older homes provides benefits from a wastewater perspective because many of these homes have foundation drains and other illicit connections (e.g. roof drains) that outfall stormwater into the County's sanitary sewer mains. These older drains and connections are a driving factor in causing overflows and backups during major rain events.</p> <p>Furthermore, while missing middle housing growth is expected to be gradual and dispersed across the County, not causing any water/sewer issues, new residential dwelling units are required to pay fees for each fixture that is added to the County's water and sewer network. The County uses these funds to make localized improvements in the event a neighborhood's demand exceeds capacity.</p>
Topic: General Growth Concerns		
U1	The prior Phase 1 report also undertook in Phase 2 to examine the impacts of various proposals. These impacts for study would "focus on issues identified as key community priorities and concerns," including "implications for transportation networks" as well as "energy consumption" and "impacts on school enrollment." (P. 30.) The Phase 2 draft framework includes (pp. 19-23) certain assumptions about some of these impacts, and also the potential opportunities afforded by the proposals, including what kinds of multifamily homes would likely result and the range of family incomes that might make such homes affordable. It would be very helpful to make available for public review the data on which the draft framework bases these assumptions.	Please review the responses questions on each of these topics in this document and the FAQs . Population growth resulting from expanding housing choice is expected to be modest. Across the areas currently zoned only for single-detached development, in Arlington, the estimated 10-year change in population density is an increase from 9.6 people per acre to 9.8 people per acre.

#	Question	Staff Response
U2	What plans does arlington have to address issues of parking, traffic, and crime that will inevitably be made worse by this “middle housing” plan?	
U3	What are the board’s plans to address increase in traffic, pedestrian and child safety in neighborhoods, cars in neighborhood areas, increase in noise within residential areas (more units, more individuals, more noise), and regulations regarding pets/animals with the increase in population density?	
U4	Have or will impact analyses be conducted prior to making changes, in order to prepare and budget for, the resulting impact on county resources, infrastructure, schools, traffic?	
Topic: Existing Residents		
V1	I currently live in a single-family home in 22207 that I own. What benefits, if any, could I see from this “middle housing” plan?	<p>Benefits of allowing 2-8 unit buildings for existing residents living in Arlington’s lower density residential areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new options for existing homeowners to invest in their properties, or find a new home in Arlington; • to meet changing household needs; • more walkable neighborhoods and locating enough residents to support neighborhood retail and transit options; and • enhancing long-term community economic sustainability, by providing diverse housing choices needed to attract and retain businesses and employers.
V2	I can understand how this helps housing developers make money, but how does this help current homeowners in Arlington? If my neighbor sells their property and a developer puts an 8-plex next door to me, how does my life improve?	
V3	How are single family homeowners not considered in those who would be burdened by the current proposal? SFH home owners will front the burden of increased density, traffic, cars, general noise, and school crowding in our neighborhoods.	
V4	Is the board actively working against single family homes? In what way is this representing those who contribute extensively via property tax on which many of these proposals are funded?	

#	Question	Staff Response
V5	How will the proposal benefits SFH home owners who live in small SFH, the vast majority of current owners live in 2-4 bedroom homes not 6-8 bedroom homes as referenced repeatedly in this presentation?	
V6	How will the board prioritize the preferences of current tax paying/home owning residents? To hear that a developer's questions and needs are being addressed beyond residents is absolutely unconscionable.	
V7	I live in a single family home and greatly value the space, quiet, and community of my current neighborhood. I actively moved out of a more urban area within Arlington (that had more crowding, cars, traffic, and noise) to my current location to meet these values, how will living next to or across from a 5-8-plex benefit my "quality of life" as stated in the current proposal?	
Topic: Implementation		
W1	How will this be implemented?	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>The draft framework would require missing middle housing to meet the same design and building placement requirements as single-detached housing. Within these parameters, buildings with two to eight units would be allowed, as long as they meet standards, such as height, setbacks, and lot coverage. The approval process would be the same for missing middle housing as for single-detached housing, meaning that applications that meet all applicable zoning requirements would be approved administratively (by-right) and would not require public hearings or action by the County Board.</p>
W2	What does "By Right" refer to?	
W3	What method would of approval is available to Arlington voters? This ordinance would impact neighborhoods and residents substantially. Will the zoning changes be done administratively despite opposition, or will you submit this to a voter referendum where neighbors and homeowners get to decide what is built next door?	

#	Question	Staff Response
W4	Is there any scale of redevelopment that kicks in site plan review and community benefits?	<p>From the FAQ:</p> <p>The draft framework proposes the same approval process for missing middle housing types as for single-detached housing. Building applications that meet all applicable zoning requirements would be approved administratively (by-right) and would not require public hearings, review by the SPRC or Planning Commission, or action by the County Board.</p>
W5	While advocating for Missing Middle housing in the community, I often encounter people fearful of "eminent domain" being used to take away their single-family homes. Can you explain how that would not be used by the county to assuage those concerns? Thank you.	<p>The County does not use eminent domain to realize private development. Rather, the County Board adopts planning and policy guidance and Zoning Ordinance regulations that specify how private landowners can use their property, to allow and encourage a land use pattern that achieves the recommendations or goals set forth in County plans and policies.</p>
Topic: Zoning		
X1	Why and when did Arlington originally restrict housing to single family uses only?	<p>Research Compendium Bulletin 4 (pages 2-11) provides an overview of the history of single-family zoning in Arlington, including key dates when the County added significant restrictions on the types of housing that could be built.</p> <p>For an outside resource on this topic, in April 2020, graduate students in the Master of Urban and Regional Planning program at Virginia Tech completed a detailed report on the history of residential planning and zoning in Arlington.</p>
X2	Has the team considered changing the framework to include examining sites not currently zoned as residential, opening up the aperture to explore expanding MM housing through mixed use zoning?	<p>This is outside the scope of the study. Many areas zoned for commercial development already have guidance in an adopted land use plan that could allow for future mixed-use development.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
X3	Where can we find the specific law that allows Arlington County to conduct this activity enacting a wide sweeping rezoning and to seize, rezone and redevelop private property without owner consent/involvement?	<p>The County Board has broad latitude, designated in the Code of Virginia, to “regulate, restrict, permit, prohibit, and determine” land uses within Arlington.</p> <p>The draft framework for expanding housing choice includes recommendations to add flexibility for properties currently zoned R-5, R-6, R-8, R-10, or R-20 (properties zoned for single-detached housing exclusively) to allow other housing types, such as duplex, townhouse, triplex, etc. This would be accomplished through a <i>zoning ordinance amendment</i> to include these housing types as eligible uses within the R-5 to R-20 zones. No <i>rezoning</i> (to another zoning category) is proposed. The existing zoning and existing rights to build, occupy, or own single-detached homes will remain in place.</p> <p>The eventual zoning ordinance amendment, if adopted by the County Board, would, in effect, be additive rather than restrictive in terms of its impact on the scope of development rights within these zoning districts.</p> <p>The policies described in the draft framework, if ultimately adopted by the County Board, would enable private property owners to build alternate housing forms, in addition to single-detached houses, within these areas of the county. The County does not propose to acquire property or build the housing contemplated in the draft framework.</p>
X4	If this framework is implemented as is, will all or most existing Missing Middle housing that is not currently compliant with their zoning become compliant? Has the county done an analysis about how many buildings fit into this category?	<p>Most existing missing middle housing is found in the R2-7 (Two-Family), RT (Townhouse) and RA (Multifamily) zoning districts. These districts are not included in the draft framework given the existing presence of diverse housing choice in these districts. Nonconforming dwellings in these districts would remain nonconforming. The limited supply of existing Missing Middle housing located in R-5 to R-20 districts is mostly duplexes, built before the Zoning Ordinance was amended to require special exception approval for these uses. If the draft framework is implemented as currently proposed,</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>these older duplexes would no longer be a nonconforming use. However, they may still be nonconforming with respect to dimensional standards such as setbacks or lot size/width.</p> <p>Despite the potential for continued nonconformities, in R2-7, RA, and R districts, property owners of nonconforming duplexes may make interior structural changes or additions by-right. In addition, standards for development in the R2-7 and RA zoning districts are recommended for future study, focused on the unique characteristics of these districts as locations with existing diverse housing choice.</p> <p>The County does not have an inventory of nonconforming dwelling Countywide. However, as one data point, research conducted for a 2018 Zoning Ordinance amendment to allow interior structural changes or additions for nonconforming duplexes in the R2-7 district identified almost 1,500 duplexes in in that district that were nonconforming with respect to lot size.</p>
Topic: Areas of Future Study		
Y1	If the county revisits lot coverage rules for single family homes, would it additionally cover missing middle housing as well?	Yes. An examination of lot coverage regulations in R-5 through R-20 zoning districts, if addressed in a follow-on study, would be comprehensive.
Y2	The sizes and prices of new single-family residences that are currently permitted by the existing Zoning Ordinance are considered by many residents to be excessive and seem to contribute to overall increased imperviousness, tree canopy loss and changes in community character. Saying that the proposed MMH housing can be the same size, height and coverage as the jumbo-sized new single-family houses may not be desirable. Will there be serious consideration given to Zoning Ordinance changes that may reduce the maximum size of new single-family buildings within R-5 and R-6 districts?	Staff has identified this as a concern which could be addressed through a follow-on study. Exact timing of such a study is dependent on the Planning Division’s work plan, which is coordinated through review with the County Board annually.

#	Question	Staff Response
	<p>a. If so, when will that study take place and how might it affect the proposals in the MMH framework?</p>	
Topic: Community Engagement		
Z1	<p>Will you be making presentations to civic associations, to the Civic Federation, to socialize the framework and get feedback and if not, why not?</p>	<p>The community engagement plan for MMHS is focused on conducting broad public engagement in order to reach as many people as possible, including those who may not be aware of the Missing Middle Housing Study.</p> <p>County staff will attend the June 14 Civic Federation meeting.</p> <p>The study team encourages civic associations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the information and documents on the Phase 2 engagement webpage • Watch the narrated presentation on the framework • Watch the Live Q&A Event recording • Share the framework and associated information with their communities • Encourage residents to share individual feedback through the online feedback form • Submit written comments and letters <p>Civic Association feedback and questions are welcome at any point during Phase 2 (through mid-July) and through Phase 3 (late summer and fall).</p>
Z2	<p>I just spoke to three different neighbors and none were aware of the county's "missing middle" initiative. How is Arlington ensuring that it's citizens are made aware of this plan to completely change the zoning laws that will greatly effect their quality of life?</p>	<p>The Missing Middle Housing Study has been underway since 2020, with many different information sharing and engagement opportunities for the community. For the Phase 2 framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County mailed a postcard with information on the framework's release and engagement opportunities to ~151,000 addresses at the end of April.

#	Question	Staff Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team developed a new webpage and created a one-pager so the community can easily understand what is in the framework. • Information and engagement opportunities have been shared repeatedly through Planning + Building e-news (8,800+ subscribers), Housing News & Notes (~11,400 subscribers), and Inside Arlington (~133,000 subscribers) • Information and links have been shared through multiple social media channels (Twitter, Facebook, Nextdoor) • The study team has done direct outreach with the Missing Middle Community Partners and many other stakeholders to ask them to share the information and engagement opportunities with their networks.
Z3	<p>Given the complexity of these materials and their potential significant impact on our neighborhoods, why is the public engagement period only 1 month, which also doesn't allow civic associations to educate and assess the feedback of their membership?</p>	<p>Community input and feedback will be accepted throughout Phase 2 and into Phase 3 in a variety of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The feedback form, with a specific set of questions, is the only part of the engagement that closes on May 27. That is to give staff enough time to compile the results on the responses to these questions and prepare for the July County Board work session. • Ongoing engagement through comment forms, emails, letters, and direct conversations will continue through July and beyond. • Civic Associations are welcome to meet with their membership and develop a response after the feedback form closes. That feedback will be rolled into the overall engagement presentation for the County Board.
Z4	<p>Given that Board work session will be held in June, doesn't that mean that ongoing comments re the framework itself will be moot once the Board "adopts" the framework in effect at that work session?</p>	<p>The Board work session will be held in <u>July</u>, not June.</p> <p>There will be no vote on the framework, and nothing will be adopted at the July work session. The Board will give guidance on how it wants staff to proceed with the framework. Everything from moving forward as proposed, stopping the study, and making amendments to the framework are possible. Once the Board provides guidance, the study team will begin work</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>on what Zoning Ordinance changes would be needed. The Board would not take action on any zoning changes until they are reviewed publicly, with opportunities for community feedback and input.</p>
Z5	<p>Your survey preface states: "standards include limits on the percentage of land that can be covered with buildings, driveways, and parking areas, a maximum building height of 35 feet, and minimum distances, or setbacks, between buildings and property lines (generally 25' in the front, 8' and 10' or more on the side, and 25' in the rear)." Yet the survey then asks about increased height, 15 ft front setbacks, etc. Very Ingenious survey</p>	<p>The statement from the beginning of the feedback form accurately captures the height and setback requirements in the draft framework. The feedback form is designed to solicit feedback that the Board can use in determining its guidance on the framework and expanding housing choice in the County.</p> <p>Items such as increased height, amended setbacks, lower or higher parking ratios, etc. could be included in the framework if the Board chooses. The feedback form is designed to give Board members a sense of how participants feel about such options.</p> <p>The feedback form is not designed to indicate general support or lack of support for the framework—rather to understand how participants feel about specific aspects of the framework so their views can be presented for the Board's consideration.</p>
Z6	<p>Phase Research Compendium and Phase 1 were conducted during a global pandemic. I'm concerned that during this time the County received insufficient input from Arlington's residents or input from a statistically invalid sample of residents upon which to build the study.</p>	<p>While the pandemic did limit the ability for in-person meetings and engagements, the County was able to pivot quickly into a virtual environment. Some of the virtual engagements included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online feedback form, Oct. 2020 to Feb. 2021: 350+ participants • Community listening tour, Jan. to Feb. 2021: 300+ participants • Online feedback form, May 2021: 400+ participants
Z7	<p>How are you acknowledging and taking into consideration public feedback of those who do not disagree with this proposal? Please embody those values and open dialogue! We all love this county and want to see it thrive.</p>	<p>Staff is collecting feedback of all kinds from as many people as possible via an online feedback form, emails and letters, and in-person conversations.</p> <p>All the feedback collected will be presented to the County Board members to inform their decision making. That includes feedback from people who do not support any part of the framework, those who support all of it, and those who have different feelings about different parts of the framework.</p>
Other Questions		

#	Question	Staff Response
AA1	How would short term rental rules apply?	Short term rentals (“accessory homestay” uses) are currently allowed as an accessory use, subject to the “accessory homestay” requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, in single-detached, duplex, townhouse, and multifamily buildings. These requirements include that the dwelling must be used by the resident as his/her primary residence, restrictions on the number of overnight lodgers, and compliance with the Building Code.
AA2	Can you talk about the tax/budget implications of denser development? Could more people paying taxes on a lot help pay for infrastructure or keep property taxes lower?	<p>It is correct that most of the infrastructure needed to accommodate new housing supply and options in Arlington is already in place, compared to greenfield development in other parts of the region that requires new street and utility networks. Many studies have document the fiscal benefits of aligning growth with existing infrastructure.</p> <p>A detailed analysis of budget implications of the draft framework is not part of this study because it would not capture the long-term benefits of diversifying the County’s housing stock for future generations, providing a range of housing options at price points that would otherwise not be available.</p>
AA3	<p>The purpose of the Housing Conservation Districts (HCD) was to deny landowners the right to build townhouses. Is the HCD now off the table and we are instead encouraging construction of units of three? So if a builder bought four R-6 lots, are you saying they could build 12 townhouses, but only in groups of three?</p> <p>Why not just allow a townhouse rezoning and they don't have to go through subdivision and take advantage of preservation of more open space?</p>	<p>Townhouses are allowed only through site plan approval in areas designated by the County as Housing Conservation Districts because garden apartments with market affordable rental units (MARKS) were being demolished to build very large, market-rate townhouses. In areas zoned for multi-family development, large townhouses are not a desirable alternative to affordable rental units.</p> <p>In contrast, the MMHS draft framework is seeking to expand housing choice in areas where options are currently limited, responsive to the community’s key priorities and concerns. Thus, the draft framework considers townhouses, in groups of no more than 3 units with no more than 6,000 total square feet of floor area (average size of 2,000 sf/unit), as a replacement option for very large, expensive single-detached development and at a scale comparable to existing housing.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
AA4	What design criteria or limitations are you proposing, e.g., no front-facing garages on townhouses?	<p>The staff team is considering limited design criteria, such as whether to require that townhouse units must face a street rather than a side yard, or whether to regulate the location of on-site parking or garages on a lot. The community feedback provided during Phase 2 will help inform whether and which standards would be included in draft zoning text in Phase 3.</p> <p>There are not design standards for single-detached houses, other than basic restrictions on height and placement.</p>
AA5	Would these options be available in HALRB-regulated communities like Maywood?	<p>Maywood is the only neighborhood in Arlington that has been designated a Local Historic District. This designation means that houses within the district cannot be erected, altered, or demolished without an approved Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) from the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB).</p> <p>Under the draft framework, existing single-detached houses in Maywood or other Local Historic Districts could be retrofitted with interior alteration, or exterior alterations with a CoA, into multiple dwellings. As noted in the responses on adaptive reuse, retrofits would need to meet Building Code requirements.</p>
AA6	So many jobs after pandemic are going virtual. For example, several Federal departments will allow for remote permanent work. Since the rest of the information and intellectual workforce is now able to work from, say, Middle America, why is Arlington thinking of the current workforce and living concept vs the 2 - 3 decade workforce? Meaning, the future workforce is not going to require geographic location to Arlington?	<p>Although the pandemic forced many employers to adopt remote work strategies temporarily, in many areas of the workforce there has been a shift to hybrid work schedules, where employees come into the office at least part-time. It is likely that being within some proximity of the physical office will continue to be a consideration when deciding where to own/rent housing.</p> <p>Also, please note the recent announcement from Virginia Governor Youngkin requiring most state employees to return to in-person work, which is indicative of some of the individual decisions being made by employers.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>Workplace location is also just one factor considered by households when choosing where to live. Arlington is a desirable location due to its high quality public amenities and access to multi-modal transportation, recreation, and entertainment options. One segment of the population that could be served by expanded housing options is retirees, who do not factor their workplace location into housing decisions.</p>
AA7	<p>Why is owning a single-family home in Herndon worse than living in a triplex in arlington? Shouldn't government encourage citizens to work towards the goal of home ownership of a single family home, wherever that home may be?</p>	<p>The government, at the local, state and federal level do support and encourage homeownership. However, single-family development is not preferred above all other housing types. Homeowners need or want housing in various forms, based on their budget and family circumstance.</p> <p>Also, when considering commute times and proximity between home, work and other destinations, housing options closer to Arlington and the region's core may be a better option for some.</p>
AA8	<p>Would a greater housing supply in Arlington be expected to reduce sprawl in currently undeveloped areas of Virginia?</p>	<p>A greater supply of housing, at a broad range of price points, closer to the core of the metro area could reduce the demand for housing in the exurbs.</p>
AA9	<p>Do you know what the impact on places like Minneapolis has been since they shifted away from single-family zoned housing?</p>	<p>Minneapolis's zoning reforms to allow residential buildings with up to three units in lower-intensity districts went into effect in January 2020. These developments are required to maintain the same size and placement standards as single-detached development. Development activity has been modest. Between January 2020 and March 2022 (27 months), the city approved 31 duplex projects and 14 triplex projects (104 units total) on lots that only allowed single-detached houses prior to 2020. (source: Reason)</p> <p>Portland, Oregon's, zoning reforms allow up to four units on a lot, in varying combinations, including accessory dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. These regulations went into effect in August 2021. Portland took a different approach from Minneapolis, allowing more floor area for multi-unit projects than single-unit projects. Between August and December 2021 (5 months), the city approved 118 units that would not have been allowed under the prior regulations. (source: Sightline Institute)</p>

#	Question	Staff Response
		<p>Earlier this year, Arlington’s Joint Facilities Advisory Commission completed a report documenting approaches to expand housing choices that are being considered in other localities, with a focus on how impacts on schools and public facilities were addressed. In addition to Minneapolis and Portland, this report summarizes policies and proposals from Charlotte, NC, Charlottesville, VA, Montgomery County, MD, and Sacramento, CA.</p>
AA10	<p>Will home businesses be allowed in these new multi units? Maybe multi units can be built by right if the Zoning rules change but will they be allowed to house home businesses? Will neighbors be asked to assess any occupancy permits? Does the County still require Occupancy permits for businesses that assess residential street traffic?</p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance regulates home occupations, which area allowed as an accessory use in all dwelling units and must be subordinate to the principal use as a dwelling. Only certain types of home businesses are allowed (see link above), and the County must approve a Home Occupation Permit to determine whether the proposed use complies with zoning requirements.</p>
AA11	<p>As a resident of Hall's Hill/High View Park, our community has an active historic designation application in process, so how will this be impacted?</p>	<p>Staff is unaware of any applications for a new Local Historic District designation in the HHHVP neighborhood. Community members can visit the Historic Preservation Program’s website to learn more about the Local Historic District designation process.</p> <p>See response to question AA5 above for more information on how the draft framework would apply in Local Historic Districts.</p>
AA12	<p>The sample floor plans in the technical report are helpful but can be hard to make sense of. Could you provide 3-D renderings of potential new MMH building types, and comparable single-family types currently allowed, for comparison?</p>	<p>No further graphics are available.</p>
AA13	<p>You have examined what additional missing middle housing would be built after the change in zoning. Have you considered the suitability of that housing for senior citizens? Many of the units seem to involve a lot of stairs.</p>	<p>There would be single floor units at ground level in most multi-unit buildings. Further, the Fair Housing Act requires accessible design and construction standards for ground floor units in all multi-family buildings that contain four or more units.</p>

#	Question	Staff Response										
AA14	<p>Slide 24 says that” MMH could be attainable to up to 39% of Black or African American households, 39% of Hispanic or Latino households, and 60% of Asian households in the Washington metro area” Could you share the calculation that produced that result with us?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. To what share of white households would MMH be attainable? c. To what share of Black or African American households, Hispanic or Latino households, Asian households and White households would single family homes be attainable? 	<p>Based on consultant’s expected sales prices or rents of newly constructed missing middle housing, households with incomes as low as \$108,000 would be able to attain the lowest cost housing options (likely units within 6-plexes or 8-plexes). Staff compared this level of attainability to the percent of households in the Washington metro area at that income level, broken out by the race/ethnicity of the householder (2020 5-Year American Community Estimates).</p> <p>The lowest cost missing middle housing options under the draft framework would be attainable to 62% of white (not Hispanic or Latino) households. The median sales price for a single-detached house in Arlington is \$1.1 million. The household income needed to attain housing at this price is approximately \$250,000, assuming a 20% down payment. The American Community Survey does not include income brackets above \$200,000. The percentage of households in the Washington metro area with incomes greater than \$200,000 are shown in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1052 841 1885 1188"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1052 841 1493 938">Race/Ethnicity of Householder</th> <th data-bbox="1493 841 1885 938">% of Households with Incomes \$200,000 or more</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1052 938 1493 1003">White, not Hispanic or Latino</td> <td data-bbox="1493 938 1885 1003">26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1052 1003 1493 1068">Black or African American</td> <td data-bbox="1493 1003 1885 1068">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1052 1068 1493 1133">Hispanic or Latino</td> <td data-bbox="1493 1068 1885 1133">11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1052 1133 1493 1188">Asian</td> <td data-bbox="1493 1133 1885 1188">25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race/Ethnicity of Householder	% of Households with Incomes \$200,000 or more	White, not Hispanic or Latino	26%	Black or African American	10%	Hispanic or Latino	11%	Asian	25%
Race/Ethnicity of Householder	% of Households with Incomes \$200,000 or more											
White, not Hispanic or Latino	26%											
Black or African American	10%											
Hispanic or Latino	11%											
Asian	25%											