

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

Clarifications and Requests for Additional Information	Comment	Staff Response	
	<p>There is confusion about “Missing Middle”. Many people think middle refers to price. Can we have clarity in definitions?</p>	<p>The study is about expanding housing choice, which supports many community priorities, including smaller housing options with lower housing costs, starter homes, more bedrooms, better accessibility, more than one unit in a building to offset housing costs and/or allow for more than one household to live in the same building, or private open space.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Please provide more detail on housing types not to be studied in Phase 2.</p> <p>URD zoning – isn’t that a way to bring forward different housing types ?</p> <p>Cottage clusters could be a good option in certain circumstances.</p>	<p>Cottage clusters and accessory dwellings are not recommended for study in Phase 2.</p> <p>Both attached and detached accessory dwellings are already permitted through recent changes to the Zoning Ordinance and an extensive community process. While not enabled on all lot types and with the design flexibility that may be most desirable, recent changes to accessory dwelling regulations are allowing the creation of a Missing Middle housing type that meets several key community priorities and addresses community concerns.</p> <p>Cottage clusters are groupings of small single household homes on one large lot or a cluster of small lots focused around a central open space. They typically require more land than is available in an Arlington infill context. Clusters are permitted through special exception review in Arlington’s existing Residential Cluster and Unified Residential Development (URD) standards, with standards for minimum lot size and lot coverage comparable with current regulations for stand-alone single household homes. Exploration of small lot single detached homes could inform subsequent development of recommendations for how existing regulations for</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p> <p>Commission on Aging, 10/18/21</p> <p>C2E2, 10/25/21</p> <p>JFAC, 10/27/2021</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		residential clusters could be modified to support cottage clusters with smaller lot and dwelling sizes.	
Does stacked townhouse include English basement type development? Are townhouse and rowhouse interchangeable?		Stacked townhouses could include an English basement. The terms “townhouse” and “rowhouse” are both commonly used to describe attached housing types. Arlington’s Zoning Ordinance uses the term “townhouse,” defined as “One of a series of three or more attached similar dwelling units, located on separately-owned lots or on a single lot, separated by common party walls without openings extending from basement to roof, and where each unit has its own external entrance.” There is variation in the design options for each housing type recommended for study, and Phase 2 will explore these design options to identify solutions that may best suit community priorities and concerns.	LRPC, 9/27/21
Will you consider smaller detached homes?		Yes, small lot single detached homes are recommended for study in Phase 2.	Commission on Aging, 10/18/21
Was community feedback geographically based?		The January-February 2021 Community Listening Tour was geographically based, to allow for multiple opportunities for community engagement and stakeholders within different parts of the county to share in discussion with one another. However, the study team did not categorize or analyze feedback by geography, nor seek input on which housing types would be preferred in different geographies, as study of the specific housing types and appropriate locations will be a focus of Phase 2.	LRPC, 9/27/21
Was there outreach to residents in federal or local housing programs?		The study team provided information to our Community Partner network, which includes organizations that represent and share information with residents in federal housing programs. A Spanish-speaking session of the Community Listening Tour was held in partnership with BU-GATA, local non-profit tenant advocacy group. However, it is important to acknowledge that the needs of residents in	LRPC, 9/27/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		federal housing programs are addressed through other County programs, such as the County’s Housing Grant, Housing Choice Voucher and committed affordable housing (CAF) programs .	
	Talk about equity and inequality. Is the Chief Racial Equity officer involved?	The Chief Racial Equity officer is involved in the study, including the approach to ensure that findings and recommendations will be considered and refined through the lens of equity. Study recommendations should not only support the County’s vision of being a diverse and inclusive community but support the ability for all people to have access to opportunities needed to reach their full potential and to experience optimal well-being.	LRPC, 9/27/21
	Describe some of the enhanced public outreach. In Pentagon City there are many people in rentals. I wish they could move into an Arlington neighborhood, but it is cost prohibitive. Many apartment buildings have Facebook pages.	The study team will continue to focus efforts on engaging hard-to-reach populations, renters, and other stakeholders that do not traditionally participate in planning processes. Engagement will focus on social media, sharing information digitally, and meeting people where they are. For example, the study will provide a “Pop up” presence at community gatherings and events. Additionally, a Housing Arlington mailer was sent to every residential address in October 2020 inviting participation in this process.	LRPC, 9/27/21
	Will we also be looking at parking and its impact on cost?	Yes, design parameters for the housing types selected for study will consider on-site parking requirements and its impact on cost and other community priorities and concerns.	LRPC, 9/27/21
	How will you measure the effectiveness of current accessory dwelling regulations? Do you have information on homeowners who are interested in building an AD but cannot due to zoning restrictions?	This is outside the scope of this study, however it should be noted that there was extensive community discussion regarding the size and location of accessory dwellings and the resulting amendment balanced the interests of property owners and their neighbors.	C2E2, 10/25/21
	Can you provide data on new single detached homes that are	New single-family detached homes are allowed by-right in all of the County’s “R” zoning districts. New construction	C2E2, 10/25/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>approved by-right versus new homes that receive approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals?</p>	<p>must meet the Zoning Ordinance’s requirements for lot coverage, setbacks, height, main building footprint, parking, among other standards. In certain circumstances, the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) can approve applications that seek to modify placement of buildings and structures or relief from certain zoning requirements. In 2020 there were 173 construction starts for single-family detached homes in Arlington. In that same year, there were 7 applications to the BZA for new single-family construction.</p>	
	<p>Can vacant office buildings be repurposed for Missing Middle Housing?</p>	<p>Vacant office buildings can potentially be repurposed for housing. However the form of mid- to high-rise redevelopment is not consistent with “middle” housing forms, like duplexes, townhouses and other small multi-unit building.</p>	<p>C2E2, 10/25/21</p>
	<p>Is it fully within Arlington’s control to amend its Zoning Ordinance, or are their limitations to what can be required for development?</p> <p>Specific development requirements mentioned include solar panels, energy efficiency standards, and restricting new connections to natural gas utilities.</p>	<p>The Code of Virginia specifies that the County shall have a Zoning Ordinance, as adopted and amended by the County Board. The Zoning Ordinance is reviewed and amended on a continual basis.</p> <p>The County Board’s zoning authority is limited in terms of the requirements or additional standards that may be imposed on by-right (administratively approved) development and is generally limited that that which promotes the “health, safety and welfare” of the community. In the past, the County has addressed this by creating incentives, through the special exception process (County Board approved) whereby, in exchange for additional flexibility and/or development rights, a property owner/developer agrees to meet/incorporate enhancements to their project that align with community goals.</p>	<p>C2E2, 10/25/21 FNRC, 10/28/21</p>
	<p>What percent of existing housing in Arlington is missing middle?</p>	<p>Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and townhouses make up 8% of Arlington’s housing stock outside of the County’s</p>	<p>C2E2, 10/25/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		<p>three planning corridors (Rosslyn-Ballston, Richmond Highway and Columbia Pike). More information on Arlington’s existing housing supply can be found in Bulletin 3 of the Missing Middle Housing Study’s Research Compendium.</p>	
	<p>Has an assessment been conducted of the impacts of supporting growth in the Metro Corridors on need for public facilities?</p>	<p>This type of assessment has not been conducted for the MMHS as it is outside the scope of our study, which is mostly focused on enabling housing choice in areas with limited options to produce missing middle housing types, not the Metro Corridors</p>	<p>JFAC, 10/27/21</p>
	<p>Why was an assessment of the impacts of these housing types on tree canopy conservation and loss not conducted in Phase 1, prior to making recommendations for Phase 2?</p> <p>If lot coverage is expected to be the same or greater than the lot coverage for single household homes, wouldn’t tree loss be the same or worse than what we experience currently?</p>	<p>The purpose of Phase 1 was to build a common understanding of community priorities and concerns and identify housing types for detailed study. Phase 2 will include development of design parameters for each housing type and impacts and recommendations for appropriate locations. Once these housing types are better understood, including appropriate locations, impacts on and opportunities for tree canopy conservation can be identified and evaluated.</p> <p>However, it is also important to acknowledge that if the status quo continues and no new housing choice is enabled, older single household homes will continue to be replaced with new homes and tree loss currently occurring in Arlington’s lower density residential areas would continue.</p> <p>Furthermore, while lot coverage for single household homes is an important policy and regulation influencing the overall size and bulk and coverage of a lot with new construction, regardless of the extent to which lot coverage and building footprints are limited, currently, the County can only limit tree removal through development</p>	<p>FNRC, 10/28/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		<p>outside of the construction footprint, which, with our smaller lots, is often at the lot line, leading to clear-cutting of developed lots. Construction footprints can currently include the buildings permitted on the site, infrastructure to support them, and access needed to construct those buildings. It is also important to note that while maximum lot coverage limits coverage by buildings, porches, decks, and driveways/parking, the addition of other impervious surfaces such as patios (< 8" above finished grade), walkways, and other paved areas is not limited by the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Despite these constraints, Phase 2 will consider how and whether new or revised policies and regulations could result in outcomes that achieve both study goals for Missing Middle housing and other County goals for tree canopy.</p>	
	<p>Have you looked at the experiences of other jurisdictions that have implemented missing middle housing policies to identify lessons learned and best practices?</p>	<p>Yes. However, in most cases changes made to enable more housing choice in other jurisdictions are very recent, and so it is not yet possible to identify lessons learned for the Arlington effort.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21, JFAC, 10/27/21, FNRC, 10/28/21</p>
	<p>Will expanding housing choice result in more affordable housing?</p>	<p>Housing choice refers to a broad range of community desires, including starter homes, homes with better accessibility, homes with private open space, and homes with more bedrooms than a 2-bedroom apartment.</p> <p>The study is not intended to create "affordable housing," which is typically restricted to households earning less than 60% of the area median income (\$69,660 for a three-person household) for rental or 80% of the area median income (\$92,880 for a three- person household) for ownership.</p>	<p>C2E2, 10/25/21 FNRC, 10/28/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		<p>However, removing barriers in the Zoning Ordinance and in Arlington’s land use policy will allow for housing choices that provide more rungs on the ladder between mid- and high-rise apartments/condos and single detached houses. As these housing options age over time, they will become more attainable than new construction. The study might also recommend additional, future efforts to focus on increasing the affordability of new housing choices.</p>	
Comments on Priorities and Concerns	<p>Allow conversion of single household dwellings to a building with more than one unit.</p>	<p>In Phase 2, the study will consider how design ideas could apply to existing housing stock as a retrofit option to encourage prolonging the useful life of older houses.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21 C2E2, 10/25/21</p>
	<p>The “Feedback Highlights” do not provide sufficient context to describe that they do not necessarily reflect the perspective or opinions of all stakeholders nor the County study team.</p>	<p>The Phase 1 Report has documented what the study team has heard through multiple rounds of community engagement. Additional information about specific comments and input can be found here.</p> <p>In addition to the priorities and concerns discussed in the report, the County’s adopted goals and policies, as articulated in the 11 elements of the Comprehensive Plan are used to guide County staff.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Restrictive land use policies have their origin in racism, segregation, and exclusion and created a shortage of housing for both new households and existing households when their housing needs change. This shortage drives up all housing prices and pushes new supply away from starter houses toward more profitable, higher cost houses. People of</p>	<p>The County’s exclusionary land use policy and zoning patterns are being addressed by studying how to expand housing choice and supply throughout Arlington County. The study will carefully consider how to distribute the potential for new development. Findings and recommendations of this study will be evaluated through a racial equity lens, to determine who might benefit, who would be burdened, and who would be left out, to ensure the County can work toward realizing an equitable community where all have access to the conditions needed to realize individual opportunities and goals</p>	<p>HC, 10/7/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>Color—who on average possess less generational wealth as a legacy of discriminatory practices, laws, and policies—are more likely to be pushed out of the market as prices rise.</p> <p>It is very important for this study to result in recommendations that dismantle the County’s restrictive land use policies and support work of racial equity.</p>		
	<p>There is concern that adding more housing choice will speed the pace of change in Arlington’s neighborhoods, thus speeding tree loss and loss of pervious surface.</p>	<p>It is expected that change will occur gradually, however, the pace of change will be studied in Phase 2 and inform recommendations for Phase 3. It is also important to acknowledge that if no new housing choice were enabled, the pace of change resulting from the status quo (allowing only single household homes) will continue, resulting in the same negative environmental consequences without the benefits of increased housing choice.</p>	<p>C2E2 10/25/21</p> <p>FNRC, 10/28/21</p>
<p>Comments on Phase 2 Housing Types or Scope of Analysis</p>	<p>Major redevelopment in Pentagon city (north west corner of Pentagon City Planning Study area) could be appropriate for cottage clusters.</p> <p>Cottage clusters in Falls Church should also be looked at.</p>	<p>See response regarding cottage clusters provided above.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Support decision to not study cottage clusters and ADU</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Be rid of 5000 sf lot minimum, no more minimum lot size.</p>	<p>Design parameters for the housing types recommended for study will identify appropriate lot sizes. This could result in recommendations for minimum lots sizes for existing and</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>Will we legalize existing nonconforming houses?</p>	<p>new housing types that are lower than today's minimum requirements and bring some nonconforming lots into conformance.</p>	
	<p>In Phase 2, will values where existing nonconforming missing middle exists be considered and compared with potential values in areas where new missing middle is permitted?</p> <p>Are you able to do any analysis on existing missing middle as a means of predicting what outcomes might be?</p> <p>What is the effect on the property value of my house – perhaps state more explicitly?</p>	<p>Phase 2 analysis will include an economic feasibility analysis that will indicate the likely sales/rent prices for the housing types under consideration.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Can we move away from itemizing what we like and focus on characteristics to allow greater flexibility?</p> <p>However, the ability to periodically check in on our zoning rules to respond to changes in Arlington is a good thing.</p> <p>Be thinking about pre-approved forms.</p>	<p>Phase 2 will conclude with recommendations for implementation, which may address how to best amend the Zoning Ordinance to not only enable to but encourage construction of more housing choice. Staff will consider options to balance flexibility to support new and creative options with need for predictability to support community priorities and concerns.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	Should we look at an FAR approach to housing or some type of FBC?		
	<p>Economic feasibility – how can we make sure that the final product doesn’t just have the luxury tag added and strip affordability?</p> <p>To achieve racial equity, future efforts must focus on affordability and consider strategies such as community land trusts, targeted homeownership programs.</p> <p>Will Phase 2 study affordability for seniors? This is also an important equity consideration.</p>	<p>The study is not intended to create “affordable housing,” which is typically restricted to households earning less than 60% of the area median income (\$69,660 for a three-person household) for rental or 80% of the area median income (\$92,880 for a three- person household) for ownership. However, removing barriers in the Zoning Ordinance and in Arlington’s land use policy will allow for housing choices that provide more rungs on the ladder between mid- and high-rise apartments/condos and single detached houses. As these housing options age over time, they will become more attainable than new construction.</p> <p>Yet the study will examine incomes and demographics in evaluating Phase 2 findings and recommendations through an equity lens, to answer the questions of who benefits, who is burdened, who is left out, how do we know, what do we do?</p> <p>The study might also recommend additional, future efforts to focus on increasing the affordability of new housing choices.</p>	<p>LRPC, 9/27/21</p> <p>HC, 10/7/21</p> <p>Commission on Aging, 10/18/21</p>
	Include the status quo alternative.	the study will evaluate both the benefits and impacts of expanding housing choice as compared with the status quo of current regulations and trends of redevelopment in lower density residential neighborhoods. This evaluation will include factors such as student generation, impervious surface, reduced housing costs, and increased density supporting more transit demand and lower carbon emissions. The study may result in recommendations for	LRPC, 9/27/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		future study of additional policy, planning, and regulatory guidance in areas of need.	
	Show where Missing middle forms already exist.	Arlington’s “existing middle” housing is shown in Bulletin 3 of the Research Compendium. The County’s exclusionary land use policy and zoning patterns are being addressed by studying how to expand housing choice and supply throughout Arlington County. In Phase 2, the study will consider how design ideas for new housing types could be most compatible with existing housing stock, which includes both single household homes, and missing middle forms such as duplexes, townhouses, and multi-family buildings. However, the study will also carefully consider how to distribute the potential for new development. Findings and recommendations of this study will be evaluated through a racial equity lens, to determine who might benefit, who would be burdened, and who would be left out, to ensure the County can work toward realizing an equitable community where all have access to the conditions needed to realize individual opportunities and goals.	LRPC, 9/27/21
	What types of changes to single family homes might be looked at in the study?	As mentioned above, In Phase 2, the study will consider how design ideas could apply to existing housing stock as a retrofit option to encourage prolonging the useful life of older houses and staff may also consider how to not only enable but encourage construction of housing types other than single family homes. This may include developing findings and recommendations for zoning standards and review processes that would make housing types studied in this effort more financially attractive than construction of a single household house.	LRPC, 9/27/21
	Can the study look at options for homeownership?	The study is focused on allowing new housing types, that could be either ownership or rental options. Both are needed. Homeownership incentives could be an area of future study, once new housing options are enabled. It is	TC, 9/30/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		important, however, to make sure that regulations do not “discriminate by tenure”, which is discrimination based on whether housing is ownership housing or rental, a violation of Fair Housing laws. The County has an array of programs and activities that support homeownership, including first time homebuyer assistance.	
	Will the study address accessibility? Accessibility should be a requirement in new housing, given the challenges and lack of homeownership for people with disabilities. Requiring accessibility will need state enabling legislation. Coverage limitations hinder ability to build walkways and driveways wide enough for accessibility needs.	It is not within the scope of the Missing Middle Housing Study to develop recommendations to require accessibility in new housing. However, the study will include housing types that may, by design, provide more accessibility than other options. Staff will work with an architectural consultant and consider options to provide accessible features.	HC, 10/7/21
	Will the study look at the likely pace of growth and change?	Yes, Phase 2 will include analysis to forecast the likely pace of change resulting from recommendations to expand housing choice.	HC, 10/7/21
	Will the study use an asset-based approach to evaluate options?	Yes, the study will consider both the impacts of allowing more housing choice as well as opportunities, leveraging existing County assets and resources.	Commission on Aging, 10/18/21
	Will opportunities for walkability be a factor in studying options?	Yes, Phase 2 will consider opportunities for walkability, including proximity to transit, amenities, retail, services, and other resources, in developing recommendations for more housing choice	Commission on Aging, 10/18/21
	When existing housing is torn down for new housing, there is a loss of the effort and carbon emissions used to build that house (embedded energy), and then additional carbon emissions created by new construction. The	This is a good point, however, preserving existing housing does not increase the supply of housing, which is a key goal of this study. The study will consider opportunities to allow owners to repurpose existing single detached homes into duplexes or multiplexes.	C2E2, 10/25/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	County should focus its efforts on maintaining or reusing existing buildings rather than replacing with new housing types.		
	What will happen if we don't expand housing choice?	It is likely that housing costs will continue to rise, due to the imbalance between jobs created in the region and the housing that is produced. It is also likely that existing modest single family homes will be replaced, over time, by larger, more expensive homes.	C2E2, 10/25/21
	Could Phase 2 include an overarching assessment climate assessment?	An overarching assessment of impacts of climate change on Arlington or impacts of new housing types on climate change would be outside the scope of this study. While the anticipated pace of development will be analyzed in Phase 2, it is expected that change will happen gradually with localized impacts and opportunities that will be studied in Phase 2. However, supporting more growth in inner ring suburbs with existing amenities and infrastructure is considered more sustainable and less carbon producing than pushing growth further to the exurbs.	JFAC, 10/27/21
Other Comments	The County has invested in excellent schools and public facilities. Investing in housing choice to support a diverse population will ensure that these facilities continue to be used to their capacity.	It is important to recognize that diverse housing choice built now represents an important investment in the overall sustainability and long-term vitality of any community.	JFAC, 10/27/21
	When will we have a methodology? what will the commission review process be for the methodology?	The study team welcomes input on the criteria for locational factors, as well as other elements of the proposed Phase 2 analysis presented in the Phase 1 Report. The methodology will be finalized after Phase 1 concludes. From a big picture perspective, design parameters and	LRPC, 9/27/21

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>There is a need for a working group to collaborate and provide feedback on the methodology, and a need for input on criteria for locational factors?</p>	<p>locational recommendations for new and expanded housing options will seek to balance community priorities and concerns, and there may be different options or choices to consider. Findings and tradeoffs from the detailed Phase 2 analysis will be presented to commissions, Community Partners, the general public, and subject matter experts for review. Community feedback will inform recommendations, and development of Phase 2 recommendations will be an iterative process.</p>	
	<p>Please find a way to move faster. We are losing too much time.</p>	<p>Phase 2 is targeted to begin by December 2021. Preliminary recommendations will be developed in the winter of 2021-22. Final recommendations for Phase 3 – Implementation will be developed in the spring of 2022 for review by the County Board, including the scope for potential Zoning Ordinance amendments to create support for more housing choice, other policy recommendations such as General Land Use Plan (GLUP) amendments, and recommendations for areas of future study. (Phase 3 - Implementation is anticipated for the 3rd - 4th quarter of 2022). Staff views this schedule as reasonable given the scope of work for Phase 2 and Phase 3 and will continue to look for opportunities for efficiency and expediency where possible.</p>	<p>TC, 9/30/21</p>
	<p>How will the MMHS remain focused on developing recommendations to expand housing choice when expanding housing choice points to the need for addressing growth management more broadly?</p>	<p>Beyond zoning regulations and new land use and housing policy, there may be other policy, planning, and regulatory guidance or requirements that the County may need to explore to support preservation/ production of Missing Middle housing types. The study will identify areas of policy and planning that may need additional study outside the scope of this study to mitigate impacts and/or support recommendations. Possible areas of exploration may</p>	<p>HC, 10/7/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>How can commissions and stakeholders support the Planning Division in managing such a large workload?</p>	<p>include affordability, sustainability, transportation, and capital improvements and investment.</p> <p>It is also important to note that the County has a Comprehensive Plan to guide growth and change in the County. Updates occur on a regular basis. For example, the Forestry and Natural Resources Management Plan Update will provide new guidance for stewarding the County’s tree canopy and natural resources. The Five-Year Comprehensive Plan Review will occur next year and may point to additional updates and guidance needed to steward Arlington through the 21st Century.</p>	
	<p>Misinformation about the study continues to be spread, and it is very frustrating considering the desires by many to have an honest and open discussion about how to address the change already occurring in the Arlington community, making it more and more difficult to find housing options that suit diverse household needs. If we do nothing, homes will continue to be replaced with large single family homes. Eventually there will be nothing left but mid- and high-rise apartments, a small inventory of existing missing middle housing, and large single household homes affordability to very few.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	<p>HC, 10/7/21</p>
	<p>Price points are a continuing source of confusion. Methods, materials and technologies will be</p>	<p>Design parameters for the housing types recommended for study will be illustrated and shared to support evaluation of potential options. Phase 2 will evaluate locating the</p>	<p>Public Comment,</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>important. Happy to see retrofits as an area being explored. It is a question what types and forms are appropriate for different areas. Perhaps duplexes and triplexes everywhere and other housing types closer to transit. Please put out images and drawings to help the public to envision the possibilities.</p>	<p>housing types recommended for study (small lot single detached, duplexes, small multiplexes, and townhouses) throughout Arlington, to determine recommendations for the most appropriate locations for each type.</p>	<p>LRPC 9/27/21</p>
	<p>I concur with Phase 1 recommendations. I would have liked to see the responses weighted renter/homeowners. I am disappointed with the timeline; a years long study is too long. I am disappointed to see ADUs not being considered. I would like to see how requirements impact prices. Increasing density is important for climate. I am viewing appeasement of a minority of homeowners. How could changes have impacts beyond Arlington, such as tree preservation and traffic reductions.</p>	<p>The Phase 1 Report has documented what the study team has heard through multiple rounds of community engagement. While the study listserv already includes 11,500 people, engagement efforts will continue to focus on those who may benefit from expanding housing choice, including renters.</p> <p>The priorities and concerns discussed in the report are consistent with those addressed by the County's adopted goals and policies, as articulated in the 11 elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Design parameters and locational recommendations for new and expanded housing options will seek to balance community priorities and concerns.</p>	<p>Public Comment, LRPC 9/27/21 Public Comment, LRPC 9/27/21</p>
	<p>Happy to see that the Commission on Aging will be consulted. Opportunities for downsizing are important. I don't see enough of</p>	<p>Some housing types proposed for study may be more accessible than others, and some may be less expensive than others, providing new housing opportunities for meeting different household needs. The first step is to</p>	<p>Public Comment, LRPC 9/27/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

	<p>the needs of seniors reflected in the report. Present more likely scenarios.</p>	<p>identify the most appropriate options for Arlington, then amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow those options. At that point, we can look at how existing programs or potential new policies, such as County employee housing programs or senior housing policies, can best coordinate - with new flexibility in the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	
	<p>Please refer to a letter from Arlingtonians for a Sustainable Future submitted to the Housing Commission on 10/7/21</p>	<p>The Phase 1 Report documents the concerns that have been raised. The Phase 1 Report also indicates how we will study potential impacts and benefits in Phase 2, responsive to the community’s priorities and concerns and also responsive to the requests made in the letter submitted by ASF. Once recommendations for enabling more housing choice are developed, we can evaluate impacts and benefits. Until that time, no one can yet forecast impacts or benefits.</p> <p>Additionally, one specific request was to quantify the fiscal impact of a single housing unit. This information will not be provided by the MMHS team; however, the Phase 2 impact and opportunity assessment will provide the appropriate data and information to evaluate options. It is important to realize that any such computation does not capture long-term benefits of investing in the County’s housing stock for future generations; providing a range of housing options at price points that would otherwise not be available.</p> <p>It is also important to acknowledge that the County’s current exclusionary land use pattern <u>already</u> allows for benefits to (mostly white) current homeowners, with no possibility for those who cannot afford a single household home to share in those benefits.</p>	<p>HC, 10/7/21</p>

**Expanding Housing Choice: Missing Middle Housing Study Draft Phase 1 Report
Commission Review Comment-Response Matrix**

		<p>Finally, it is not clear how it was calculated, per the ASF letter, that MM accounts for 50% of housing types outside of the R-B corridor, but this figure likely includes garden-style apartment complex units. While these units are a valued part of Arlington's housing stock (and also at risk of loss due to redevelopment pressure), they are not the focus of the study nor do they provide the same benefits as other MM types in terms of opportunities for homeownership, easily accessible/private open space, aging in community, or three-bedroom units. The missing middle housing types that can provide those benefits - duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and townhouses, make up only 8% of Arlington's housing stock outside of Arlington's three planning corridors.</p>	
--	--	---	--