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ALY PENNUCCI: Good evening, everyone. We're going to get the public hearing started if you haven't already taken a seat. I'm Aly Pennucci with the city council central staff. I'm one of the co-managers for the EIS. And I'm joined by my co-project manager as well Nick Welch from the Office of Planning and Community Development and Andrea Petzel from our consultant team.

We wanted to thank all of you for coming out tonight to provide comments on the draft EIS. I thank my colleagues from the Department of Neighborhoods, from the Office of Planning and Community Development, and Central staff to help make this meeting happen.

So thank you guys for coming.

With that, I will turn it over to Andrea who will go over some logistics, and then we'll get started with the hearing.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. So as Aly mentioned, this is the formal public hearing for the accessory dwelling units EIS. We will not be taking any questions and answers. This is a time for you to provide some feedback.

The hearing is being transcribed by our court reporter, Nancy. So please speak clearly, and she may ask you to repeat yourself. Speakers are limited to
two minutes of public comment, and if you exceed that
time, we will cut off the mic and ask you to provide
your comments in written form. You can do that either
here in our comment forms which you can pick up
outside or leave it on our computer or type at your
own leisure at home.

Like I said, speakers are limited to two
minutes. If you are representing an organization, you
have five minutes, and that has been noted who those
people are and we will identify those if they're
groups, representing groups.

As a reminder, public comment will be accepted
until June 25, and all comments carry equal weight.
If you decide you do not want to testify, you are more
than welcome to leave your comments in writing or
submit them online to Aly.

We will proceed in the order in which you
signed up, and everybody should have received a
numbered card. Disregard the "a" on that. We'll just
simply be going by the numbers. We will have you
queue up right here, so I think at this time, if you
are one through four, would you please just queue up.

You will see the timer right here in front of
you on this desk. Green -- Aly will turn it green
when we're ready to start the comment period. Yellow
1 will flash when you have 30 seconds left. Red will be
2 when we ask you to provide your comments in writing.
3 So with that, we will open the public hearing
4 and accept comments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit
5 Environmental Impact Statement. We ask that all
6 speakers begin by identifying themselves clearly and
7 limit yourself to two minutes. And your little
8 number, you can leave it right in the box at the foot
9 of the microphone. Speakers one through four, if you
10 could please queue up, that would be great.
11
12         SHAWN HOSFORD: My name is Shawn
13 Hosford, and I live in Broadview. I've lived there
14 for 27 years. I'm a third generation Seattle native,
15 and I want to provide affordable housing to others in
16 the community. We have a 1,000-square-foot lot that
17 we live on. Our house is a 1930s small house space,
18 so it doesn't cover much space. And we did a similar
19 size garage. The garage is 800 square feet.
20 We live in a neighborhood that has underground
21 springs. Broadview is crazy with underground springs,
22 and, therefore, there's water issues at the bottom of
23 the hill. And, oftentimes, the building department
24 doesn't talk to the water department, and so they
25 don't know that those things are connected
26 necessarily.
So we could build another unit on our lot besides our garage and our house, but then the neighbors down the hill would have water problems. They would have sewage coming down. The more you cover the land, the harder it is on the downhill neighbors. So we're not going to do that.

As you can see by the pictures I provided, we spent a lot of time designing the garage to be the style of the house. To add the 800 square feet above the garage, we would not have to raise the roof at all. Due to the rules, we can't do it so far.

I'm hoping that you all will look at your rules and make it more of a menu style. If there's 14 rules, maybe there could be ten rules that you have to adhere to because all neighborhoods are all different. If you treat them all the same -- they're not all the same. Queen Anne is different than Broadview that's different than Wallingford. I'd just like to suggest a menu option.

And then in closing, I want to thank you for your time and your consideration and the fact that you're even doing ADUs in a different way. I've been struggling with this for about ten years now, so thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.
EMILY JOHNSTON: Hi. My name is Emily Johnston, and I'm a representative of 350 Seattle. We're a climate group, and so I look at housing very specifically through a climate lens. And the two are very distinctly connected. Housing is a moral crisis in Seattle, but it is also a climate crisis. Since the end of the financial downturn, we've added more than 100,000 jobs here and only 32,000 housing units. What that means is we're pushing people out of the city, people who prefer to live in the city, and that also means that their carbon footprints are doubled essentially. Because people who live in and walk in their neighborhoods have half the average carbon footprint.

So everything I'm about to say speaks to the fact that we need to build lots more housing, and we need to do it soon. So the first thing I would ask is that you actually go with an option for three ADUs. Somebody could have two attached and one detached, and one of the things that we should be encouraging is internal conversions for empty nesters, for example, who don't need 2,500 square feet anymore, can have two interior flats and have -- you know, and then have one
other unit for themselves.

Additionally, we should definitely have no parking requirements. Every time we choose privileged parking over housing, people lose out, and we also should have no owner occupancy requirements. If we don't require ownerships in single-family housing, why would we require it in the rental that's attached to the single-family housing?

We also need to waive development charges for low-income homeowners so that they can stay in their homes and afford to do that and also build additional homes that will help them stay in their homes. And we also need to waive development charges for people who are building properly.

A lot of these buildings will last for up to 100 years, and what that means is we need to be encouraging green building centers like the living building standard, like green roofs, etc., and offering people more incentives in order to build properly so we have a community friendly city. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Speaker No. 3.

And speakers five, six, and seven, please line up.

ANGELA COMPTON: Thank you so much for
this opportunity to give comments to the update to the ADU/DADU legislation. My name is Angela Compton. I'm here on behalf of Futurewise. We're a statewide organization that works on preserving our green space and farmland by curbing sprawl and the inner cities livable for everyone.

I'm here today to give support for the proposed updates that will make it easier for construction of backyard cottages and basement homes. As any of my Seattle neighbors know, we do not have enough homes for all of our neighbors, and the fact that we don't have enough homes is one of the biggest causes of homelessness and displacement.

But we all want our neighbors to have safe, affordable homes; right? So then we must ask the question: Why are the City of Seattle's laws around housing so restrictive? Are we afraid of creating too many homes for people to actually live in?

This cannot be the case for a world-class city like Seattle. Please make it easier to build homes for my neighbors who desperately need them. The addition of more backyard cottages and basement apartments to Seattle's neighborhoods will do nothing but improve the liveability of these neighborhoods.

These types of accessory dwelling units are
the perfect homes for peoples transitioning, downsizing, or just starting out. With our lack of affordable land to build homes, these legislative changes need to happen. Let alone, the proposed changes are not enough.

We urge you to continue pushing for innovative solutions from the housing corridor and liveability agenda. We not only need more homes, but we need to make sure that some of those homes are reserved for our low-income neighbors. And as we continue to grow, the city is working to provide additional support and resources for our communities at risk of displacement.

One additional support that we would really like to see in the update to the ADU/DADU policies is the addition of a preapproved design catalog for property owners to select from. The creation of this sort of catalog would significantly cut down on the time and cost of building an accessory dwelling home.

Seattle does not want to be a city that's seen as afraid of building too many homes. We should be a city that says we know that people are happier when they are able to live close to jobs, schools, and other amenities, and we are prepared to build the kinds of homes that it dictates next to a liveable and affordable future. Thank you.
ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

PATIENCE MALOBA: Good evening. My name is Patience Maloba, and I am here on behalf of Seattle for Everyone. We appreciate this opportunity to participate in testimony, and we appreciate the analysis and information provided in the EIS.

I just wanted to begin by saying that we support the effort made by these updates in the EIS to ensure that we are reducing existing barriers to the production of accessory dwelling units.

We all know the requirements have restricted the opportunity for homeowners to actually be able to produce new housing types, and we want to ensure that they are part of the housing solution as well by being able to produce new housing types. Allowing (inaudible) will enable production of more backyard cottages and modern in-home units, which can mean more affordable units and more affordable homes across the city in all parts of the city.

But alone these changes are not enough; right? One additional resource that we would like to see alongside the updates is the creation of new ways for moderate-income households to be able to actually apply for city-sponsored grants that enable them to financially convert their basements into apartments.
leading to more people being able to actually stay in place within their neighborhoods and not be pushed out of their neighborhoods. And in that way, we're creating a more stable community.

We look forward to working with the city as we ensure implementation of more accommodations and also as we find ways to create programs that will allow and ensure low-income populations and communities of color to have access and retain access to those new housing types. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Hi. My name is Laura Loe Bernstein, and I'm a renter in the U-District. And I live in the basement of a house. I would love it to have a kitchen. I'm an organizer, a volunteer with the all-volunteer group called MOAR, M-O-A-R. And we started when the scoping came out for the EIS and decided to do a petition and got 500 folks to sign on in two weeks to this idea of not just an Alternative 2, not just an Alternative 3, but looking beyond cottages to other housing types that would fit in the single-family envelope.

And so that petition is online. I really encourage everyone to look at it, and it's tied to an article that the person's name Matt wrote about
10 different ways to look beyond cottages. The EIS that came out after the scoping speaks to that. It speaks to the historical legacy of our single-family homes, who's been able to afford one, who's been priced out of certain neighborhoods, who's been limited from home ownership through redlining, through racial covenants, and how all of that plays into backyard cottages.

The document is incredibly educational. I was a middle school math and science teacher. The EIS is something that can serve us, not just for cottages, but in our wider housing discussions, especially around some of the misconceptions that people have around teardowns. The study actually showed that this will help prevent some of the teardowns in our city. And there's other kind of myths that are dispelled by this document that are really important.

So MOAR represents 500 folks that signed the petition as well as about 50, 60 people that meet regularly and 300 folks that meet online to discuss things like private financing for backyard cottages, and we encourage everyone to join us and please request the most far-reaching, beyond-cottages policy that we can have.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.
Speaker 6, you are representing an organization. You have five minutes.

And can I have a group -- Group 8, 9, and 10 can line up as well, please.

CALVIN JONES: Hi. My name is Calvin Jones. I'm here with members of Seattle Tech 4 Housing, and I'm also a renter in Madison Valley. I'm a big fan of the proposed changes to the ADUs. Madison Valley is a high-opportunity neighborhood, and every ADU that we build in my neighborhood means that someone else has access to the amazing parks, the frequent transit, the access to groceries, and the great schools that my neighborhood has to offer.

And I think this is a really great opportunity that we, as a city, should take. I'd love to see the city do more. I think that ADUs provide us some creative ways to affect issues like displacement in the city.

One potential option could be providing a public subsidy to low-income homeowners in high-expensive neighborhoods. So the rental income from the ADU could help them afford to live in the neighborhood, and maybe even in the ADU, they would welcome back a formerly displaced neighbor. Thank you.
RACHAEL LUDWICK: Hi. My name is Rachael Ludwick, and I live in North Beacon Hill. I'm also here for Seattle Tech 4 Housing. I actually -- my family actually built a backyard cottage a few years ago under the city rules. And it actually had a house there that had been built decades ago that would not be usable. You couldn't build where it is now the way it is. And it was before you could do that, before the rules were in place.

And it was actually really hard to build in that new process, and the new rules would have made it easier and cheaper and less complicated. But it is built now, and the thing that is really great is my mother moved in six months ago. And I have a four-year-old daughter, so that's her granddaughter. So she lives with us. She is at retirement age now, not in the best of health, and her living there is one of the best things our family has done.

And she's going to get to see her granddaughter, and my daughter is going to see her grandmother growing up. I think that should be easier for everyone. That's why I'm asking the city council to move forward on these changes and remove as many barriers as possible that might stop a family from building this so that they can have their family and
multigenerational family and still stay in Seattle. We should allow use of the lot. We should
definitely not care about which kind depending on what families can do. They may want to build two detached
ones and two little apartments. It shouldn't matter what kind it is. If we can build more, we should
build more. We should allow the greater square foot. If you're building it as rental income so your family
can stay in Seattle, we might need that extra space.

We should allow the greater height limits, 2 feet greater height limits. We should especially encourage people that do green building. Our roof, we
couldn't have a roof deck with a green roof on it under the current rules just because the zoning, and that seems silly given the issues of climate change.

We definitely shouldn't be requiring parking or owner occupancy because that would limit the ability to actually build more units and actually have the flexibility. To require parking, you might not have the space to have grandma in your backyard.

Every restriction that might stop a family from building is stopping a family from living their life in a way that supports them and keeps them in the city.

It also might force them into a situation
1 where they have greater environmental impacts and, you
2 know, contribute to climate change more. We should do
3 the most that we can. Thank you.
4
5 ERIC: Hi there. My name is Eric
6 (inaudible). I work in tech. I'm in favor of
7 housing. So, yeah, I moved to Seattle about ten years
8 ago. We bought our house last year. It's a great
9 place. It could definitely accommodate a backyard
10 cottage. It's on a corner lot, so it would have its
11 own -- the backyard cottage would have its own street
12 frontage. It would be this nice little house along
13 the street that's like every other house, but the
14 problem is that our lot is a whole 80 square feet
15 smaller than the requirement.
16
17 So these changes would enable us to build that
18 where it is not currently allowed, and I think this
19 would be great. I've seen so many friends my age who
20 are not fortunate to work in the tech industry.
21 They've been forced farther and farther out from the
22 city center because we don't have enough houses. We
23 need more houses. Let me put one in my backyard.
24
25 Thank you.

26 ZACH LUBARSKY: My name is Zach
27 Lubarsky. I'm also part of Seattle Tech 4 Housing.
28
29 Thank you so much for doing the EIS.
I think what needs to go through to the final EIS is a combination of Alternatives 2 and 3. Having -- allowing three ADUs on a single lot is the most important thing. Also try not to -- try not to have MHA applied to the third ADU because that's going to make it pretty financially unviable, and alternatives to height limits is not super great.

ELAINE IKE: Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Elaine Ike. I represent myself and Seattle Green Spaces Coalition.

Currently, one thing that certainly is not apparent in any of the planning here tonight is that 63 percent of the urban tree canopy exists on private lots, and, currently, the City of Seattle and Rob Johnson is pushing for a more robust trees ordinance. That has not been reflected in the planning as well.

I believe that the proposal to have accessory dwelling units is a good one but not if it displaces trees. We need the environmental positive things that trees can give to the community, namely, the air, the air we breathe, and filtering the water.

The present tree canopy is deficient. And my question is: Will the planning here make it further deficient already? We see multiple mature trees being removed from neighborhoods, and I don't think that
Seattle can remain livable if we cut down more and more trees. It’s just a fact. The heat effect is with us. May was the hottest month of May on record in the history of Seattle, and we need those trees to do the services that it gives to us. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker 8. Please remember to speak right into the microphone too.

MARTIN KAPLAN: Good evening. Thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Martin Kaplan, an architect, and I represent the Queen Anne Community Council and the Land Use Committee.

And we’d like to — we’re going to submit a comprehensive comment on the adequacy of the EIS, and that would be forthcoming before June 25. Tonight I want to drill down just on one element of the proposal that we feel very strongly deserves, you know, a lot more work.

The SEPA test for EIS adequacy states: The environmental effects of the proposed action and reasonable alternatives must be sufficiently disclosed and discussed and substituted by supportive opinion and data.

What’s left out in the EIS and has been left
out for a couple years is this notion that we have
over 38 distinct neighborhoods in the city of Seattle.
We used to rely on neighborhood plans, neighborhood
planning, and involved neighborhoods in the
conversation to have some impact over their own
destiny.
What's happened is those neighborhood plans
have been genocide, and what we have now is a top-down
approach from city hall looks at the city as being
flat, looks at the city as being homogeneous, looks at
the city as all having the same size lots, same size
character, the same size street issues.
And we feel strongly that this proposal could
benefit strongly by looking at each neighborhood in a
more nuanced way, taking into consideration the unique
qualities and character behind each individual
neighborhood. And we'll be commenting further. Thank
you.
ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you for your
comments.
Speaker 9. And could I have 11 and 12 please
queue up.
ZACH SHANER: Thank you. My name is
Zach, and I'm a renter in Beacon Hill. When the EIS
process started a couple years ago, the median Seattle
home was worth $594,000. In the two years it's taken to get to the draft EIS, the median value is 725,000. I say this just to say this political process is not morally neutral. While we've talked studies, owning a home has gotten $131,000 harder, and time is of the essence.

In the meantime, my family has given up on owning a home in the next few years. Instead, we've been looking at paying for our close friends to build a second story on their home as an ADU. They're both teachers, and they recently inherited some money to buy one of those gorgeous, classic, small north Seattle homes.

As anybody knows and it's completely unsurprising, they want to share (inaudible), and they want to build both an ADU and DADU on their lot. For one-third of the price of buying a 725 median home, my wife and I could have permanent residency. But under the current law, what we want to do is illegal.

Despite being two blocks from the highest selection of bus lines in the city and being just one mile from Northgate station, their home is just one block outside the urban village, and that's single-family.

Despite having four parking spaces in front of
their sidewalk of this north Seattle home, current law requires off-street parking that would make the DADU portion feasible. Alternative 2 of the EIS would fix that.

At 3,800 square feet, the lot is 200 square feet too small to allow ADUs. Alternative 2 would fix that. Even if the units were legal under current law, if they were to move and want to rent out their spaces, we would be functionally evicted because of the owner occupancy requirement. Alternative 2 would fix that as well.

I really dream of the day that we have painted a process to stop housing rather than to permit it, but in the meantime, this is a small step in the right direction and that's due to Alternative 2. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

ALICE LOCKHART: My name is Alice Lockhart. I live in Licton Springs. We may all be feeling a bit demoralized after the head tax spike, but we know the fight for affordable housing in Seattle is one that we cannot afford to lose.

We all need the opportunity to be safely housed with big city and small carbon footprint lives. The ADU final EIS is an opportunity to get a bit secure in city housing without displacement and
without taxpayer funding, and even cooler, the draft EIS found no significant impact from any of the elements of any of the alternatives signifying that we can likely do more and in the final preferred alternative.

In the final EIS, we absolutely need to consider climate and climate impact of low- versus high-carbon existence, here versus sprawl, in determining what is the right thing to do. You know, obviously, from a purely objective standpoint, it needs to trump just about every, except for equity consideration, consideration that we're considering.

I wrote a lot of script there, but I feel strongly. And as such, I urge you to adopt in the preferred alternative no parking requirements, no MHA requirements, no owner occupancy requirement, and no other new requirements that are likely to reduce the number of people who will consider building a backyard cottage or converting part of their existing home into additional housing.

And, last, but not least, I would implore the council to do all it can to help folks with limited means to create backyard cottages and mother-in-law apartments by streamlining processes, providing financing, and providing incentives for both.
low-income folks and for green building. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

Sam, could I have the last two sign-in sheets?

Thanks.

Eleven. And could please 13 and 14 queue up.

SHERI NEWBOLD: Hello. Thank you for performing the draft EIS and also giving me the opportunity to give some feedback today. My name is Sheri Newbold, and I'm an architect in Seattle. And I've designed over 20 DADUs and ADUs, and I have one in my house in Greenwood.

We need more flexibility in the land use code. I know firsthand that more flexibility will allow us to create more dwellings. I support Alternative 2, all of those changes in it. It will give us much more needed flexibility and allow more housing to be created.

On a personal note, I also support Alternative 2 since I own a small 700 square foot rental house in Seattle on a 8,800 square foot lot. There's plenty of space and it's flat. I would like to keep it as a rental, turn it into a DADU, construct a new house with an ADU on the property, and rent all three of those units out, but, currently, I cannot do that and add more units to the city.
Please make these changes to the land use code so that we have more flexibility, and people can add more units. Thank you.

Andrea Petzel: Just a quick status update. We have 33 speakers, and thank you for keeping it to two minutes.

Bruce Nourssit: My name is Bruce Nourssit. I own a small west (inaudible) attached single-family house in Seattle. It is 400 square feet. It provides a great place for my tenant who is a middle age woman, no kids, travels a lot. It's perfect for her. It's another unit. It's another place someone can live in the city and enjoy everything about it. It has a lot to offer.

I support more housing across the board. I support Alternative 2 because it provides the most opportunity to build houses. I think building more houses for people is more important than tree canopy, than the institutes of neighborhood councils. I think adding more people to a neighborhood doesn't take away from its character. I support more housing.

My only complaint about this legislation is it doesn't go far enough. We need to reevaluate the single-family zoning in the city. The single-family zoning was applied in the 1920s when what are now
considered centrally located neighborhoods were in the middle of nowhere. We need to think much bigger than ADUs. We need to start thinking about abolishing single-family zoning and making it possible for far more people to live in Seattle. Thank you. I support Alternative 2.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thirteen. Fifteen and sixteen can line up.

MATT HUTCHINS: Hi. My name is Matt Hutchins, and I'm an architect and also work with MOAR as an architect and as a West Seattleite. As a Seattleite, I feel strongly that not only do we have a housing crisis -- or an equity crisis and increasingly unaffordable city, building more ADUs is going to have -- could have potentially a huge impact if we allow them to happen.

We need to take all the best of 2, Alt 2, and all the best of Alt 3 and see how much more we can do. We should at least allow two ADUs per property, whatever form they take; at least two more people per ADUs so we have 12 people per property; 200 square feet per -- in extra space in the ADU; the 2 feet height bonus because that makes construction a lot easier; and 2 feet for green roofs for passive house for different environmentally -- I should say living
building rather than green building systems. All those things make living in an ADU and DADU better. I am firmly against too much parking, too many mansions, too many restrictions like owner occupancy. They're entirely classist. If we believe that it's okay to rent a house -- and, in fact, a quarter of Seattleites do rent a house, if we believe it's okay to live in an apartment, more than half of Seattleites rent, why should we not be able to add more house and rent both.

And then, finally, anything that we can do to restrict the cost of permitting across property tax; anything that we can do that's going to help lower income people who do not have the benefit of equity that's built up in this kind of crazy real estate world to purchase one of these and to build one of these and to live in one of these, I support.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. Fourteen.

DON MILES: I'm Don Miles. I'm a Queen Anne resident, and I also own a rental house in West Seattle. If one looks at the EIS, it doesn't say that this is going to solve our affordable housing, and so I would suggest people look closely at what it actually says.

I think Alternative 1, to some degree, is
given short shrift in the EIS, particularly in the summary sections. I think that the environmental impacts of Alternative 1 should be more thorough in nature because, of course, those -- many of those units exist now.

I also think that sloping sites in hillside neighborhoods needs to be addressed in the aesthetic section. I think skinny streets or dual streets need to be looked at in the transportation section. I think that historic preservation needs to be addressed, and it isn't currently.

In the full build-out section, the illustrations show a number of aggregate impacts of the concentration of this development in a specific neighborhood site. The EIS refers to these concentrations that could potentially be problematic or having more impacts. I think that in the full build-out scenario, you're getting something that could create a sort of alley community or backyard community, which could have security and safety issues and turns its back on the socializing effect of the urban sidewalk.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. We'll have you submit the rest of your comments in writing, please.
Speaker 15?

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 16?

JESSE SIMPSON: Hi. I'm Jesse with the Capitol Hill Renters Initiative and Mill Park Neighbors. I'd like to speak in favor of the broad proposal and specifically in favor of Alternative 2 since it broadly allows the most ADUs to be built overall. Seattle is in the midst of a housing affordability crisis, and we need to do anything we can to build homes in the city. We need to open up the vast areas of the city that are zoned single-family housing for people with lesser means to live in. And that means ADUs, and I think also going beyond that and abolishing single-family zoning as a whole.

I'd like to echo the point that we shouldn't have any parking requirements for ADUs requiring parking when putting in backyard cottages, mother-in-law apartments. Much less feasible in most development situations. We need to prioritize creating spaces for people to live over spaces to park cars. Alternative 2, again, I'd like to see it
implemented with some slight changes, specifically allowing more flexibility in terms of type of ADUs, not distinguishing between attached and detached ADUs.

There are parts of the city with larger homes on relatively small lots that are ripe for internal conversions and other areas with small homes and large lots where you can build multiple homes with a detached building.

Making the rules as flexible as possible will help more people feasibly fill these ADUs and add to Seattle's housing stock and help more people within the city. Thanks.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

And 19 and 20 and 21 can line up.

JESSICA WESTGREN: Good evening and thank you for your time and attention. My name is Jessica, and I'm here from Welcoming Wallingford. Tonight I'd like to speak to you in favor of the ADU/DADU Alternative 2.

I'm not going to surprise anyone when I mention that we are in a housing crisis. Backyard cottages, mother-in-law cottages are the smallest, least impactful way for us as a city to house our citizens. Currently, we cannot build duplexes, triplexes, four floors, and corner stores on the
Wallingford enjoys access to several iconic Seattle parks, transit that travels both north and south and east and west. These opportunities should be made available to more people. Backyard cottages and mother-in-law apartments allows families to stay together. A parent can house their children. Aging family members can downsize and remain in your family. These things are both important and impactful.

I like Alternative 2 for several reasons. Out of all the alternatives, No. 2 removes the most barriers to entry. It does the most to make building backyard cottages possible. No owner occupancy and no off-street parking required are great. It potentially reduces predevelopment costs, which is awesome.

I say that if our citizens want to address the housing crisis with their own hands using their own land, then let them do so. I do want to add a small bit, though. If you're going to create a whole bunch of landlords by creating a whole bunch of backyard cottages, I think it would be great if the city offered lease writing classes and legal classes so that these new landlords can feel prepared to navigate the complicated Seattle landlord-tenant laws.

Thanks again for your time and have a
1 wonderful evening.

   GLEN PITTENGER: My name is Glen Pittenger. I'm a third-generation Seattle resident, a 40-year city resident, and a 25-year homeowner in Maple Leaf, and I fully support Alternative 2 from the draft EIS because I feel it creates more housing in the city in the vast, vast single-family zones and allows us to share our land with more people.

   It allows us to downsize a place, and I think many of us would like to know we can live on our land forever and not be priced out. Doing that may just promote more teardowns and more $2 million mini mansions, and that doesn't do anything for anybody and nothing for our affordability. Don't allow a snobby 2 percent that used to dominate our neighborhood councils to tell the rest of us how we can live on our land.

   ANDREA PETZEL: Speaker 19 and have 20, 21, 22.

   LARRY CALI: My name is Larry Cali. I'm a 48-year resident of Queen Anne Hill, and I agree with Marty Kaplan that, yes, every neighborhood is unique. But in order to be fair and equitable for all neighborhoods that whatever alternative is adopted that it be citywide, go into effect on the same day,
1 and no exceptions. It's the only way that this
2 proposal, whatever it might be that is adopted, would
3 be fair and equitable to the whole city. Thank you.
4
5 ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. I just want
6 to make sure we didn't miss Speaker 19?
7
8 MIKE STECKLER: No, I'm good.
9
10 ANDY FESSEL: My name is Andy Fessel,
11 and I'm a homeowner in Seattle. And it seems like
12 it's Queen Anne against the rest of the city, but I'm
13 a homeowner in Queen Anne. I say let's do a DADU in
14 my backyard.
15
16 And I'm here for the future. The future I see
17 is my daughter. She's age 31. She's a medical
18 professional; spends from early in the morning until
19 late in the evening helping people with rheumatism up
20 on Pill Hill. And she called my wife and said, "I
21 need you, Mom and Dad, to help me with this family
22 stuff."
23
24 And my wife got my grandkids, and so we looked
25 all around for solutions. How can we make this work
26 in the city in terms of commuting and where they might
27 live, etc. As we looked around at different homes and
28 found a cottage, a DADU, in the alley and said what a
29 wonderful idea. I'd be more than willing to walk
30 across the backyard to take care of grandkids.
So I tell my daughter that DADU stands for dad and you. And so I hope -- we're in great support, my wife and I, for Option 2. We want to confirm that our daughter and my son-in-law wouldn't live in the city if we didn't have a DADU option. They would be commuting in from the east side. You lose that youth that the city is all about.

We have a next-door house to us that has been sold twice in recent months all by dot-com millionaires. Since they have a kid, they move out to Issaquah and on to the next dot-com millionaire. That's not the future of the city. The future of the city is young people living here, growing, and going to the schools.

I take the bus to Seattle Community College. I want to get back into the high-tech sector. My wife does volunteer work. We're the future, but we want to age in place, so we need more storage. We need a garage. We want to be able to take the funds out of our house when we move on, so we need to allow our daughter to buy from us and rent it to someone else. So we should consider those changes, and they can be for dad and all the kids. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

Let's have 24, 25, 26 line up as well.
KRIS ILGENFUTZ: I'm Kris Ilgenfutz, and I'm from the Fauntleroy neighborhood. And I'm following up on a letter that was sent from the Fauntleroy Community Association in November 2017 expressing our requests for the city to consider as they look at ADUs and DADUs.

And one of the things that I would like to strongly urge is that an owner must be present in one of the units for at least six months of the year, and I would like you to request -- I would like to request that parking be required for each unit built. The Fauntleroy Community Association and our neighborhood will be following up with comments towards the end of June. Thank you very much.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

PAUL CHAPMAN: Hi. I'm Paul Chapman. I'm from Welcoming Wallingford. Thank you all for the work that you put into pulling together this EIS and running this meeting for us.

We need this change. For over the last 100 years or so, we have incrementally restricted housing on the 80 percent of the residential land in Seattle. And, unfortunately, my neighborhood, Wallingford, has for decades been at the forefront of...
excluding the housing we need to address our growing population.

Do not let obstructionist homeowners block much needed housing in our city. It will increase the number of affordable units and give homeowners options to generate income and age in place. Do not let concerns over canopy displace people in favor of trees.

Unfortunately, however, this proposal doesn't go far enough. We don't need 3,300 units. We need 33,000. I strongly encourage you to implement these changes and to streamline permitting issues that make it harder for owners to build these units. I encourage you to provide incentives to entice owners to build. Thank you very much.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

Twenty-four.

KAREN DeLUCAS: Hi. My name is Karen DeLucas. I am an architect as well as a homeowner in Madison Valley. My husband and I were fortunate enough to go to our own new house. The last few years we had an attached ADU inside of that.

I'm here today to support many of the changes that the EIS has been looking at, including allowing two ADUs on a lot, increasing the size of a DADU,
allowing for ADUs on smaller lots, removing -- removal
of the parking requirement as well as the removal of
the owner occupancy.

One of the other bigger barriers to building
more ADUs I see is financing. Construction costs are
soaring in Seattle, and trying to get financing to
build DADUs or ADUs traditional ways is actually
rather difficult. So I would encourage the city to
look at creative ways of financing them.

ANDREA PETZEL: Twenty-five?

Twenty-six.

BEN WADSNED: Twenty-six. My name is
Ben Wadsned. I've lived in Seattle for about 25
years, and I'm lucky at this point to own four houses,
two of them with my brother. Three of these are
rentals, and the fourth I live in with a DADU over the
garage.

I should have brought my reading glasses. My
comments tonight are focused on the owner occupancy
requirement because we want to have dwelling units on
two of these properties. But I want to tell you about
two of these houses as well as a third house that I
don't own.

House No. 1 is the house my brother lived in
for six years before leaving Seattle for a job. It's
a four-bedroom house with two rooms on the main floor and two in a daylight basement. We lived in it. We lived upstairs and rented downstairs out to several different single people for six years. Sometimes he had a roommate, but it was usually just him. So three people and never more than three cars. Today we can don't that. For whatever reason, we rented it out probably three times over the last ten years and had very few families interested and had none interested enough to rent it. We ended up renting it to four roommates. That means four roommates and today four cars. You get my point. ADU/no ADU, it doesn't really matter.

The other house I want to tell you about is a 1,000 square foot house on a 9,000 square foot lot on a back alley. The backyard is virtually empty with the exception of a garage that gets very little use because there's ample parking in front and has access to the front of the house a lot easier.

I'm really eager to build a backyard cottage in the backyard of this house and add another dwelling, but I can't do that because I don't live on the property. That's one less home in a desirable but not especially expensive neighborhood. I'm not looking to sell the property, but as the EIS made
clear, the smartest thing I could do from a financial standpoint would be to tear the house down and build a big new house and sell it. I don't want to do that.

The last house I want to tell you about I don't own. It's down the street from where I live. It was, up until 2015, a small post-war shoebox that sold for 400,000 in 2015. It's now a 3,800-foot McMansion that sold in July of last year for 1.6 million.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. Please submit the rest of your comments in writing.

BEN WADSNED: So bottom line, I urge you to -- I urge you strongly to adopt Alternative 2 and make this as easy as possible for homeowners and landowners --

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

BEN WADSNED: -- to add additional properties. Thanks.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. Could 28, 29, and 30 come on down.

MARIE KAHN: Hello. I'm Marie Kahn. I've lived in Seattle for about 40 years. Whether you like it or not, our city is growing, and some people want to put their head in the sand and ignore the growth and try and limit the amount of density that
we're creating. The reality of that is you're just
going to push it into large apartment buildings or
people commuting from out of the city into the city.

So I think that we need to get more density,
whether we like it or not, to maintain housing. New
development is very costly, so if we don't allow
integration in the neighborhoods like DADUs and ADUs,
you're going to get larger buildings, and you're going
to get more dense buildings that are expensive and, by
their nature, are not very affordable.

You don't get developers building large
apartment buildings in a dense area and building cheap
apartments. It just doesn't happen very often. The
DADUs and ADUs are, by their nature, lower cost
housing than a lot of the new big buildings. They
don't have parking garages. They don't have a lot of
the systems that bigger buildings have.

ADUs and DADUs are not really bastions of
large developers. You're not going to find developers
coming into neighborhoods building duplexes and
triplexes and destroying the nature of our
neighborhoods. Big developers come in, they mow down
houses, and they build a McMansion because that's
where they make their most money.

So I don't think that this is a risk of
changing the character of our neighborhoods by having large developers coming in and spoiling the character of the neighborhoods. The DADUs and ADUs are going to be the bastion of mom-and-pop landlords and small family landlords, and I think that creates a more intimate landlord-tenant relationship. And it's a better landlord-tenant relationship to maintain the character of our city.

I think that allowing DADUs and ADUs gives people more options to live in home. If you have someone waving a $1.2 million check in your face and you're on a limited budget and you have the option of having a DADU in your backyard and maintaining your home, I think that gives people better option than selling out and having their home leveled and a large McMansion built in its place.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

MARIE KAHN: In short, I think this is a low-impact way of integrating more people into our city and not creating larger buildings in dense areas.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: We'll have Speaker 28.

DAVID MOEHRUNG: My name is David Moehring. I'm with the Magnolia Community Council, and I just handed to you a petition signed by
87 people in the city of Seattle looking for an additional alternative above and beyond what has been presented.

DADUs are a good idea, but so is open space and so is trees. We can have both. We don't have one or the other. However, if you look at what's in the study, it's not shown on any of these boards is that there's basically no more trees left on these private properties except for the right-of-way. And two-thirds of Seattle's trees are on single-family lots.

So two ADUs in the backyard, guess what, where do the trees go? And it does impact our environment. LiDAR did a study for Seattle in 2016, as you know, and they show correlation directly where there's trees versus where there is local heat. Where there is no trees, we have local heat increase -- temperature increase, more air-conditioning. And all of our efforts to try to get a better environment for the city of Seattle and state of Washington actually goes the opposite direction. I encourage you to look at those LiDAR studies as well.

The density at two units on a 3,200 square foot lot is too dense. It is more dense than the LR-1 comp house that I live in, in east side of Magnolia.
So I would encourage a wiser way -- and the petition actually encourages a way -- how to get to two units without decreasing the open space.

We also want to maintain public ownership of our -- I mean not public. I'm sorry. Private ownership rather than having people who don't necessarily live in Seattle, such as happened in Vancouver, B.C. and other places, but they rent the land.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

Twenty-nine.

GREGORY SCRUGGS: Good evening. My name is Gregory Scruggs, and I'm just speaking on my own behalf. I'm a resident of Squire Park. My wife and I own a home in the study area of the EIS. We're in something of a doughnut hole between two urban villages on a single-family lot.

We do not -- we have a lot large enough for an ADU under the current regulations, but we don't have any off-street parking. And there is no room in the current configuration without entirely moving our house to add an off-street parking space. So I'm here to support any of the alternatives that don't require off-street parking in particular.

We do own a car. We park it on the street,
but we don't anticipate that a future mother-in-law suite for my mother-in-law would need an additional vehicle coming to the neighborhood. We have a number of trees in the backyard as well, and I can anticipate planting new trees if we have to remove the old ones -- or the existing ones to put in a new ADU.

And also I did want to support any of the incentive options reducing carbon (inaudible), what have you. We just bought a house. It's quite an expensive undertaking to maintain one house and pay a mortgage. So any of those possible short-term incentives, like waiving fees and that sort of thing, for a period of years would certainly help us. We moved from an apartment to this house with a big backyard, and it feels like valuable, precious urban land that could go to waste that could ultimately serve to house a person. Thanks.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

So we'll have 32 and 33 queue up as well.

You are Speaker No. 31? Speaker 30? Go ahead.

MEGAN MURPHY: Okay. So I'm really interested in watching the carbon footprint decrease. So it's really cool to watch this morph and take shape. There's a lot of flexibility as it flowers
and -- into something. So this is from MOAR. I looked it up. M-O-A-R. Because I thought this was about the urban head text.

I'm involved in the housing issues, and I don't need a lot of space. So a lot of homeowners that qualify for small loans from the Office of Housing from the pool of MHA payments when creating additional dwellings, I'm assuming that the interest rates will be really low. Because usually when you get one from the government, it has a reasonable interest rate that you can trust.

So also you can have double ownership. Allow split ownership of lots, the existing house and the new cottage, like a fee simple subdivision. That one looks good. That one -- housing opportunity overlay, create a ring overlay within 10-minute walkshed of schools, parks, urban villages, arterials, and frequent transit where additional housing is desired. Allow residential small lot zoning with MHA and overlay.

Make parking requirements for additional units voluntary. Use green building incentives similar to other improvement types. Allow 10 percent increase in size in the height for projects on lots over 4,000 square feet. Allow 20 percent increase for lots
over 5,000 square feet. Waive building permit fees for five years for ADUs and DADUs. Portland uses this incentive improvement nearly one per day, six times the rate of Seattle's accessory dwelling unit production.

So I like to see the community shaping the rules instead of the rules shaping the community. So thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

We have Speaker 32 and 33. Speaker 32.

KELLI REFER: Hi. My name is Kelli Refer. I am (inaudible) and a Wallingford resident. Our family is currently in the process of building a backyard cottage, and through this process, we've actually learned a lot about how the current rules are very restrictive.

One, in particular, issue is the parking requirement. Our family doesn't own a car. We have no intention to. We're walk, bike, transit advocates. And what we've sacrificed in the space for a car parking spot on this property is actually a closet for my baby. So her bedroom is going to be very tiny and barely fit a twin bed, and because we needed to make sure that we had a space for a car that we don't have, we actually lost a lot of valuable space for our
family.

We also lost garden space. I love trees. I love gardening. I want to see a good tree canopy in the city, but we did have to cut -- we didn't have to cut down a tree, but we lost a lot of our green space due that that parking requirement. I support all of the proposed Alternative 2 recommendations.

And another issue I just want to bring up is we've been waiting -- we've been working on this project since January of last year. We're just about to lay a foundation, and the majority of that time has been spent with our project being held up in the permitting office. We need to expedite these projects quickly through the permitting office so we can get them built and create more housing for people.

Finally, this is just one small step in dealing with Seattle's housing affordability crisis. We need to get rid of all the single-family zoning and open up the cities for all kinds of housing. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: That concludes those who have signed up on the sign-in sheet. Is there anybody wishing to make a comment? Yes? I'll have you sign in too, please.

Q I was signed up and decided to go later.
BONNIE WILLIAMS: I'm from Wallingford, and I have a little bit different perspective. I lived in Ballard for a long time, and I had one detached DADU built next to me that was illegal. The city didn't discover it was illegal and refused to inspect it. It had inadequate wiring, things like that.

Anyway, so I have had some experience with living near a detached dwelling unit, and I think one of the things that I see that could change is that the entrance can be almost anywhere. And the thing that I like about Alternative 1 is it still allows people to build an ADU or a DADU. And maybe this will change, but I think that to change the entrance, if someone chooses to add another unit, I think that that entrance should face into that yard instead of compromising neighbor privacy, next-door neighbors. If they don't want one, that's their choice. If they do, then make it face into their yard.

Another thing is about the parking. I think the parking should be looked at. My neighborhood, because I don't think it's fair that people think that there's room for unwanted cars, there really is not. And I think it's a big issue in Wallingford and Ballard and the neighborhoods.
I do support Alternative 1. Not everybody wants to be a landlord. Not everybody has room on their property. There is a possibility that property taxes could rise on single-family home lots, even if you choose not to build. If this passed, it could affect the property taxes because the MHA upzones do affect property taxes, so that is something to be considered. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you.

EILEEN HIRAMI: My name is Eileen Hirami, and I've lived in Seattle for 37 years. And I've 10 years in areas where there was no curbs and sidewalks, but then I couldn't afford to live in those areas. So I ended up moving to a section of the city with no curbs and sidewalks and didn't realize I didn't feel as safe walking, particularly as the city gets busier, and there's a lot of cut-through traffic.

I really support -- think we need a lot more affordable housing, but like people said, you know, neighborhoods do differ. So I have one thought. You know, the guy said let's adopt the proposal citywide at the same time everywhere, but every neighborhood is not the same.

How about adopt a proposal for the neighborhoods that have curbs and sidewalks for safety.
and good storm water management, storm water management, and let's slow down. Let's do something different for neighborhoods, which there's a lot of Seattle, north end and south end, that do not have curbs and sidewalks and good storm water drainage. And that's my comment. Thank you.

DENNY BIRD: My name is Denny Bird, and I'm a long-time resident of Seattle. And I'm all for a little bit cheaper housing. I own a few apartment buildings even and try to keep the rents down and haven't raised the rents for two or three years, even though the taxes have been going up.

My biggest concern is if you add a whole bunch more structures without looking at the different cities and locations that the infrastructure is going to be a major problem. Because where I live right now where you have trouble with water pressure, the sewage, and all those issues that I think need to be looked like.

ANDREA PETZEL: Thank you. And could you come sign the sign-in sheet.

M.C. NACHTIGAL: Hi. My name is M.C. Nachtigal. I currently live in West Seattle, but I also own a home in Rainier Beach and another one in Rainier View, which are rental homes. Especially the
one in Rainier View, it's a 1,700-square-foot zone, which is I think is absolutely ridiculous to me in city limits and have a humongous backyard that could easily have multiple more houses with minimal impact. And, obviously, I'm not allowed to.

But I echo all the things that other people have said about the environmental impact, the human impacts, the carbon footprint, all of the reasons I strongly support this.

But I would add one additional thing that I would really like to see, and that is I think everyone here knows people who have currently nonconforming ADUs. And I would really encourage to get them permitted and make sure they are safe and make sure they do follow regulations by giving a moratorium on any penalties. Really encourage all the ones that are already out there to come forward and get permitted at whatever the current regulations are. Thank you.

ANDREA PETZEL: Any additional comments?

Okay. If there are none, we'll consider the comment period closed. Again, we're still accepting written comments through June 25 online, and with that, we'll close the public hearing. Thank you for your time.
(The proceedings concluded at 7:34 p.m.)
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Comment Form
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

This form is for your comments on the ADUs Draft EIS. The comment period will be open from May 10, 2018 to June 25, 2018.

We encourage you to submit comments on-line at www.seattle.gov/council/adu-eis or use this form because it will help us efficiently respond to your comment, but you can submit comments in other ways too:

Via email: ADUEIS@seattle.gov
In writing to: Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff, PO Box 34025 Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valued input.

Public disclosure/disclaimer statement
Information submitted through this form may be requested by and provided to members of the public. Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone, or email) may not be used for commercial purposes.

Name: Sean Maruishia
Email: smaruishia@gmail.com

An effective Draft EIS comment focuses on the environmental analysis and the alternatives, not on issues outside of the proposal. Comments addressing specific issues in the EIS and detailed suggestions for ways to improve the adequacy and completeness of the EIS are more effective than general support or opposition to ADUs. The ADU Draft EIS analyzes the following elements of the environment: Housing and Socioeconomics, land use, aesthetics, parking and transportation, and public services and utilities. Comment on as many or as few topics as you like.

COMMENT:
I've been a Seattle resident for 20 years now, a high school teacher for 14 of those, a renter until just last year. I lived especially for the last decade or so, in constant fear of a sudden rise in rent and being priced out of the city, an especially scary prospect because I didn't own a car. Suburban transportation would be very challenging given the 2-4 jobs I've held at once during these times.
COMMENT:

I've only recently become a homeowner, and found myself with more space and parking than I could possibly use. I want to build apex out to give another couple a friend — my chosen family — a home. In spite of their (upper?) middle class incomes, there's no way they'll be able to afford their own place, and the stability of a mortgage, on their own. There's a baby on the way.

Let us build together, live together, and create together. We want to live and grow in this city. Let us.
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Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

This form is for your comments on the ADUs Draft EIS. The comment period will be open from May 10, 2018 to June 25, 2018.

We encourage you to submit comments on-line at www.seattle.gov/council/adu-eis or use this form because it will help us efficiently respond to your comment, but you can submit comments in other ways too:

Via email: ADUEIS@seattle.gov
In writing to: Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff, PO Box 34025 Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valued input.

Public disclosure/disclaimer statement
Information submitted through this form may be requested by and provided to members of the public. Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone, or email) may not be used for commercial purposes.

Name: Brecca Smith
Email: Brecca.smith@gmail.com

An effective Draft EIS comment focuses on the environmental analysis and the alternatives, not on issues outside of the proposal. Comments addressing specific issues in the EIS and detailed suggestions for ways to improve the adequacy and completeness of the EIS are more effective than general support or opposition to ADUs. The ADU Draft EIS analyzes the following elements of the environment: Housing and Socioeconomics; land use, aesthetics, parking and transportation, and public services and utilities. Comment on as many or as few topics as you like.

COMMENT:
As someone who has moved from lower-middle class renter to upper-middle class homeowner in the last year I fully support Alternative 2. I am a preschool teacher and before receiving an inheritance I had no hope of owning a home and little chance of staying in Seattle, my city of 12 years. With an inheritance that made buying a home possible I desperately want to build an ADU or DADU
COMMENT:

to help other people doing important but low paid work stay in Seattle too. Unfortunately our lot size is only 3,800 SF meaning even though we have the means and desire we cannot move forward in creating more housing.

There are other issues about parking and building density. The need for housing is so great please don't wait any longer to allow homeowners like myself to build more places for people to live!
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This form is for your comments on the ADUs Draft EIS. The comment period will be open from May 10, 2018 to June 25, 2018.

We encourage you to submit comments on-line at www.seattle.gov/council/adu-eis or use this form because it will help us efficiently respond to your comment, but you can submit comments in other ways too:

Via email: ADUEIS@seattle.gov
In writing to: Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff, PO Box 34025 Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valued input.

Public disclosure/disclaimer statement
Information submitted through this form may be requested by and provided to members of the public. Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone, or email) may not be used for commercial purposes.

Name: Sam Jones
Email: SamEJones@Gmail.com

An effective Draft EIS comment focuses on the environmental analysis and the alternatives, not on issues outside of the proposal. Comments addressing specific issues in the EIS and detailed suggestions for ways to improve the adequacy and completeness of the EIS are more effective than general support or opposition to ADUs. The ADU Draft EIS analyzes the following elements of the environment: Housing and Socioeconomics; land use, aesthetics, parking and transportation, and public services and utilities. Comment on as many or as few topics as you like.

COMMENT:

ADUs are an efficient way to add density citywide without the destruction naturally affordable other housing options. ADUs do not take away from neighborhood character & are an effective way to add value to a lot. Vancouver is full of them & it is seen as a great success from their implementation. ADUs also provide a subsided source of income for middle class homeowners who are struggling to pay off their homes due to the dramatic increase in property taxes.
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Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

This form is for your comments on the ADUs Draft EIS. The comment period will be open from May 10, 2018 to June 25, 2018.

We encourage you to submit comments on-line at www.seattle.gov/council/adu-eis or use this form because it will help us efficiently respond to your comment, but you can submit comments in other ways too:

Via email: ADUEIS@seattle.gov
In writing to: Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff, PO Box 34025 Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valued input.

Public disclosure/disclaimer statement
Information submitted through this form may be requested by and provided to members of the public. Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone, or email) may not be used for commercial purposes.

Name: Peter Gudonis
Email: peter.gudonis@gmail.com

An effective Draft EIS comment focuses on the environmental analysis and the alternatives, not on issues outside of the proposal. Comments addressing specific issues in the EIS and detailed suggestions for ways to improve the adequacy and completeness of the EIS are more effective than general support or opposition to ADUs. The ADU Draft EIS analyzes the following elements of the environment: Housing and Socioeconomics; land use, aesthetics, parking and transportation, and public services and utilities. Comment on as many or as few topics as you like.

COMMENT:
- Including the MHA taxes could prohibit development at $13/sf.
- For potentially 1,000 sf right amount to a 6% tax on potential floor.
- Please do not include this small-scale development into taxing.
- Revise Min. Lot to 3,000 (but also allow 2 units for 1,000 sq ft, with typical Rate at 4,100 - 5,100 sq ft, only 2 or 3 are permitted. What’s preferable, complicated or well planned, with no overspacing? Especially adjacent units?
- Why keep the owner-occupancy rule when short-term leases with more than 2 properties is prohibited?
- Requiring parking also restricts sites where a spot can be created.

Overall, this is an opportunity to also keep the missing middle or housing stock, provide flexibility to families, and increase affordable options.
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This form is for your comments on the ADUs Draft EIS. The comment period will be open from May 10, 2018 to June 25, 2018.

We encourage you to submit comments on-line at www.seattle.gov/council/adu-eis or use this form because it will help us efficiently respond to your comment, but you can submit comments in other ways too:

Via email: ADUEIS@seattle.gov
In writing to: Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff; PO Box 34025 Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valued input.

Public disclosure/disclaimer statement
Information submitted through this form may be requested by and provided to members of the public. Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone, or email) may not be used for commercial purposes.

Name: Tim Zerrell
Email: tim.zerrell@gmail.com

An effective Draft EIS comment focuses on the environmental analysis and the alternatives, not on issues outside of the proposal. Comments addressing specific issues in the EIS and detailed suggestions for ways to improve the adequacy and completeness of the EIS are more effective than general support or opposition to ADUs. The ADU Draft EIS analyzes the following elements of the environment: Housing and Socioeconomics; land use, aesthetics, parking and transportation, and public services and utilities. Comment on as many or as few topics as you like.

COMMENT:
In future EISs I encourage the city to examine an additional alternative that goes further than the proposal instead of a halfway alternative. I am enthusiastic about Alternative 2 and am curious what an alternative that allowed even further ADUs, one story, more lot area, etc would look like.
Aly Pennucci, AICP  
Council Central Staff  
600 4th Ave. Floor 2,  
P.O. Box 34025  
Seattle, WA  

Dear Aly Pennucci,  

I am writing to comment on the Seattle Accessory Dwelling Units EIS, released to the public on May 10th. While I fully understand the need for additional and affordable housing, I do not feel the proposed plans are the reasonable way to do it. I support Alternative #1, leaving the present zoning laws intact, until solutions more in line with neighborhood plans can be developed. My reasons for opposing alternatives 2 and 3 are as follows:

1. Present zoning laws were crafted WITH community involvement; the proposed alternatives were not.

2. Homeowners have invested large portions of their assets in their homes on the basis of present zoning laws. Changing those laws would end single family residential areas in Seattle, and destroy the nature of our neighborhoods.

3. I live in a single family residential neighborhood on a street that already has 6 ADU’s, both legal and illegal, with diversity in income, ethnicity, house size and lot size. I would be open to more ADU’s and apartment buildings as long as they comply with present zoning laws. There are many apartment buildings in my neighborhood, most of which do offer parking.

4. It is unreasonable to allow housing to be built without parking. Both adults with children and older adults cannot get around only on bikes and public transportation. The parking in my neighborhood is reasonable today, but would not be if more housing were built that did not include parking space.

5. To remove the owner occupancy requirements will turn many homes in single family neighborhoods into Air BnB type units; already the option of earning income in this way has taken many houses and apartments off the market for people who live and work here; the Council seems to be oblivious to how much previously affordable housing has been taken off the market in this way.

6. The present regulations protecting the size and locations of homes and ADU’s also protect the green canopy and the “live-ability” of single family
neighborhoods. Alternatives 2 and 3 are not compatible with the building scale in my or other single family neighborhoods.

7. The water and sewer infrastructures are not designed to accommodate a large increase in the population they serve.

8. Developers can simply pay a fee to avoid providing affordable housing. Affordable housing must be mandated; it can’t be optional.

I feel that for a solution to work, neighborhood opinion must be included so we can solve this problem together.

Sincerely,

Carol Olwell