



Town of Yarrow Point

Middle Housing Survey Analysis



September 5, 2024



Executive Summary

The Town of Yarrow Point (“Town”) Middle Housing Survey launched on May 29th and closed on August 4th, 2024. The survey intended to capture residents' opinions on the new middle housing requirements and understand their desired approach to meeting them. Some questions and responses also clarified the residents' familiarity with the requirements, their preferred methods of engagement with Town decision-making, and their broad demographic characteristics.

This analysis of responses details the themes of the survey results. Broadly, the survey results indicate the following:

- Most respondents oppose HB1110 and believe it will negatively impact Town infrastructure, character, and quality of life.
- Most respondents want strict enforcement, clear guidelines, and transparency throughout the process of updating the code.
- When able to elaborate on the impacts, residents often mentioned parking, property values, aesthetics, and trees.
- Some responses seek public processes to approve developments of the newly required typologies (courtyard apartments, cottage housing, duplexes).
- There are opportunities for further communication about the implications and requirements of middle housing: some responses still want the Town to “fight” the mandate, and others indicate confusion about the typologies.
- While demographic questions allowed for some subgroup analysis, both exploratory analyses and those presented here reveal little difference between demographics captured by the survey.

These themes echo throughout the survey across different questions and different respondents. Quantitative questions tended to result in majorities in nearly every instance, indicating frequent and broad agreement between respondents.

These results ultimately represent a group of respondents who desire transparent implementation, clear information, and involvement throughout the process. The broad goal of middle housing implementation from respondents is for the Town to implement and enforce the strictest guidelines possible while achieving the minimum standards required by the mandate.

Table of Contents

Middle Housing Survey Analysis.....	1
Executive Summary.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Planning Context.....	4
Survey Purpose and Response.....	5
Quantitative Survey Results.....	6
Respondent Characteristics.....	6
Town Engagement.....	6
Housing Policy.....	9
Development Preferences.....	9
Middle Housing Impacts.....	11
Written Responses.....	13
Middle Housing Requirements and Impact.....	13
Preferred Approaches to Middle Housing.....	15
Additional Comments.....	18
Appendix: Full List of Responses and Figures.....	19
Quantitative Results.....	19
Respondent Characteristics.....	19
Town Engagement.....	22
Housing Policy.....	25
Written Response.....	30
Middle Housing Requirements.....	30
Preferred Approaches to Middle Housing.....	44
Additional Comments.....	61

Introduction

Planning Context

The Washington State Legislature passed House Bills 1110 and 1337 during the 2023 state legislative session, which were later signed into law. These bills impact the Town of Yarrow Point and require that the Town implement a range of changes to its development regulations. In brief, the changes required by each bill are as follows:

[HB 1110](#) - Yarrow Point is required to: allow middle housing in single-family zones; allow only administrative design review of objective standards; and allow two middle housing units on each lot. The bill further provides processes and criteria for extensions of implementation and directs Commerce to provide technical assistance, including rulemaking and certification authority. It also amends RCW 43.21C to exempt certain actions from environmental review.

[HB 1337](#) Requires counties and cities to allow two accessory dwelling units (ADU) on every lot in predominantly single-family zones within urban growth areas. Yarrow Point must allow two units per lot, including the primary. The bill also limits parking requirements based on distance from transit and lot size and removes barriers to separate sale and ownership of ADUs.

At a high level, the new legislation requires that the jurisdiction allow at least two housing units per lot in a range of configurations in all areas previously zoned for single-family. Additionally, sales of accessory dwelling units may occur separately from the main house; there is a reduction in required onsite parking; and an increase in accessory dwelling unit square footage. When applicable, any design criteria must be objective, applied uniformly across single-family and middle housing types, and subject only to administrative review.

Survey Purpose and Response

The middle housing survey intended to capture residents' opinions, concerns, preferences, and existing understanding of middle housing requirements. The results of these responses can inform further outreach, planning, and implementation efforts. The survey also collected demographic data to assess the representativeness of the survey and conduct subgroup analyses to determine if responses differed across demographic groups. A mix of closed and open-response questions allowed residents to provide the planning team with discrete response feedback and expand on their answers and opinions in more detail.

The middle housing survey launched on May 29th, 2024 – following an open house at Town Hall – and closed on August 4th. 178 responses were received, good for an estimated 7.5% margin of error with 95% confidence.¹ Most respondents filled out nearly every closed-response question, with most questions receiving at least 175 complete responses and an average completion rate of 99%. Open-ended questions received fewer responses but still offered enough additional context to offer more nuanced and reflective takeaways from the respondents' opinions. Approximately two-thirds of content-based² open-ended questions received responses.

The survey also completes a key piece of the public engagement efforts in this middle housing process. Receipt of the state's middle housing grant requires Yarrow Point to engage the public in this process. This survey offers a concrete result of that engagement while clarifying the Town's opinion of the most recent middle housing legislation and offering the Town additional information on how the residents of Yarrow Point would like to be involved.

¹ The assumed standard deviation used to calculate the margin of error was .5, which is a standard value when the actual value is not known. Values for standard deviation in this calculation can range from 0 to 1.

² All open ended responses aside from the questions asking for “any additional thoughts” and email addresses for the Town newsletter

Quantitative Survey Results

The following discussion presents selected plots and a high-level discussion about the survey responses. The complete list of plots is in the appendix of this document.

Respondent Characteristics

Middle housing survey respondents' ages skewed older than the comp plan survey and the Town's demographics. Responses among those 65 and older were the most frequent (37.1%), and 98.8% of respondents were above the age of 35, falling into the 35-54, 55-64, and 65 and older brackets. According to the most recent American Community Survey (ACS) data, those age groups comprise an estimated 64.7% of the Town. While responses among age groups do not accurately reflect the ages of Town residents, they do align with common trends among public surveys.³

Other characteristics like homeownership, time in the community, and household size are approximately reflective of the demographic data in American Community Survey estimates. The groups most represented by the survey are homeowners (98.3% of respondents), those who have lived in Yarrow Point for 6-15 years (33.7%), those without children under 18 at home (66.9%), and households with 2-3 people (61.8%). The distribution of these characteristics allowed the team to conduct some subgroup analyses.

Town Engagement

Most survey respondents indicated that transparency is important to the decision-making process related to housing policy implementation. Out of 175 responses to the question, 98.3% stated transparency was either “extremely” or “very” important (Figure 1). Additionally, just 14.6% of respondents indicated that they were “very familiar” with middle housing requirements. Most (59.6%) indicated some familiarity, although more education around middle housing implications could support more informed involvement among residents.

³ Pew Research Center. 2012. “Assessing the Representativeness of Public Surveys” Pew Research, May 15. <http://pewrsr.ch/10ObXLh>.
Mercer, Andres and Lau, Arnold. 2023. “Comparing Two Types of Online Survey Samples” Pew Research Center, September 7. <https://pewrsr.ch/462mgi9>.
Both Pew Research reports cited focus on telephone surveys and more rigorous sampling methods, but the assertions about representation is the relevant context for this report.





Figure 1. Importance of Transparency in Housing Policy

Figure 2. Town Decision-Making Engagement Preferences



Nearly two-thirds (66.3%) of respondents did not take the comprehensive plan survey. However, a large majority of respondents (81.5%) indicated that they would prefer to engage with Town decision-making through online surveys (Figure 2).⁴ While “survey fatigue” – or the decline in responses given multiple surveys in a short period of time⁵ – is a consideration, the Town may consider additional surveys at key points in the decision-making process to gauge resident opinions and preferences.

Town Hall meetings also received a majority of responses, indicating a desire for more informal discussions between residents and elected officials.⁶ Of the “Other” responses, some residents stated a desire for more opportunities for emails with opportunities for comment, and others expressed an interest in increased or improved distribution of existing materials. Comments additionally mentioned more physical notice of surveys and newsletters with public meeting minutes.

A majority of respondents (92.7%) indicated email as their preferred form of communication and information from the Town. The community website and physical mailers received 29.2% and 26.4%, respectively, with social media and “other” methods preferred by fewer than 10% of respondents. While a multimedia approach can reach multiple segments of the population, it is clear that email is the strongest preference among Yarrow Point residents. There may be opportunities for targeted augmentation of engagement efforts through physical mailers and postings and the Town’s website.

⁴ This is the response most likely to include some level of response bias. Survey respondents are already taking a survey and are more likely than those who did not take the survey to want to express their opinions through additional surveys.

⁵ Porter, S.R., Whitcomb, M.E. and Weitzer, W.H. (2004), Multiple surveys of students and survey fatigue. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2004: 63-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.101>

⁶ Multiple responses were allowed, and percentages are based on percent of individual respondents. Thus, multiple majorities are possible.


Housing Policy

Development Preferences

Most survey responses indicated a desired limit of 2 units per lot⁷ (93.3% of responses) and that single-family homes are most appropriate for the Town (93.3%). Other than single-family homes, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs or DADUs) were deemed appropriate by 38.8% of respondents, the second largest proportion.

Given the requirement for two units per lot and increased options for housing typologies, the survey also asked about cottage housing, duplexes, and courtyard apartments. These newly required typologies were indicated as appropriate in 24% of responses combined, with no typology receiving more than 14% of responses. “Other” responses stated an interest in designs that fit in with town character, suggesting “Small tasteful townhouse developments...” and “apartment above a garage or one story ADU that will not affect a neighbors view.”

Figure 3. Preferred Units per Lot in Yarrow Point




⁷ 2 units per lot is the minimum under HB-1110 and under current Yarrow Point code is allowed through one primary unit and one ADU. This was noted in the survey.

These responses were analyzed by the time of residency in Yarrow Point to assess whether there were differences among long-term or relatively new residents. Approximately 32% of respondents new to Yarrow Point (who arrived in the past five years) indicated ADUs were appropriate. That proportion increased to 45% among those in Town for more than 26 years.

Concerning these other typologies, 87.6% of respondents indicated that the expected impact of the newly required typologies is either “not so” or “not at all” desirable. A further 94.9% indicated that community aesthetics are “very” or “extremely” important.

In summary, among all housing development preference questions, residents indicated a strong preference for the minimum density required, broad opposition to the newly required typologies, and value for the development aesthetics of the Town.

*Figure 4. Suitability of Housing Typologies in Yarrow Point
Analyzed by Length of Yarrow Point Residency*



Middle Housing Impacts

Most residents indicated concern about the impact of increased density on utilities (87% “concerned” or “very concerned”) and about safety in Town (80.2% “concerned” or “very concerned”). These results tracked closely among all demographics and reflected the relative consistency of respondents’ opinions on the impacts of middle housing in Yarrow Point.

When asked about the impact of the new housing policies on property values and desirability, there was more disagreement than with other questions. While 69.7% indicated an assumption that property values would decrease, the 16.3% that provided a custom response indicated nuance, confusion, or uncertainty. Sample responses included:

- “Depends on the approach the town takes to maintaining the integrity of the community.”
- “Probably a slight increase if gentle density and clear rules are implemented along with the changes.”
- “The population won’t suddenly double; it will take years for that. Single homes on larger lots with or without ADU will likely become more desirable, as there will be fewer of them.”

Among all “Other” responses, 5 indicated a belief that values would decrease, 9 stated some level of uncertainty (“don’t know” or “unsure”), and the rest expressed some level of nuance or dependency on what the Town’s approach is.

The survey also asked about the possible impacts of smaller units with lower maintenance costs.⁸ Most respondents indicated that these units would not benefit residents (71.4%). Given the relevance of aging-in-place in this question, the team analyzed responses by age of respondents, but the results were mostly consistent across age brackets.⁹ The only slight difference is in the 55-64 age bracket, where the percentage of responses indicating no benefit decreased to 65.4%.

⁸ “Do you feel that allowing for smaller, lower cost to maintain units could benefit residents and allow them to remain in the community longer; i.e. aging-in-place?”

⁹ Particularly those with more than 1 respondent in the bracket

SBN 2024

What level of concern do you have regarding the impact of increased housing density on local infrastructure such as roads and utilities?





Figure 5. Density & Local Infrastructure Concerns

Figure 6. Anticipated Impact on Property Values & Desirability

SBN 2024

How do you anticipate the new housing policies will affect property values and desirability in Yarrow Point?



Written Responses

This section presents text analysis, summaries, and selected quotes and excerpts from the open-ended responses. A complete list of the original written responses is located in the appendix of this document.

Middle Housing Requirements and Impact

The state is requiring Yarrow Point to allow for a minimum of 2 units per lot (under HB1110). Please express your opinion regarding this state level requirement being mandated to Yarrow Point.

Nearly all responses express opposition to the state-level mandate requiring a minimum of two units per lot under HB1110. Many residents feel this requirement is inappropriate for their small, close-knit community. Some residents also emphasize the potential negative consequences of this mandate, such as increased density leading to a loss of the Town's character. While a few residents acknowledge the need for increased housing, they express frustration with the state imposing these changes without considering the specific needs and circumstances of Yarrow Point.

Select Quotes and Excerpts:

- "... [This law] will change the nature of this beautiful, quiet, safe place that has existed for centuries in safety, peace, quiet and tranquility."
- "We fear losing the charm and desirability of our community. We moved here to enjoy a low traffic walkable community. That will change."
- "It is ludicrous and doesn't, nor should it apply to Yarrow Point..."
- "The state clearly has no interest in the impact to local communities"

What are your main concerns or expectations regarding the impact of these housing policies on our community?

One predominant worry is the potential alteration of Yarrow Point's character and aesthetic. Many respondents fear that increased housing density will lead to the loss of the Town's identity. Traffic, parking, and infrastructure strain also emerged as significant concerns. Respondents worry that the Town's existing infrastructure may be unable to support the increased population density, leading to congestion and challenges in maintaining the Town's quality of life. The impact on property values also emerged as a common concern.

Select Quotes and Excerpts:

- "...I think it will dramatically change the nature of the community into a more perceptible "have" and "have not" neighborhood... In the end, the "neighborhood" feel of this place will diminish dramatically. It will not be a place of choice to raise children."
- "[These policies] will destroy the village atmosphere of Yarrow Point"
- "Renters or apartment units draw a different type of resident that will detract from our special community of home owners and families. Multi-unit dwellings will fundamentally change the fabric of our neighborhood and create parking challenge"
- "Traffic, parking, utilities, construction, noise, loss of green space, loss of property value [are all potential consequences of these policies]"
- "Home values will go down and the only person that benefits are builders who will capitalize on maximizing their returns. We chose YP to have more space and larger lots, not to have higher density and increased traffic."

Preferred Approaches to Middle Housing

In your opinion, what measures should be taken to ensure the preservation of our community's character during the implementation of new housing policies?

Many respondents advocate for enforcing existing codes and introducing new, more restrictive regulations to limit the impact of new housing policies. They believe these measures and strict enforcement are necessary to maintain the community's character and prevent overdevelopment. Another primary concern is preserving green spaces, particularly the Town's tree canopy. Respondents are worried that increased housing density could lead to the removal of significant trees, which some see as integral to the community's character. A common theme among respondents is the desire to adhere strictly to the minimum legal requirements imposed by state law, without going beyond what is absolutely necessary. This approach is seen as a way to minimize the impact on the community while still complying with state mandates.

Select Quotes and Excerpts:

- “Do everything we can to make the impact as slight and extended in time as possible.”
- “If we are mandated to comply with this new requirement, I am interested in understanding how we can meet the minimum standards while preserving the character of YP.”
- “Strict tree code, enforce parking restrictions, restrict development to a smaller lot size and keep significant permeable lot cover o(sic)”
- “Follow the law but keep our town's unique character. Don't change current setbacks and height restrictions...”
- “pass code that will minimize the impacts of increased density, do what we can to minimize the increase in cars and street parking, get development to pay for development (rather than current residents), get development to pay for the increased usage of our roads/utilities/town assets, increase fees for development...”

What would you like to see in place for residents or developers to comply with the new policies such as FAQs?

Many respondents stress the importance of rigorous enforcement of existing and new guidelines to ensure that development aligns with the community's standards. They advocate for strong penalties for non-compliance and thorough oversight during construction. Another key theme is the need for clear, easily accessible information about the new housing policies and their implementation. Overall, respondents are looking for strict oversight and transparency to ensure that new developments align with the existing character and standards of Yarrow Point.

Select Quotes and Excerpts:

- “Required design reviews and penalties for non conformance”
- “Strict oversight by town planner. Same as what you do for current codes should be sufficient. If that level isn’t sufficient those should be enhanced too”
- “Transparence regarding enforcement of policies. Strict penalties for not following code”
- “Public reviews with the planning commission, published rules and regulations regarding trees and parking, process checklist, FAQ.”
- “Detailed requirements of the code emphasizing what has changed in compliance. FAQ are always helpful in understand the requirements of the codes.”
- “No parking on the right of way.... Enact a prohibition on cutting down significant trees. We have so few left. Require planting two trees of a type that can grow to be significant for every one cut down.”

How should the Town address potential challenges related to increased traffic and parking demands resulting from new housing density?

The responses from Yarrow Point residents continue to reveal concerns about the impact of increased housing density on traffic and parking. Responses echo the desire to keep cars off the streets to maintain safety. Many residents advocate for stringent parking regulations and enforced restrictions on garage space and street parking. Some residents propose more proactive measures to manage traffic, such as re-engineering existing infrastructure like the roundabout or adding speed bumps and stop signs to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety. There is also a call for the Town to seek state funding to support necessary infrastructure improvements. Respondents urge the Town to carefully plan and enforce these measures to preserve Yarrow Point's safety and character amidst the changes.

Select Quotes and Excerpts:

- “If the state is requiring these changes then the town needs help from the state with a myriad of implications for more people ex. traffic, change in setbacks and building codes, 520 traffic circle impacts, public safety for more people, etc.”
- “No additional on-street parking whatsoever. People need to store their cars on their own property. The town streets are for pedestrians, bikes, and moving vehicles...”
- “Provide off-street parking for each new unit. Install speed bumps if necessary for pedestrian and bicycle safety.”
- “Parking/garage needs to be a requirement for any new housing - not street parking (at least 2 spaces per unit). The roundabout needs to continue to be looked at and re-engineered as well as looking at providing passes to more residents to allow them to use the gate to enter/exit via the exit into Kirkland”

Additional Comments

Is there anything else you would like to share or any additional comments you have regarding the middle housing policies?

The responses from Yarrow Point residents regarding the middle housing policies reflect a mix of concern, frustration, and a desire to preserve the Town's character. Many residents express strong opposition to these policies, with one person sharing a "great sense of frustration that this intrusion into our private life was foisted upon us." Others emphasize the potential negative impacts on the community, such as increased traffic, parking issues, and the loss of green spaces, with one resident stating, "Keep Yarrow Point character via trees and walking. No more on-street parking." There is a recurring sentiment that the policies will change the Town's character, leading to a loss of privacy, enjoyment of property, and potentially increased crime.



Several respondents also highlight a desire for the Town to fight against these policies, with calls to "make it almost impossible for a developer to build two units on one lot" and to "resist at all cost." Some residents suggest alternative approaches, such as reducing lot sizes to increase density without significantly altering the neighborhood's character. Others acknowledge the need for more housing, but stress that it should not be at the expense of the community's values and quality of life. There is also concern about the state's approach, with one resident commenting that "the state lawmakers didn't think this through." The feedback reflects a community deeply invested in maintaining its identity and wary of changes that could undermine the qualities that make Yarrow Point a desirable place to live.

Amidst the largely critical responses, a few residents express cautious acceptance or support for the new housing policies, recognizing potential benefits for the community. One resident highlights the opportunity for greater inclusivity, noting that "cheaper housing means more young people could afford to move in, and I think that's a great thing." Another resident expresses a willingness to participate in addressing the housing shortage, stating, "We need to participate in some way to alleviate the shortage of housing." There is a desire for more diversity in housing options, with one resident welcoming the idea by saying, "I welcome more diversity of housing in YP. We don't need more oversized mansions."

Appendix: Full List of Responses and Figures


Quantitative Results

Respondent Characteristics



SBN 2024


Do you have children under the age of 18 living in your household?



178 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

SBN 2024


How long have you lived in Yarrow Point?





178 complete responses
Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey (2024)

SBN 2024

Which of the following best describes your current housing status in Yarrow Point?




Town Engagement



SBN 2024


How would you like to receive information about the changes in housing policies?

Select all that apply




SBN 2024

Did you take the Comprehensive Plan Survey?



SBN 2024


How familiar are you with the requirements of HB1110 (Middle Housing)?





SBN 2024

How would you like to receive information about the changes in housing policies?

Responses among those less than 'very familiar' with HB-1110 (multiple responses allowed)




Housing Policy



SBN 2024


What kind of an impact will allowing a duplex, 2 unit Courtyard Apartment, or 2 cottage houses per lot have on Yarrow Point?



176 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

SBN 2024


Design guidelines can be created for middle housing, how important is it to you that the aesthetics of our community are preserved?



177 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey


SBN 2024

What level of concern do you have regarding changes to safety in the Town?



SBN 2024


What level of concern do you have regarding the impact of increased housing density on local infrastructure such as roads and utilities?



SBN 2024

What types of housing do you think would be most suitable for Yarrow Point? (select all that apply)


Responses by how long each respondent has lived in Yarrow Point



178 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

SBN 2024


How do you anticipate the new housing policies will affect property values and desirability in Yarrow Point?



175 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

SBN 2024

Do you feel that allowing for smaller, lower cost to maintain units could benefit residents and allow them to remain in the community longer (i.e., aging-in-place)?




175 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

SBN 2024

Do you feel that allowing for smaller, lower cost to maintain units could benefit residents and allow them to remain in the community longer (i.e., aging-in-place)?

Responses by age group of respondent



175 complete responses
2024 Yarrow Point Middle Housing Survey

Written Response

Middle Housing Requirements

The state is requiring Yarrow Point to allow for a minimum of 2 units per lot (under HB1110). Please express your opinion regarding this state level requirement being mandated to Yarrow Point.

It is inappropriate for communities like Yarrow Poit

It is ludicrous and doesn't, nor should it apply to Yarrow Point. Need I say more about those representing us in Olympia.

Maybe only mother in law suites

It would be counter-productive, futile, and arrogant to expect YP to have special treatment. The issue of allowing for more housing is serious. It's not forced on us and we already allow ADU,DADU so this will not be a big change, especially if we limit on-street parking.

strongly disagree.

Several lots already have 2 units. Many lots are not designed to accommodate 2 units plus off street parking. Two cottage units per site will be just rental and we will have absentee owners. (We already have a lot of absentee owners and that has its problems)

This law should have never happened.

The state should give the Town the ability to decide the building policy, e.g., the type of units that can be built and how it can be done.

Not in favor

Since we are not allowed to use the city of Bellevue's library, I thought that meant that Yarrow Point was more or less autonomous from the state, but we still have to adapt to their mandate?

This law seems to have been enacted by a group with limited experience in urban planning. Implementing a broad, "one size fits all" approach is fundamentally flawed.

Not in favor of the state mandate for all lots.

It is ridiculous - you don't take existing, established neighborhoods and create some arbitrary mandate to ensure multi-unit housing. Housing development should take into consideration a variety of factors - including the tax base of communities like the predominately affluent Yarrow and how this will likely negatively affect home values and desirability of the neighborhood and potentially influence long-term residents to leave the area. You don't infiltrate already established residential communities with this type of housing - people move into a neighborhood like this specifically because it is only single-family unit housing.

Extremely disappointed and would support resisting its implementation.

This is the first step to turning all housing commercial; wrong solution to the US's overpopulation. Once YP allows this, it will just keep going until we are pushed out of our own houses for apartment buildings or surrounded by them
It is ridiculous and should not be forced upon our town.
No way. This is ridiculous.
Disappointing and ridiculous to mandate destroying YP and other nicer neighborhoods throughout King County - but not surprising and in line with current majority political ideologies.
The state clearly has no interest in the impact to local communities.
The State is pushing their social experiment on our communities without any regard to the appropriateness, fit, or history. Yarrow Point and many other long-standing small communities like it across the state will be permanently damaged. The State is overreaching by dictating zoning code to small communities. These decisions should always be left to the community to decide. It is an enormous and permanent mistake to force all communities to double, quadruple, or more their density regardless of their existing size and character.
Goes against citizens' rights.
I'm okay with it
Ridiculous.
Undesirable, would change character of the town
It's a state requirement, I'm not sure what you are asking?
Allowing for and mandating are 2 different things. Allowing DADU's and ADU's is different than requiring them. Are we now allowed to rent out ADU's? As I recall, we have not been allowed to rent those units in the past.
Fine with me as long as there's onsite (not ROW) parking
We have no choice so keep minimum of 2 units per lots
Understand the need but unhappy about it as I came here for the character of the town.
Hopefully they provide funding to address the necessary community accommodations
I don't feel the state should be changing established guidelines
We should limit the dwelling units to state minimum of 2. Encourage guest homes to keep density down.
Absolutely idiotic and typical progressive idea that has not been thought out and certainly is not the reason why housing is so expensive in our stste
Totally fine with it.
Feeling very frustrated. Really tired of centralized control.
It's disgusting. It will change the nature of this beautiful, quiet, safe place that has existed for centuries in safety, peace, quiet and tranquility

I do not think that the state of WA is requiring such a thing. Must be someone that wants to benefit with all of these measures. I will appeal to the WA state if it's such a requirement.
Not in favor
I do not like the state mandating this
Disappointed
not appropriate
This is a mandated rezoning policy essentially. It's taking town planning and zoning out of the hands of the Town and is not tailored to the specifics of the Town.
I thought that our zoning already allows ADU/DADU meeting this requirement. So nothing needs to change.
It's a starting point to solve a housing shortage however it seems disconnected from our community.
Our town should have the freedom to choose and not have this idiotic policy mandated to us.
The policy should not be implemented and mandated in Yarrow Point given the extreme challenges of Yarrow Point as community planned many decades back. The neighborhood cannot support the problems that come with greater density.
Very strongly opposed to the mandate.
we being a small community this should not be forced on us
I welcome more diversity of housing in YP. We don't need more oversized mansions.
I have made my point clear. This is part of a larger plan for DEI. A political and social means for equity based on socialist values. DEI is everywhere. I just did not think it would be State-mandated and be in my backyard.
It makes no sense. We are not the same as most communities as we have one way in; one way out. Towns with less than a certain # of inhabitants should be exempt and we should exempt ourselves.
Not a fan. Seems like misapplication. In some ways we are really more of a community than an actual municipality.
Against it
Overreach. One size does not fit all. It is permissive...we should have autonomy over our own jurisdiction and decisions about zoning and density, NOT Olympia.
I think it's all right if handled responsibly and the units are well built.
Not support
Makes sense
Try and find a way around it.
Feel legislation too extreme and not thoroughly vetted. Rush to solve a problem that requires

much more planning.
Should not be a requirement
Don't support HB1110
Our community is amazing and safe. Our kids safety is top priority as well as our property value. Don't change it!!!
It should NOT be mandated, should be decided by residents of YP.
The housing policies are driven by urbanist/housing activists in Seattle and Olympia. They could care less what impact these policies have on the people in the communities. I thought our representatives in the legislature followed their own desires and not that of their constituents. They ignored comments and refused to respond to inquiries. Clearly, they do not care that Yarrow Point or many other suburban neighborhoods are not in real urban areas and have little regard for any local controls. Ironically, they also seem to have no regard for the environmental impacts of cramming more and more people into Puget Sound. The top-down mandate that essentially every neighborhood in the Puget Sound must accommodate at least 2 units has created more than enough additional house "spaces". Give this time to work before the density zealots are allowed to demand further density. I am concerned that they will use the State's building the huge bus transit station on 92nd - that we did not ask for and really mainly serves people who don't even live on the Point - as a gateway to making us accommodate yet more density on Yarrow Point, whether it is needed or not.
I am opposed to this state mandate.
New housing policies should not be implemented. The town, together with other points communities should challenge legality of the legislation in court
This is idiotic and makes no sense for our small community
this is an outrageous and misguided policy that has been created for more urban areas and we should fight it
I am shocked that the state legislature would enact a bill such as hb1110 that would homogenize our beautiful state into a one size fits all type of living options!
I am devastated by the thought that YP should be required to add more congestion to this small town.
This is ridiculous and immoral
I do not like it and think it is short sighted and will not address the state's mandate in any meaningful way.
I am ok with the mandate
prefer we don't have this but it is better than allowing more than 2 units.
I don't know if we have a choice regarding meeting the minimum bar.

This is horrible. The law makes sense for larger towns such as Kirkland. It is terrible for a small town such as ours. Big costs and headaches, ticks off residents, and doesn't help for the states goals. Bad bad idea. We need an exception

Need to follow rules but not to increase the density as will change the nature of YP

Like a lot of well intended mandates, I worry about the unintended consequences. We should take a very cautious approach here -- not diving in head first. We can always continue to increase our permissiveness -- but again once we allow the wild west, it's very difficult to put the genie back in the bottle.

Pure NONSENSE! It would completely change the character of the point

State should not have the authority to impose the requirement.

Ridiculous and state government overreach

ADU is the best option.

Excessive demand by Seattle legislators but we will have to live by it. Do not exceed the monomial requirements in our implementation.

We think yarrow point does not have wide streets and infrastructure to support such growth. By forcing multiple unit buildings we loose the integrity of this town. Pushing the old residents out of the neighborhood

This feels like overreach - it should be the town that decides this

It seems intrusive though I appreciate the need.

its terrible

We fear losing the charm and desirability of our community. We moved here to enjoy a low traffic walkable community. That will change.

I will probably move in the next three years

Unrealistic

The per lot requirement is stupid since there are huge differences in lot size, and the feasibility depends on location. Perhaps consider whether a better solution would be to set a smaller minimum lot size (6000-7000 feet???) and permit short plats to creat separate lots rather than tiny little adus that may look out of place.

We have to do it, but I don't like it

again i feel YP should be exempted as it is not necessarily appropriate for our community

We are too small of a town to be required to adhere to this statute.

Terrible idea, but since it is the law let's get a plan in place to minimize its impact on our quality of life, safety, trees and property values.

Should not have happened. Repeal law

Not a fan.

We opposed this requirement at the state level when it was moving through the house and we actively communicated with our state legislators. But I don't understand the point of this question. We're a tier 3 municipality and this is required. Unless we're going to play the lead in seeking court relief or a legislative solution (which seems unlikely), ALL ATTENTION should be on implementing it in a way that addresses SAFETY, QUALITY OF LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PROPERTY VALUE for the residents of the community. We will need a full overhaul of many Town policies and ordinances to accommodate the changes and the sooner we get to work on that the better.

Disagree with the state mandating development in our town. Overreach.

I am opposed to increasing the density of housing period.

Objection. Should allow local residents to decide.

Totally unacceptable

Allowing for it and requiring it are 1 different issues. If required it will have a significant impact on the character of our community.

They should require YP to allow up to 4 units.

It is ridiculous. However, it does comport with how Washington state is operated and managed. This is why we will be leaving soon.

I feel like the rug is being pulled out from under me. I did not invest over \$1 million in a house 17 years ago, expecting that the community would be changed in such a significant way. This house represents a good portion of my anticipated, retirement savings. I feel that this is being taken from me

This policy is another example of government infringing on the rights of the people.

Very upset about it

Yarrow Point is way too small a town to be under such a mandate.

It is wrong for the state to have demands placed on an existing township that existing residents would suffer from and not support.

I am completely against it.

It makes little sense in a tiny community

It's fair to require it everywhere. Need for middle housing is everyone's problem.

The state knows nothing about our little town. The state should not dictate our local policies.

Dislike the mandate of 2 units, would encourage the town to not go any further than what it's legally required to do

I think it is a fair requirement to address housing shortages and encourage all neighborhoods to add housing in a way that works for that neighborhood

Not a fan!

Evil is in the details. Depending on lot size/shape/location (water view etc...). Yarrow Point has a geography with a lot of water fronts and water views. It has the shape of an island. This type of neighborhood should be preserved. The state of WA as a lot of space to increase density without hearting the surroundings as much as it would in YP. Human beings are thriving when surrounded with beauty. The zoning code is designed to organize the cities and the landscape. This global new law that allows for more units/lot needs to be applied with a lot of care in YP. The state is not able to drill down and design the best for YP. This our duty to do it.

I think that it is fair. I think that density is key to lower housing costs and to manage population increase.

I am not sure why Yarrow Point is spending time and money on this survey if the State of WA is telling us we must comply with 2-unit housing.

Unacceptable.

Ridiculous.

ADUs are fine. Nothing bigger

We oppose this being a requirement.

Not at all supportive of the State mandating this requirement on cities and towns within the state

Very much opposed.

If it changes the security of Yarrow Point, I will leave. Mandating this to a small town by the state is tyrannical.

Don't like it.

We wish we could fight the requirement of 2 units per lot! Our neighborhood really has no where to grow, with only one road to enter the neighborhood, which is already congested at the Town entrance.

No good

We already allow it with ADU's. I understand that existing code might have to be updated to allow larger ADU's

What are your main concerns or expectations regarding the impact of these housing policies on our community?

I think this is merely the beginning and that the requirements for more dense housing will increase. I think it will dramatically change the nature of the community into a more perceptible “have” and “have not” neighborhood. High value land (e.g. waterfront) will be too expensive to allow anything other than Mega Mansions or Apartment/Condos. In the end, the “neighborhood” feel of this place will diminish dramatically. It will not be a place of choice to raise children.

Lower property values

Lots cost 3 million and house torn down and 5 million dollars to build, No one can afford this so taxpayers will have to pay for these units, and the upkeep ie insurance , utilities etc will not be affordable so again we the taxpayer will subsidize. Gaslighting the residents into anything to support this all one has to do is look at the people running King County and the answer to this is simple.

Density and loss of trees

Do not provide more on-street parking. Streets are for walking, biking, and driving, not for storing cars. Encourage walking to our transit stop.

roads not designed for existing traffic. parking on the street already quite limited. Visitors for the higher density will create parking issues

That renters will not take care of their homes or surroundings and the town will have no way of enforcing compliance.

Will destroy village atmosphere of Yarrow Point

Lack of available parking for greater density housing. Greater traffic with limited street throughput.

More people, more cars, more traffic, declining property values

Worried that this will disturb the neighborhood and the family life that has been cultivated up until now.

I understand the necessity of such policies for larger towns and cities, but the township of YP lacks the land mass to accommodate these requirements. Why isn't there a minimum town size for which these requirements would apply? Are all single-family residences now required to add an accessory dwelling unit to comply with this new mandate? If so, who will fund these units?

traffic, parking

Over development, constant demolition and construction disrupting daily living for residents. Construction traffic. Parking.

Renters or apartment units draw a different type of resident that will detract from our special community of home owners and families. Multi-unit dwellings will fundamentally change the fabric of our neighborhood and create parking challenges. We are not a community of low cost housing and by allowing this type of housing into the neighborhood will negatively affect the

image/desirability of Yarrow as well as potentially bring in more transient activity due to short-term residents.
Density, traffic and aesthetics
Loss of neighborhood. Traffic. Utilities. Noise. Home Values.
Increasing housing density harms community & higher town population will lead to rising crime rates
Our town should remain as IS. Single family homes with only one unit per lot!
Too many renters who aren't as invested. A weird look too of too many different buildings per lot.
Anything other than single family homes + ADU would negatively impact the character of the neighborhood and devalue existing nearby homes. More units increases traffic and noise.
Over population
Degrading the character of our community. Negative consequences for safety, density, traffic, strain on infrastructure, sense of community, walkability, appearance.
Density and decreased value
Character of the neighborhood is single family
We are a small community in a defined area. This does not fit the character of the neighborhood.
The implications of multiple units per lot is catastrophic for our community and completely takes away from the neighborhood we have worked to build up over the years.
Paid taxes going towards development
Home values will go down and the only person that benefits are builders who will capitalize on maximizing their returns. We chose YP to have more space and larger lots, not to have higher density and increased traffic.
Changing the small town appeal of Yarrow Point. Additional impact on traffic for a single access community, parking, and utilities.
parking
Density
The character of the town will change. Also, additional development is needed for footpaths and roadside parking.
I am concerned about parking issues and a transient population and property values
Home values, property impact, noise
Density, traffic and not having enough other resources and infrastructure to support increased density.
Deforestation, preserving our sidewalk and paths, keeping parked cars to a minimum
Traffic, utilities, parking
I have no major concerns. The natural pricing factors will maintain our current standard of community, and the additional units per lot allow for more financial optionality for me as an owner.

Safety will decrease, people will move in/out more frequently, lessening the desire to maintain the quality of the community.

Increase in crime, lower safety

The impact in this community will be that our home pricing will go down because of this middle housing policy. Don't think that Medina and Hunts Point will do such a thing.

concern - overloading the main road and creating traffic safety....

Compromising the town of Yarrow Point

Change the character of the neighborhood which is single family homes

House values and too much density

I'm concerned about 2 things. The first is crowding and traffic. The Town is small and can't support large growth. Second is the culture of the Town. Yarrow Point is precious because of the community feel. It's harder to maintain the small town feel with growth.

Encourage use of transit and school buses rather than more cars. Encourage walking and biking. Do not provide more street parking - people should park their cars on their property.

I understand the problem that is trying to be addressed with middle housing legislation however Yarrow Point is a small suburban outlier. Being tucked into Bellevue, Kirkland, etc. with no businesses here (and associated tax and infrastructure benefits) it's just houses. For YP to be responsible for addressing the exact same housing standards as Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond, etc. seems odd. ADUs, etc. built here won't solve a housing shortage for middle income people. The units will be million dollars units.

Too many cars. Overcrowding. Too much lot coverage for good drainage.

Yarrow Point is an old community ie formed over hundred years back. It lacks many modern planned amenities like sidewalks and decent width of roads for vehicle parking and many more. Increasing the number of dwellings will create much more congestion for the resident to a point even walking outside will become difficult. We do not support more than the current code allowance on our property.

Increased population density, decreased property values, safety and security, neighborhood quality and character.

It will destroy the concept of single family neighborhoods

Traffic, parking and noise. Also the impact on cutting mature and significant trees.

Maintenace of the tree canopy. More units per lot could require more tree clearance. Parking is also a concern-it is not realistic to think people will move to YP without a car.

Views being blocked affecting property values and anything more than what is allowed now changing the spacial unique nature of the neighborhood. What about the reason people live here? I know builders will take advantage of any law and build multi unit apartments without considering neighbors! No thank you. Enough change is occurring with the underground project and having a housing policy that opens the door for builders to maximize the footprint of a housing unit while taking down trees- interrupting individual privacy- and making a huge profit is

not fair for current homeowners. It is all about money. My view would be stolen by a builder.
devaluing property; increased traffic, services, etc.
Higher density increases noise level and reduces privacy. Will increase traffic and parking issues,
Parking, stress on utilities, overuse of /stresses on facilities (roads, beaches, parks, dog poop)
Lost of natural trees, too crowded
I am concerned that there be enough parking for each household to have 2 spaces.
Parking and maintenance for rental properties. More cars speeding through the neighborhood.
Potential increase risk of crime.
That the town would become more dense and lose its appeal
Don't want to destroy the atmosphere of a single family zoned area. Fear commercialization.
long term maintenance
will lower the house value, NO need to have more people to live at Yarrow Point
This is a single family home community. No duplexes or apartments should be allowed.
housing density
1. My main concern is that the character of the town will be ruined - and needlessly. None of us really own anything. We are simply custodians for the next generations and they have a right to enjoy an area that isn't just crammed with more and more housing. 2. We also have an obligation to protect the environment and these policies will considerably reduce the canopy of trees and other plants. 3. The long-term cost of building utilities to accommodate growth is a real burden for the Town and an incredibly inefficient way to add housing.
congestion
If adopted, resulting traffic and increased density will quickly transform Yarrow Point into just another Seattle like neighborhood.
Maintaining the tight knit and open community that we have today.
Overrunning existing services and traffic. Circle is already way over crowded at times
lose the character of the town and reduce property values..
Middle housing will lead to the destruction of the beautiful Town of Yarrow Point.
We need to preserve our community as it now. YP is a very small area with a very high tax rate.
Less open space is NOT a positive for this area.
Traffic, housing prices
Decline in property values, too many people, less desirable crowded neighborhood, too much traffic, no place to park all the new cars, and the community character will change.
Yarrow Point turning out like Kirkland
Changing our quaint small town feel by adding multi family, the cost to the town and parking issues are my concerns.
Developers will take advantage of the situation if we expand the minimum state requirement under HB1110. Redmond and Kirkland and downtown Bellevue have numerous multi family units. The character of our neighborhood will change dramatically.

Crowding, parking, safety, traffic, walkability
Terrible law that is completely inappropriate for our town. We shouldn't be forced to change the zoning and nature of our town causing permanent damage for a theory that isn't likely to achieve what they hope. It is a terrible idea with a terrible implementation with a terrible cost.
Keeping the space and life style we wanted when we moved in 14 years ago
I worry that developers -- who already do full tear-downs (inclusive of all trees/landscaping) will use this new law to build multiple structures and further drive their profits up. This creates additional incentives to sell to developers (not families) which will over time dramatically alter the character of our town.
decreased green space. increased density, traffic, parking
Major traffic and parking issues
Negative impact on property values
Losing the single-family feel
The state blatantly taking away our rights to manage our own community and keep the character of it intact
Loss of quality of the community.
Congested roads, less parking spots, cars parked on the streets, no playground or recreational area to accommodate growth, over crowded schools, safety , attract unwanted traffic
I think this risks destroying the character of yarrow point without measurable impact on the overall housing problem
There is currently a lot of green space and charm, more buildings would disrupt that.
Home values. Community impact.
changing the livability of the town
traffic, parking, utilities, construction, noise, loss of green space, loss of property value
Depreciation of house values
Safety and Privacy
Too many people and cars without sufficient parking or infrastructure. Crime and safety. Too many restrictions on lifestyle and amenities. I would like to see some kind of provisions for potential commercial infrastructure, such as the Green Store in Medina for local food/beverage/supplies without getting in a car.
Impact on the feel of the community, traffic, safety, decrease in green density, the investments we have made in our house and property decreasing.
most concerned with developers with no vested interest in our community trying to maximize the lots to fullest extent
Our main concern would be that our small town does not have the infrastructure to accommodate a larger population. We do not have a retail store, large parks, etc.
LOSS of YP's QUALITY OF LIFE, TREES, SAFETY (traffic!) and REDUCED PROPERTY VALUES
Traffic and safety, and declining property values. Becoming Seattle.

Degradation of property values, safety, quality of life, and community character.
Don't want YP to be high density like Kirkland with crowded housing on lots
Degrading the community and overcrowding.
Crime
Do not agree with mandated middle houses requirements. Maintain current character of our community.
The town does not have infrastructure to support the construction of these units. There is no HOA to monitor the type of construction that fits into the community.
Changing the dynamic of single-family housing will change in a negative way the family oriented neighborhood as well as resale prices of our homes and begin the destruction of our neighborhood
I purchased my home in 2006 with the expectation that there would be single-family homes where single families cared for their home and their community. I feel that opening up the lots to multiple housing units will degrade the quality of the community.
No middle housing is affordable in Yarrow Point, Hunt's Point or Evergreen Point. Tear downs go for 2.8-3 million. Two units would cost 3 million each at a minimum 1500 square feet X \$ 1,000/sq ft. On a 15,000 square foot lot. No one could afford this nor could the occupants afford the \$15,000 property tax on each unit much less the mortgage payments, insurance and maintenance.
confusion
Changing the character of the town. More traffic, more noise, less rural/ small town feeling.
Safety and home value.
I do not think that these code changes should be forced on existing homeowners. Property owners purchased under the assumption that they were protected by the existing CC and Rs.
Traffic load
Impact on traffic and schools
Cost to the town, traffic
Aesthetics, parking, crime
Destroying the character of the town, increased traffic, parking issues and crime.
loss of privacy and view. Loss of quiet enjoyment. More conflicts with the height of the edges.
Barking dogs.
It may change the character of Yarrow Point and it may lower the market value of our property.
1 Increase in traffic 2 Decrease in current housing values
What zero lot line requirements mean. Also question # 11 should have included a single family home option which would be my choice.
Change of character of neighborhood, parking, infrastructure, more rentals (less stake in neighborhood).
Lack of infrastructure to support significantly more people. I am also concerned about housing density vis-à-vis the beauty of Y P

Small lanes don't support extra traffic. Quiet nature of neighborhood is further degraded as units are added. This program should not be driven by real estate and development interests interested in profits over quality of life.

Trees! More houses = less trees Parking, congestion Losing the nature/feel of small town

Do NOT want the State requirements to change the character of our community

Change character of YP, lower property values

Traffic, stress on infrastructure,

Destroying the small town character of our town, increasing construction disruption and noise, destroying roads, stress on infrastructure, especially with electric cars becoming so popular

Lower Values

That new policies do not negatively impact particular resident segments (old homes, new homes, large lots, small lots).

Preferred Approaches to Middle Housing

In your opinion, what measures should be taken to ensure the preservation of our community's character during the implementation of new housing policies?

Do everything we can to make the impact as slight and extended in time as possible.

Maintain our property values

City council should reject this and challenge legally since it violates our property rights. Change building codes so contractor would not want to build and at last resort allow only owners to occupy property and enforce current codes for maintenance of property.

No density here and save the trees

Enact a prohibition on cutting down significant trees. We have so few left. Require planting two trees of a type that can grow to be significant for every one cut down.

be as restrictive as legally possible

Don't quite know but traffic is a concern. The renters could have one or two cars and then friends visiting could have a traffic impact. Also the loss of canopy for our community. Tree canopy is already disappearing with the new construction.

How about severe restrictions on buildings lot lines etc.

Strict enforcement of housing policy.

Adherence to town codes

Make sure to take into consideration town residents, and communicate clearly what changes are being made and how we can maintain a democratic process.

If we are mandated to comply with this new requirement, I am interested in understanding how we can meet the minimum standards while preserving the character of YP.

keeping the look and feel of traditional homes vs apartments/standard duplex configurations

Architectural and landscaping requirements, construction quality. Appropriate timelines for completing projects. Permits that take the above into account and follow guidelines in order for projects to meet the permits standards.

Housing needs to adhere to an aesthetic that fits into the neighborhood feel, parking needs to be included in any type of development, and units should be for ownership vs. rental.

Make black and white zoning changes and make them hard or extremely hard to approve. Stay only tightly in line with legal requirements and offer zero flexibility above those legally required obligations.

DO NOT permit ANYTHING other than single family homes

Prohibit this absurd new law.

Come up with a way to get around this. Our lots on YP are too narrow for this.
If possible all housing should remain single family homes + ADU. If mandated duplex units should be on the periphery of the neighborhood, such as south of 520/Points Drive NE towards Queen Bee.
Every measure legally possible should be taken to minimize the implementation of these new policies. The town should not do anything more than is absolutely required by law.
Strict town policies
Stick to ADU format
Single family homes only.
Limit to single family homes
To limit the development codes to be single family homes with a small ADU if mandatory
Allow current ADU/DADU units to be counted in the total required. There are many homes on the Point with such units above garages and separate buildings. I believe there are homes with self-contained apartments or areas of their main homes with complete kitchens, etc. that could be counted
Limits on tree removal, strict parking/right-of-way requirements
Retain minimum lot sizes
Change as little as possible. Follow the state laws but do it in a manner that has least impact. Can be that neighbor's opinions are sought for 2-unit permits.
Very strict guidance as to adequate onsite parking and appearance
Design guidelines
Strict tree code, enforce parking restrictions, restrict development to a smaller lot size and keep significant permeable lot cover o
Strict development guidelines regarding traffic, parking, setbacksetc
We should welcome new residents with open arms.
Aggressively attempt to keep Yarrow Point single family homes, or as close to that as is possible.
Should not be implemented at all.
keeping things the way they are
public input
less is more
I think one policy is to not allow for subdivisions or condominiums. ADU's would then likely stay with the owner (family). There is still a risk of the ADU's truing into rental units.
Prohibit cutting down mature trees. We have lost virtually all of our trees. Trees support birds and wildlife. Literally prohibit redevelopment from cutting down significant trees and require planting new tree species that can grow to become significant

Long term planning for Yarrow Point ex. Will YO be absorbed into Bellevue at some point? Fire, police, utilities are all part of Bellevue/Clyde Hill. How long can Yarrow Point afford to be a stand alone town?

Convince people to vote for conservatives in our state because leftist progressive measures and propositions ruin neighborhoods.

Current code is sufficient. This should not be implemented.

Legal action with state if possible. Codify and create stricter town building codes to discourage this type of construction and property development in Yarrow Point.

Do not allow condos

Compliance with codes, which has been a problem in the past, regardless of number/size of units. Must ensure preservation and/or replacement of significant trees.

The housing policies are in place? So multi- units can be built? Then WHY THIS SURVEY?

Rather than allowing more than one dwelling per lot, lower the lot size requirement but only allow one unit per lot (and not multi family). For owners that wish, you could allow land owners to divide lot so you have 7,500 lot size vs. 15,000

Strictest rules possible to keep things as it currently is.

pass code that will minimize the impacts of increased density, do what we can to minimize the increase in cars and street parking, get development to pay for development (rather than current residents), get development to pay for the increased usage of our roads/utilities/town assets, increase fees for development, create legal code which will attempt to keep Yarrow Point limited to one single family plus one ADU or one DADU) per lot and that is it. Require on site parking.

Landscaping laws, no splitting of land

Strict enforcement of noise ordinances, off-street parking

Stricter yard maintenance requirements, off street parking requirements, stricter traffic speed enforcement

Developers should not be allowed to do adjunct housing, only homeowners

Close supervision of the process, property owners' input, legal help. Strict permitting.

make sure it doesn't become low income housing

Design requirements

keep as is

This will ruin our community. Keep it to single family homes. It doesn't need to change for lower income housing.

minimize the housing density

1. If the Town could put a moratorium in place while new policies are being created, great. Otherwise, I would only allow One Single Family Home + 1 ADU or 1 DADU. Not sure if that is possible under new laws. 2. I would require the setbacks to be staggered so you can't push two buildings right to the edges of the setbacks. Only one could go to the setback. Reduce the visual impact of adding a second unit. 3. Some design requirements so builders can't just build soulless big boxes maximizing every square inch. The developers do not care about the community at all. They just view neighborhoods as a place to build the biggest possible boxes at the cheapest cost. The materials that get circulated always suggest property owners will be doing the development. In most cases it is just for-profit builders who do not care if their project adds to the community or fits in. 4. More extensive landscaping required. 5. Real development fees to capture the long-term costs adding units will have on the infrastructure and the Town's budget.

New housing policies should not be implemented. The town, together with other points communities should challenge legality of the legislation in court

High quality construction, maintain unit guidance on size, setbacks, and implement maintenance requirements for lots.

Vote in a new state government, that stops these idiotic policies to make up for their costly regulations

minimize the change from current rules/density

Have the state legislature change hb1110 to exclude Yarrow Point and similar towns from the requirements of this bill.

YP needs to be excluded from these guidelines due to the size of it's area.

Consideration of current homeowners/residents and not builders

Reduce the minimum lot size, preserve trees and green spaces, require parking accomodatios

All measures available.

Keep current housing policies.

Extreme care regarding traffic, safety, parking, etc.

We should preserve our zoning and town character exactly as is. This law is terrible. We should do everything possible to avoid it.

I'm not sure what's even possible. But I'd do whatever we can to SLOW DOWN the process because once things are allowed, it's very hard to ever rescind policies.

tight control over parking, green spaces

Minimize new housing policies

New homes not look like boxes.

Work to limit the state encroaching on our Town code

Traffic, parking, stability of residence.

Maintain lot size requirements.

Avoid giving approval to multiple unit structures to protect the neighborhood
Impose an additional restriction that ensures that the lot size is sufficient to support 2 units (at least 7500 square feet per unit) and (2) architectural guidelines to try and avoid the duplex look
don't let it happen
Regulate parking. If there is not enough street parking for extra units, do not permit the building. Enforce tree codes.
Resist Change, Protect Private Owners rights
Some of these questions are confusing and difficult to answer because lot sizes have a large variation, and there are other factors to consider. Not sure what you consider to be our "character" at the moment? We should strive to be a friendly and safe town, with good family values, but also with tolerance for differences in design, the occasional loud party, design quirkiness. We should also strive to maintain YP's history of minimal regulations and tolerance regarding plantings, trees, antennas, occasional noise, off-leash dogs, hedges, fences, boats, rvs, etc. We enjoy YP's as our little rustic hideaway from overbearing government regulation and surveillance/oversight.
Only allow the minimum that the law requires.
our infrastructure is not suited to this... each community must be evaluated before a law can be applied
Our town will change and we will see more activity with the opening of the La Quinta hotel that is close by. Yarrow Point is not set up to accommodate additional density.
TREES (tree lined streets), DESIGN (front door faces front, reduce bulk,) SIDEWALKS, PARKING and better traffic flow at 520, NO VARIANCES on current setbacks and height. builders pay into fund to support our public spaces, parks and wetherill
Protect children and overall walkability with improved traffic safety, keep building "bulk" down, avoid creating new crazy shaped housing like the "pencil houses" in Seattle that look so out of place.
Council needs to take a comprehensive look at the tools available to ensure safety (with traffic increases, both vehicle and human), walkability, character (keep setbacks, avoid weird variances, keep bulk down, reward roof cuts and design variation), well managed tree canopy, improved open spaces.
Follow the law but keep our town's unique character. Don't change current setbacks and height restrictions. Allow people to build One Single Family Home + 1 ADU or 1 DADU is currently allowed which is one housing configuration that counts as 2 units if they desire, but not the other types of middle housing you've listed.
Local laws maintaining the current housing requirements.
Stricter preserve of large trees, as developer cares less about them and will opt to maximize lot usage.

Do not support housing policy. However no more than 2 units per zonable lot size.
Careful supervision of design elements of such units. There are quite a few ADU's around Yarrow Point—how many more are needed to meet the state requirements?
Do not implement this terrible policy
There would need to be severe restrictions on sub leasing. The terms of the lease would need to be a minimum of one year. I would support the establishment of a homeowners association to ensure that a minimum quality standard was maintained around the housing units. The number of people living in each unit would need to be closely monitored to prevent multifamily internationals coming in to one unit to provide a Bellevue education for overstate sees minors. As a PTA executive at Interlake High School I saw situations like this where there were multiple students with different last names living at the same exact address
The policy is not designed to accomplish anything but political virtue signaling that something is being done.
just allowing the minimum state requirements pursuant to HB 1110 would be the best way to proceed
Don't allow developers to clear-cut lots. Keep current parking restrictions. Be strict in height and distance from ROW with developers of new homes.
Single family residential lots.
Existing homeowners should not be forced to make these changes.
Implement minimum impact changes that are legally required
Maintaining trees, the same or less lot coverage, requiring on site parking, maintaining building height restrictions
Limiting more residents than we currently carry
Allow the minimum additional development allowed by law.
We need to preserve our community's character. it is why we live here!
The height of the buildings. The setbacks. The tree/ edge policy.
I think that more dwelling density can be desirable if it is well done. They key and tricky question is how to do it well.
By definition, Community character is going to be impacted by any change in housing style/type. Change in housing creates change in community.
Maintaining the single family existing requirement.
Implement is little as possible, resist on all levels.
Very careful regulations regarding density
Minimum measures.
***CONTROL DEVELOPERS, STRICT RULES ON HOW THEY WORK Commit to a strong tree policy Work on parking issues, don't allow cars to park on streets overnight Work on congestion getting out of roundabout on weekday mornings ***CONTROL DEVELOPERS

The Town should actively implement land use changes to meet the minimum requirements of the State before the timeline allows the more onerous State provisions

Not exceed minimum requirement

Limit to two homes per lot and limit tree removal

Strict building codes

Equality

What would you like to see in place for residents or developers to comply with the new policies such as FAQs?

How about the creation of a “Community HOA” with Builder Guidelines

Required design reviews and penalties for non conformance

All adjacent property owners must approve plans for developer to build and enforcement of existing codes

Policies about buildings per lot and tree preservation

No parking on the right of way and no fouling of travel lanes over 10 minutes. Enact a prohibition on cutting down significant trees. We have so few left. Require planting two trees of a type that can grow to be significant for every one cut down.

A ‘real’ tree ordinance. Strict setback limits enforced. Level of quality maintained same as a new home being built.

Rigid requirements

Examples of not/acceptable housing. Very clear policies with processes for approval and submission.

Designs, long-term plans, how residents will be added to the community.

What exactly does "house-scaled" mean? Are the additional units required to be occupied?

How will parking be addresses per unit/dwelling? What is the landscaping plan/trees per lot? What are the limitations on allowing units to be used as a rental vs. owned?

Written approval from all adjoining lot owners to move forward with any of these developments (ADU, DADU, etc).

Ban it entirely.

Successful scenarios. Pictures and tours of it done right and poorly.

Increase costs for developers to develop in Yarrow Point.

Single family home development only

Keeping setbacks, larger lot sizes, minimal impact to roads, parking on site so the streets aren't congested. Increase in parks and open spaces on YP and some kind of benefit for those keeping to

single family residences.

There should be ordinances in place that preserve not only the character of Yarrow Point, but preserves the views of property owners. I can visualize a scenario where a developer buys a piece of waterfront, replats the property and puts 15 bungalow type homes on it, blocking views and changing the character of the community. The community gave little input to the building of the transit center and consequently suffers from a round about with 10 signs on it (not appealing), and a traffic jam every morning and every afternoon making it nearly impossible to get on or off the point as parents drop off and pick up kids from school buses. What will the impact be on our community beach and access points to Lake Washington and how will that impact the access and parking in those areas? It is important to think through all of the potential issues and scenarios that might arise with this new law.

Public reviews with the planning commission, published rules and regulations regarding trees and parking, process checklist, FAQ.

FAQs

Developers on the point seem to be taking more off a do whatever you want and just deal with consequence if you get caught I.e. red tagged remodels and houses higher than they should be. Not sure how you put an end to that behavior

?

A concise faqs section of town website would be nice

Strictly enforced development guidelines

More information made easily accessible. Through social media, the internet, our town website, etc etc.

background checks on people entering into middle housing, with dangerous felons and pedophiles never allowed.

Respect private properties and lake boundaries.

a strong tree code

simple rules and regulations

All the setbacks and height restrictions remain in place for each property. Again no allowance for subdivision or selling of the secondary housing.

No right to block the streets. No right to park worker vehicles on the streets. Fines when they block the street.

This is an interesting question. Follow through with regulation and building variances seems uneven and secretive.

Lots of signage before any new structures get permitted.

Required to have neighbors not lose property value or views or privacy over the build. Trees especially.

Strict oversight by town planner. Same as what you do for current codes should be sufficient. If that level isn't sufficient those should be enhanced too,

thorough FAQs with several examples
Just general updates on the process and current activity.
tree coverage
It depends on the policies. Not sure how to answer this. Significant development fees. Much more neighborhood comment. The lack of design criteria is leading to a lot of very bad construction that detracts from the neighborhood. It will only get worse with HB1110.
Hard rules on maintenance, landscaping and lot usage. Hard rules on construction quality and design procedures. Hard rules on AirBNB and short-term rentals. Hard rules on frequency of occupancy.
Offsite parking mandatory to accommodate total# of residents
Have the legislature already removed Yarrow Point from inclusion in hb1110.
Developers and squatters should look somewhere else.
Yes FAQ and easily accessible education on our policies.
Replace the town engineer
Tight regulations.
More than FAQs I'd especially like to closely control what developers -- who already are having the largest cultural/aesthetic impact of any group on our town -- can do.
In addition to the housing you must be able to provide for parking, NOT ON THE STREET
Strong code enforcement
Adhere to existing code
Detailed requirements of the code emphasizing what has changed in compliance. FAQ are always helpful in understand the requirements of the codes.
Setbacks, tree removal constrictions, green requirements
Transparency regarding enforcement of policies. Strict penalties for not following code
Permission from all neighbors to proceed.
Some of these questions are confusing and difficult to answer because lot sizes have a large variation, and there are other factors to consider. Not sure what you consider to be our "character" at the moment? We should strive to be a friendly and safe town, with good family values, but also with tolerance for differences in design, the occasional loud party, design quirkiness. We should also strive to maintain YP's history of minimal regulations and tolerance regarding plantings, trees, antennas, occasional noise, off-leash dogs, hedges, fences, boats, rvs, etc. We enjoy YP's as our little rustic hideaway from overbearing government regulation and surveillance/oversight.
Keep lot coverage requirements. Make sure parking is adequate. Do not allow permanent parking on the street.
strict design codes

A design review would be imperative along with adhering to existing setbacks, height restrictions, and all other codes.

Clear rules and follow through of any new policies. See above#15. Council must BUDGET for enough staff to make this happen. Have all new construction pay into public safety and parks fund.

FAQ's aren't needed - just get the right policies in place.

Council needs to work across the full set of ordinances to find ways to maintain and improve current community standards of safety, character, and other attributes that all contribute to quality of life and property value as we go through implementation of the state requirements.

Don't understand. Keep code as currently is allowing for 2 units per lot but not other types of development.

Complete gap analysis to current zoning requirements and specific guidelines to support little housing initiative.

Right now, it is a well known fact that very little oversight takes place for new construction or waterfront revision projects. Personally, we have experienced the town changing a permit that allowed a neighbor to get away with ignoring the permitted setbacks to the property. In fact, the project actually encroaches onto our property by several feet. Instead of requiring the owner and contractor to follow the original permit, the town produced a revised permit for the neighbor that states "as built!" This error was pointed out to the town prior to the completion of the project, but no one did anything other than look at it and state "oh my, that's egregious!" Legal work was required to assure the property line was not impacted by this lack of supervision. This sort of scenario will likely happen repeatedly as the town tries to comply with additional units on existing properties. There have been construction projects that have taken 5+ years to complete. There does not seem to be any rules, careful project supervision or management and people are not required to make the changes if their contractor does not follow the permit. This creates an environment that pits neighbor against neighbor to oversee projects on adjacent properties in what used to be a friendly, supportive small town atmosphere. There seems to be a "sense of entitlement" for new owners who assume because they bought an expensive piece of property they can do whatever they want and no one will care. This situation will only be exacerbated with the construction of low cost dwelling units.

How about we start with a no soliciting policy in this town like neighboring towns have. How about we also don't allow lots with overgrown trees, and bushes which depress the overall value of our properties. Why don't we manage the town better than we do?

That is a poorly worded question. I'm not sure what you're looking for and I'm not concerned about the developers, but I am concerned about the ongoing maintenance of the properties. When there are multiple families responsible for a single property it's rarely kept up. Landlords will not be as diligent and maintaining a property as a single family homeowner. Due to lack of any rules, we already have a lot that is overgrown on 94th Ave., Northeast that houses multiple families of raccoons and is a danger to the community. I would expect regulations or rules that would prevent this from happening. We would also have to maintain guidelines as to what constitutes an eye sore While respecting that, some families just get very busy and may neglect their property for a week or two.

Residents should not be responsible to cover any costs through assessments or taxes and developers should cover entire costs without kickbacks from the government. This policy is a loser for residents of Yarrow Point

guidelines

Make as few changes to current guidelines/rules as possible. Protect existing natural ambience and tree canopy in YP. Keep current building height and distance from ROW restrictions. Encourage building of new ADUs to match style of existing home on lots. For new builds, encourage a variety of different style homes.

No multiple dwellings

FAQs and opportunity for two-way communication

Not sure what is meant here...

Easy website rules about what IS NOT allowed

Faqs and easily readable code.

Detailed permit process online that is easy to understand

I am not expert enough and have not thought enough about it to respond.

Clear building codes and better administrative permitting processes with reasonable construction periods.

FAQs help. This stuff is hard to understand. Town council and planning commission are still trying to understand it all after months of hearing about it.

Strict density and aesthetics considerations

What?

FAQS, Large financial penalties for breaking rules, longer permitting times for developers (!) to ensure they don't clearcut properties for efficiency

Clear guidelines and timely response to questions

FAQ's, obvious link to requirements on town website

Building publication with straight forward explanations of the codes

Examples of what can happen (and not). For example, on a 12,000 sq/ft lot, this could be built

How should the Town address potential challenges related to increased traffic and parking demands resulting from new housing density?
Do as much as possible to keep cars off the street. Safer for walkers, bikers and the children.
Disallow street parking
maintain 3 hour parking restriction on street. No tents or camping on property. Evict Tennant if illegal activity reported ie prostitution, drugs, since this would increase traffic to community. Prohibit renters .
Can't
No additional on-street parking whatsoever. People need to store their cars on their own property. The town streets are for pedestrians, bikes, and moving vehicles. Get rid of the roundabout and restore the T-intersection so that we are not trapped trying to leave YP
Maintain no street parking overnight. Enforce traffic speeds.
Maintain same restrictions that are in place now
Not sure how the Town can address these challenges. There is very limited street infrastructure.
Strong adherence to any new housing laws
Parking/garage needs to be a requirement for any new housing - not street parking (at least 2 spaces per unit). The roundabout needs to continue to be looked at and re-engineered as well as looking at providing passes to more residents to allow them to use the gate to enter/exit via the exit into Kirkland
> Cap the number of these developments to a minimum. > Only permit such zoning to a few hundred yards within the entry to YP/520. >Required underground parking for multi-home units
Not do multi-family housing
Ban the implementation.
Find a way around it. There is always a solution. Absolutely no apartment living. We are not Kirkland.
Mandate extra parking for each unit (which may reduce the square footage of the building site) to avoid excessively blocking the street with parked cars, which becomes unsafe on roads without sidewalks.
Require property owners to provide adequate parking on their property. Require a minimum of 2 spots per dwelling unit. Ban overnight parking on our streets.
Do not allow for multiple homes on one property.
Require increased onsite parking capacity for all new construction and put strict limits on street parking.

Think this through with parking restrictions. Some of our streets are already difficult to access when a neighbor has a party. Parking should not be allowed on both sides of the street or within range of our mail kiosks and parking at any time on the streets should be limited to 1-2 hour and strictly enforced by Clyde Hill Police. No overnight parking on the streets of Yarrow Point. Things such as our water pressure has gone down significantly as larger and more homes are being built on the Point. How will increased density and demand for water usage be handled? Should all waterfront homes be issued permits to irrigate from Lake Washington? Some homes have permits, others do not. Permits are currently required to utilize Lake Washington for irrigation. Will the state be willing to issue permits to all waterfront residents due to the increased demand on city water? There are also old covenants along westside waterfront homes which allows "free right of passage" to all residents. How will that impact waterfront homeowners? What will the impact be on our community beach and community access and the parking demand on the streets linked to those?

Implement requirements and enforce them

Require off street parking.

Seek state funds to develop infrastructure.

Any and all units should be required to adequate garage space

As they currently do

Increase support for these needs

Demand that cars can not be parked on the street. Demand a large portion of each lot dedicated to permeable improvement. Demand a strict tree code to keep from deforestation.

Strict guidelines that would most likely make it uneconomical to build multi units on one lot

We have plenty of road space.

That's something I can't answer...none of this sounds good. Never knew about the Comprehensive survey. Maybe that addressed some of this

The Town Hall and the Board should not allow such a thing happening in our neighbourhood. It will impact a lot the security and community values we have and had before for many, many years.

public discussions

more stop signs, perhaps crosswalks

Do not accommodate for additional parking. Parking has to be accommodated by the property being developed.

Do not provide more street parking. People should build parking into their lots.

If the state is requiring these changes then the town needs help from the state with a myriad of implications for more people ex. traffic, change in setbacks and building codes, 520 traffic circle impacts, public safety for more people, etc.

Good luck. Towns and cities should not have new policies imposed on us from county or state bureaucracies. We lose our freedom to choose.
The code should not be implemented as the neighborhood cannot support the congestion and pressure on utilities. The quality of life will drastically reduce,
Since it is the state imposing these policies, get funding from state
Ensure on property parking is provided for
I will be moving.
Not sure. Overzealous rules and parking enforcement is actually a hinderance. I definitely don't want unlimited street parking but all the 2 hr signs and construction parking rules already seem like overkill. Sometimes you just need to park on the street, Maybe strict enforcement of no overnight parking and no extended parking.
we need to anticipate this issue. We already have problems with parking on our narrow streets. Educate residents about where it is legal to park and where it is respectful (of your neighbors) to park (i.e. don't park in the ROW in front of your neighbors house all the time...use your. own ROW)
Provide off-street parking for each new unit. Install speed bumps if necessary for pedestrian and bicycle safety.
Require added units to have off street parking
Parking already a problem with rights-of-ways often planted and unusable for parking. Enforce rights-of-ways.
make sure they have off street parking
Don't allow this new housing!!!!
don't know
Continue to have on-site parking required. Development fees. parking permits?
New housing policies should not be implemented. The town, together with other points communities should challenge legality of the legislation in court
Increased taxation on construction of units. Spend all of that money on increased sidewalks, landscape maintenance, park amenities, and street work.
See above demanding onsite parking. Demand new traffic study for traffic circle capacity
legislate no on the street parking
Yarrow Point must do whatever possible to have the legislature exempt this town from hb1110. Yarrow Point has only one road entry and exit. Think of the negative impact on the town congestion, safety, parking, and noise that hb1110 would have on the town.
Put it to a vote for the residents (not the county or state)
Difficult problem with no real solution, since parking is already a real challenge for guests coming to existing residences.

ensure that each new house has a parking spot or garage for the residents,
Try to prevent density as much as we can.
Keep policy of one single family home and one mother in law unit
Fund new parking, sidewalks, speed bumps, better traffic control.
Fight against this law that is completely inappropriate for our town
I'm skeptical that traffic is the issue. Parking will be.
Units cannot be constructed without a viable off street parking solution!!
Streetside parking codes robustly enforced, so as not to have cars parked in roadways and too close to corners that would cause sight obstruction & safety issues
Limit density. Don't change character. Fight back.
Codify the requirements for parking and car/mobile home/boat parking and setbacks. YP has low public transit access to Bellevue and the East Side. Good access to public transit to Seattle but not the safest place to go for evening activities, therefor high need for multiple cars for a family.
Very diligent about approving these structures otherwise town will become a urban place rather than a quiet small town
Require off street parking
Don't allow a building if there is insufficient street parking
Require parking and allow flexibility in setbacks to help add garage parking
Require off street parking for all residences and all residents
Enforce reduced speeds and require on-site parking for all potential residents.
I would love Yarrow to be a gated community.
Good question. Our streets are not wide enough for additional parking and the streets that ARE wide enough should not have to bear the load of seeing a flood of cars in front of their houses.
REQUIRE PARKING ONSITE for all homes and then add SIDEWALK on one side and PARKING STRIP on the other for all the way around YP and all the public roads. Driver education (from YP and elsewhere, including e-bikes) to SLOW DOWN
Strict enforcement
This is the kind of thing the comprehensive plan efforts should be aimed at. What's the plan?

Town MUST look proactively across the policy levers to address safety and quality of life issues related to the increased density that the state law is intended to create. Key issues start with the town entry: the 520 intersection isn't going to get any safer or more passable with increased construction, resident, and worker traffic from new density. Probably need to consider sidewalks all the way around and may need to consider reduced speed limit on the 92nd "freeway" or even chicanes or speed tables. Parking will have to leverage Rights of Way given the state requirements, and the Town should consider where that will be encouraged - the "nonparking" portions on the east side of 92nd are an obvious choice, but more will be needed. Private lanes may need to absorb some of the burden if legally permissible.

Avoid increased density.

Require state provided funding to meet the requirements of these mandates

Currently, parking ordinances are not monitored. There is simply not the infrastructure in place to monitor this. This will require additional personnel to supervise construction and additional police support from the Town of Clyde Hill.

Since I do not support increasing a housing density, I have no answers for you

We're stripped the number of residents coming into the community. I didn't buy into this area expecting a significant increase in population.

Additional taxes on residents occupying middle housing to cover any added expenses or make developers pay the additional costs.

Keep current street parking limitations where in effect. Don't clog 92nd with cars. Install speed mitigation on 92nd.

I am not in favor of increasing the density of housing or the population of Yarrow Point.

Not sure what options are available to expand

Require on-site parking. Look into reinstating a local, (to downtown Bellevue and transit center), bus (van) route that goes down the point to encourage less usage of cars.

Limit how long cars can stay parked along our roads

No idea.

Require multi-units to plan for parking accordingly.

I think that the main impact will be on parking capacities. New dwellings should be required to have enough parking capacity on their lots. Anecdotally, it may have an impact on ... playground and pickleball court usage...

This cannot be answered without knowing what changes will be made.

Request grant funding from WA state legislature who initiated these intrusive requirement, which were not voted on by residents.

Restrictive parking code? Increase enforcement. There are already plenty of cars that sit out. Don't want YP to become a parking lot.
Very strict regulations. It is already hard to park on YP so adding too much housing will not be good
Parking spaces should be included within the lot itself. Not added to streets.
no overnight street parking fix the roundabout school dropoff/pickup issues
Meet minimum requirements
I have no idea. I hope increased traffic does not impact the safety of walking.
No suggestions, it will be a problem.
Refuse the State requirements, or limit to two homes per lot
Manage through on-site parking requirements.

Additional Comments

Is there anything else you would like to share or any additional comments you have regarding the middle housing policies?
Just a great sense of frustration that this intrusion into our private life was foisted upon us.
I don't know of any resident that supports this and unless the people occupying such housing are owners it will diminish the appeal of our community
Preserve trees and animal habitat. Too many trees are being allowed to be cut. Developers are winning. It is all for money. Save older historic homes.
Prohibit cutting down more significant trees and mandate planting tree species that can become significant trees.
Our property taxes are already high and I have a concern that the county will increase our property taxes even more. Also, the units built should be held to the same building standards our homes are held too.
Shouldn't our town be exempt from this law?
No
Concerned about the neighborhood changing
HB1110 is fundamentally flawed. How in the world did this get passed?
I would like the law makers who established this mandate to visit Yarrow and attend a Town Hall meeting to hear directly from residents and explain their reasoning.
Please fight it a little harder, do not let it happen.
It should be made difficult for builders to choose the option of increased units, not encouraged in any way.
Need to fight it.
This is not a low end community. If you are looking for a townhome, look elsewhere.
Extremely unfortunate, there are enough areas locally to build multi dwelling housing. Yarrow Point should resist at all cost
We hope that the community doesn't change
Rather a ridiculous law for small communities/towns such as Yarrow Point, Hunts Point, Clyde Hill, Medina.
Cheaper housing means more young people could afford to move in and I think that's a great thing.
Follow the law but make it uneconomical in a practical way
It opens the door to increased crime which is a dire concern
It should not be done at all in our neighbourhood.
we need to participate in some way to alleviate the shortage of housing

There would be more traffic on streets and parking on street because many of these properties will not have an additional garage
I feel for the Town and council having to deal with this but I view this as the most significant impact to Yarrow Point since incorporation. I recommend the Town try and run a campaign to get awareness of this issue to the residence.
Keep Yarrow Point character via trees and walking. No more on street parking.
When will these new laws go into effect?
Policies like this move us toward communism or marxism.
Middle Housing policy should not be implemented in Yarrow Point as it will destroy the character of the town and quality of life for the residents.
Citizens should be involved before state makes decisions.
There are many examples of increased housing density in lively vibrant neighborhoods. Look to positive examples of what has already been done.
Reduce the lot size requirements to "potentially" double the # of homes in Yarrow Point. Fight all other requirements in court.
Only implement the minimum required and keep the rules tight and enforced. Unfortunately it seems like the only way on this. I don't like that we keep adding all these restrictions like the tree code, no construction parking etc. but in the instance of dense housing I think it is necessary to preserve the character of Yarrow Point as a desirable single family housing neighborhood.
Impractical policy
No to developers! Keep the trees
This is a nice area don't turn it into something else
This cannot happen.
The Puget Sound area is fragile environmentally and does not have unlimited water and power resources. Endlessly adding more and more housing is not the answer. Who are you building this for?
We should as a town make it almost impossible for a developer to build two units on one lot
Our government is of the people, by the people and for the people. Bad laws such as hb1110 should be changed.
A better solution is reducing the minimum lot size to 10,000 sqft from 15,000. that will increase the density without altering the neighborhood significantly
Thankful that the town is doing such a great job of educating all of us residents and getting our opinions.
The state lawmakers didn't think this through. Will vote against all of them
I am speechless on this subject
Do not exceed the minimal state requirements to protect the YP community.

We don't have the infrastructure to support the extra work required to support this policy. It will cost the town and taxpayers more than the grant will support.

Town should keep current guidelines, but reduce lot size requirements to permit more density as desired.

Yes, I like the idea of additional housing, but not if it impacts my privacy, enjoyment of my own property, encourages crime, or creates dangers.

Take care for unintended consequences regarding policy. Your tree policy has caused many trees to be brought down due to people wanted to do it before the deadline. These things happen. People do not like being told what to do with their property.

we need CONSISTENT implementation of any plan ... no exceptions for someone who wants to make a creative lot subdivision. they still need to work within setbacks, height, characters (design), tree codes.

I'm concerned that the survey could lead residents to miss the point. These changes ARE COMING, like it or not. If we try to ignore it or slow-roll it, state rules will simply steamroll our own zoning and land use rules. The real task is to focus on the OTHER policies and ordinances that will support maintained - or even improved - safety, quality of life, character, and property value.

Some people are already building ADUs. Don't force it. My house has what could be a separate living area in our basement. Don't require us to change the character of our town. Be creative.

Forcing communities to increase density against their will is unjust and unamerican.

The position of the compressive plan to agree with state regulators position on increase density is in consistent with majority of yarrow point residents. It should not be accepted and so noted in the comprehensive plan.

This is a poorly thought out policy which did not take into co ideation the impact on small towns

We need more housing.

I strongly want the community to remain as it is and Allow us to continue to live as we have been.

I am totally opposed to this policy.

The policy itself is a good idea on paper. It should not be mandatory however. New large subdivision developments should definitely have a variety of housing types and pricing. But Yarrow Point does not have subdivisions and therefore it makes no sense to retrofit to existing single family lots.

I wish that we were informed in a more timely manner about the Town Hall meeting. Seeing it on a sandwich board the day of does not suffice.

Yarrow Point is not where the state is going to find options for middle-housing price tags. We are a peninsula on the water. Therefore, our land is scarce and valuable. Building cheaper homes here will not fix the overall affordability problem facing Washington state. Major metropolitan areas--NOT TOWNS--can benefit from these policies which, in turn help the overall state goals.

Having an adu on my property that I can rent out would help with the ever increasing property taxes. And would also be nice to provide housing for family members who may need it in the future.

I am sorry that I could not participate in the open house last Tuesday. I hope to be able to participate more moving forward.

Mayor and Town Council should strongly oppose implementation of middle housing/ADU's.

Fight to maintain character of YP, please.

This is changing the quiet nature of our town.

More information on the implications of Zero Lot Lines and divided ownership of current single family houses/lots.

More residents in Yarrow Point will affect traffic at 92nd and adjacent neighborhoods, since we share freeway exits and entrances. We live here because we like to have space around our home and lots of trees and nature.

I would love to see programs to get more resident input so whatever is implemented reflects the town, not a vocal minority