



Public Comments Community Open House Events Missing Middle Housing

The City hosted two Community Open House events on September 21 and 25, 2023. More than 170 Knoxville residents came out to learn about the City's proposal for Middle Housing zoning changes, get their questions answered, and provide input into the plans.

This document includes the input recorded through individual comment sheets and chart paper comments at both events.

Thursday, September 21, 2023

Emerald Youth Foundation, 1718 N. Central Street – 4:30 – 7 pm

Individual Comment Sheets:

What were your key take-away's from today's event?

- Positive vibes.
- The need for this kind of housing. Better understanding of code revision process.
- Well presented overall. It would be good if our representatives and administration would focus on infill and sustainable development and de-emphasize housing crisis.
- Great initiative idea! It's open to discussion which is great.
- Hopefully zoning will be approved so that more middle housing can be approved for our community.
- The proposed changes to zoning laws would not affect existing single-family homes.
- Appreciate the pilot approach. Appreciate the factors that went in to designating the pilot areas, especially the new KAT routes.
- I am grateful that our city is studying and carefully considering middle housing and appreciate the openness to community input at this early stage.
- I think this is part of the answer to providing more affordable housing to the much-needed housing market.
- Well thought out plan that addresses immediate need.
- Confusion.
- That the middle housing project takes into consideration building an aesthetically pleasing environment.
- I am a strong proponent of this proposal.
- Don't think the administration's proposal goes far enough.
- Why limit to TDR 2 seems like redlining.
- Liked the architectural design requirement for new builds. These ideas aren't necessarily affordable housing, but could help alleviate the housing scarcity.
- Liked the parking requirement minimums dropped but make a parking maximum limit. Don't leave it to builders to increase parking. Create requirements for sidewalk development in new builds. Oakwood-Lincoln Park needs to continue to help create density within North Knoxville as growth continues up Central and Broadway. This plan will continue to sustain a diverse and thriving community. Balance these options with rental and ownership homes/units.

- Good Plan! Keep expanding.
- City is really working hard to address this issue.
- Great information sharing platform.
- Looking forward to seeing middle housing be considered and incorporated in a cohesive way.
- Good to see a large number of young adults here.
- No talk of amount of housing. No talk of affordability. Band-aid solution. Seems like gentrification.
- The city/county are not doing a damn thing about affordable housing and have no plans other than kicking the can down the road.
- The community seems to support infill development along major corridors as well as in TDR areas.
- MMH is a great important opportunity for the Knoxville community.
- Excitement and appreciation.

What do you think is most critical for Knoxville related to Missing Middle Housing?

- Rethinking parking so higher density doesn't lead to paved backyards.
- Public demand overcoming objectives of current homeowners.
- Affordability and access to public transit.
- Affordable housing.
- Affordability.
- I feel that making ADUs more easily placed would potentially benefit not only renters but homeowners.
- Design character in line with neighborhood context. Balance of density and open/green space walkable, connected sidewalks required with new builds/reconstruction.
- My concern is that we have more affordable housing. To serve and include all the people in our Knoxville community. We need to increase housing that low income and the presently unhoused can afford/live in.
- Having standards that create an environment that's visually pleasing but also giving developers leeway to grow housing inventory.
- Ease of building or converting. It's great to have codes it just shouldn't take 12 weeks within the city to get a permit.
- The ability to maintain community in neighborhoods that will be affected.
- Increase density of housing for social equity.
- Basic supply and demand. Increase supply to bring down prices nothing would help social equity more.
- Do away with Archaic suburban zoning.
- It's not 1950.
- Maintain some original character of the neighborhoods. Educating people that these housing options are already here in Knoxville and in popular areas such as 4th and Gill and Sequoyah.
- Implementation as fast as possible.
- Parking reduction.
- Do more to inform builders and buyers about how to make these now residences efficient. Of course, state laws prevent requiring those things but federal rebates and incentives are available.
- Not sacrifice the historical assets of the homes or the zoning effectiveness. Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.
- Community buy-in and community driven. Bottom up solution.

- Availability of social equity.
- The ability to implement the plan as soon as possible to address the housing crisis.
- Affordability!
- Recode selling properties for a dollar for/to rich white men, community land trust.
- Affordability and walkability.
- Raising awareness and support.
- Affordability, density, walkability, and good urban form, possibly a new form-based code.
- Affordability.

Community Input, Comments, Suggestions:

- Test the case study examples like the Cleveland against the proposed zoning changes. See what works and what doesn't in order to learn what adjustments might need to be made. For example, the Cleveland can't be built under the proposed changes, both due to parking req's and required lot frontage. Maybe the changes should be more nuanced relating to zoning? RN-4 = lower required frontage + 5 spaces per dwelling visit for instance?
- The city should also be looking to infill commercial and blighted areas.
- Marble city needs investment and renovations. This is something Knoxville has needed for a long time coming.
- I believe more middle housing/ ADUs would be needed in other areas like further West Knoxville/Rocky Hill area.
- I think there is a huge availability of space that is underutilized for ADUs in the single-family home space.
- I would like a map on paper so I can use it myself.
- Pilot removal of parking minimums.
- If the city would provide incentives for subsidized housing, we could provide shelters for the shelter less and improve our city. We need to work toward helping those who need opportunities and not just emphasize profit/income.
- Work with developers as much as possible to ensure middle housing has an increase in the area.
- Think of how these buildings will age and possibly have an emphasis on design that'll stand the test of time.
- For secondary alley structures you need a way for emergency vehicles to find the property.
- Will the new standards allow a single family to be converted to a tri floor plex when it is sold?
- I believe having the TN Renters Assoc. funding this study is a conflict of interest.
- Why not apply these standards to RNI where lot size is not a factor?
- Why not put the emphasis on the corridors like Broadway where empty buildings already exist?
- I'm not against more density, but I do have concerns of a slippery slope.
- This is great for the community and improving social inequality.
- Please pass this!
- Don't let 3 neighborhoods in west Knoxville dictate land use policy for the entire city.
- Love it!
- Expand past this in ongoing years to allow ADU more missing middle and more med-density mixed use in all zone F.
- How about hiring a local consulting firm for a change? Someone that knows the community.
- You guys are doing a great work. Keep it up.
- I think it's imperative for this to happen.
- Community land trust.

- Community land trust.
- Opportunity to work with innovative community partners like SEED instead of just the same powerful developers. Promote equity at each step of the process.
- Push outreach to the university and to people who are heavily searching for housing. They need this.
- We should encourage ground-level uses within MMH instead of just residential. The parking requirements seem that they will stifle density when enough of parking isn't available. Additionally this type of housing should encourage less driving and more walkability. Marlow's reduced setback proposals should be approved! A 25 setback is not necessary.
- Keep it up! Encouraging for the rest of Knoxville.

Chart Paper Comments:

- Does the architectural character fit with the area? The design standards address this pretty well. Make sure these are emphasized.
- I am excited at the idea that I may be able to afford a home in Knoxville after I graduate.
- I think this would be great for our city. Allows for more affordable housing in our communities.
- This would be a breath of fresh air for students like me!
- I strongly support Knoxville Missing Middle Housing. It would provide young people like me with a path to homeownership, and would make me more likely to stay in Knoxville when I graduate UT.
- I think this is a great solution to address the current and future needs of housing in Knoxville.
- Extremely excited for these proposals! I believe the parking requirements will lead to density restrictions however. There should be more opportunities for the elimination of parking requirements! Prioritize more ground floor commercial opportunities for MMH!
- Great opportunity to provide housing for students who can no longer afford to live near campus.
- This is a really great initiative. It will encourage the provision of more housing options and increase overall housing supply.
- This seems like a great opportunity that would help aid the current housing crisis both the university and broader are experiencing.
- This is not a new idea and it was very helpful to see existing examples in Knoxville! I am excited for this necessary change.
- I support this fully. These types of housing played an important role in our historic neighborhoods and their re-emergence is one of many strategies to address needed housing types of housing and connected by transit and infrastructure.
- Great opportunity for infill lots
- Let's make this just the start!
- I love what Mrs. Ball and her team are doing to address the housing problem.
- Good plan!
- Environmental standards somewhat lacking.
- How do we keep 4th and Gill from sliding back to 100% rental like in the 80s?
- What does the sector plan say?
- Lower the codes for construction of 4-plexes!
- Incorporating pre-approved plans with streamlined permitting processes would be a huge incentive for investors to build more middle housing. The cost savings could be substantial enough even without any other tax incentives.
- A step in the right direction but is a band-aid to a worsening housing crisis.

- Certainly, standards for design and compatibility are in place. Why not create stronger environmental standards. All that's in place are the 2018 standards for insulation. How about HVAC and hot water heaters? Induction stovetops?
- Have pre-approved duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes available to purchase from planning.
- Concerned about deforestation/covering of previous surfaces in backyards to add parking spots. How does this dovetail with the new urban forestry plans?
- Adjust duplex roof pitch requirements to 5/12 vs 6/12.
- The fact remains that the targeted neighborhoods already are diverse and already containing missing middle apartments. Should we be focusing on neighborhoods with bigger yards? Or is it easier to deal with downtown neighborhoods with more political will to do this?
- Will this really address the missing middle or will it create even more luxury apartments in houses that may be split up?
- Potentially more impervious surfaces and reduction of wildlife habitat: How is the City reconciling the potential loss of natural areas (e.g., grass, treed spaces that allow stormwater infiltration) with the proposed Urban Forest Master Plan, by requiring one backyard parking space per unit on what are mostly ¼ acre lots?
- Attempting to fix something that already works: I can't help but notice that the City is focusing on neighborhoods that *already have* "Missing Middle" housing in the form of apartment buildings and divided housing, as well as density. Is this because there may be more "political will" to absorb these measures in these near-downtown neighborhoods? I understand that a goal is to create this new housing in walkable areas (near grocery stores and restaurants), so I get that. But in reality, it makes far more sense to move the focus out to the next suburban ring of neighborhoods that have bigger lots (less density) and less diversity in housing. I am letting my cynicism show here, but is the City trying to use the near-downtown neighborhoods as a test case so that they can use them as a model for moving further out with this type of policy? As a resident of Old North, I am not 100% sure I like being the guinea pig to prove to the next suburban ring that the Missing Middle policies work (or don't work).
- Does this even address "Missing Middle" housing: I can't help but think it is a little unrealistic that the proposed Missing Middle policy would even create more affordable housing. For example, if someone decides to divide up a Victorian worth \$900,000 into two or more units, it seems the only viable path forward would be a price point in the range of luxury housing, if the landlord planned to not just break even on his/her investment. This strategy may have worked better ten years ago when these houses were worth \$400,000, but then again, there wasn't a lack of affordable housing at that time which is forcing these types of policy changes in 2023.
- Infill: Most lots in Old North and 4th & Gill are 50' wide, which would not allow infill with a Fourplex – just an observation. But even if a developer wanted to build a Triplex or smaller on a vacant lot, it seems that the land and construction cost would again push the monthly rents for these new units above what is generally considered to be "affordable" housing. For example, the new townhomes at 801 N. Fourth are going for \$350-360K each for 1 bedroom, 1,150 SF units *right next to the interstate*. If these were to be rented out by an investor (which I am sure they will be), we are talking a minimum of \$2,800/month. A new triplex in the center of a neighborhood that isn't bombarded with 70-80 dB of traffic noise all day would likely go for significantly more.

Monday, September 25, 2023

John T. O'Connor Center, 611 Winona Street – 4:30 – 7 pm

Individual Comment Sheets:

What were your key take-away's from today's event?

- I feel that the city is making a great effort to ID the problem missing middle housing and is listening to citizens/neighbor concerns about affordable housing. I like seeing the suggestions/pictures/images of how to increase density in a good/attractive way.
- The MM concept is ideally what we've wanted for a while.
- This could be a huge opportunity for existing residents and owners in the MMH identified areas.
- Good event.
- I think the middle missing housing concept is great going back around a circle to what a lot of neighborhoods were before they decided to transform the housing projects as a new way of living and relocate all blacks elsewhere.
- My key take-away is that the city made a huge mistake, when they redeveloped college homes Christen berry Lonsdale Austin homes and Walter P. They should have thought through the fact that the mortgage should reflect the resident's salary.
- The plan is a great start. Emphasis on walkable bikeable access to neighborhood service shops is paramount. Density is required for this.
- Some community members have expressed concern over absolute landlords. Missing middle housing could address Knoxville's housing crisis.
- The city staff seem excited and involved. Is this essentially putting back into the zoning code some of the lot restrictions that were workshopped in to prevent/limit duplexes and ADU's?
- That the COK is concentrating on Middle Housing to address our housing crisis.
- It is very nice to see a plan of action taking root to address this issue. A formal change enacted by the city is a welcome start to resolve Knoxville's Housing issues.
- That once again the inner-city neighborhoods are being TARGETED for change because the political push back isn't as strong here as it is in other parts of the city.
- Why else would it be a "good idea" to create more density in the most densely populated neighborhoods in the city?
- The plan is short sighted. A quick fix with little regard to what these neighborhoods will look like and more importantly LIVE like in 25 years. Was nothing learned from the public housing built in the 50s and 60s that created slums and repression?
- The arguments for selecting these neighborhoods because of walkability are as unrealistic as this plan's hope for affordable housing.
- What is the hurry? Spend more time thinking and designing, looking to the future and the big picture.
- I see this as counterproductive. Regressive. All the identified neighborhoods have struggled to overcome the effects of the automobile, interstate expansion and suburban flight. A great amount of the preservation and rehabilitation to stabilize these old neighborhoods has been accomplished by returning these buildings to their original use as single family homes and creating livable, desirable places to live. This change in zoning produces the risk of losing what we have accomplished and reverting to an instability.
- It feels like a sales job for plans that are already pretty fixed.
- The city should not be using the FBC as an example for MMH. The FBC was made worthless due to the variances and closed door help for developers. Sw-1 is an example of the misuse of

the code. What was a quiet low-density neighborhood now has structures that stick out like a sore thumb.

- Very excited I'm aware Knoxville community needs to slow walk change. This has been presented extremely well.
- No information about conversion of existing homes to multifamily.
- There is a need for this type of housing in Knoxville and it will highlight and restore the historical character of the city.
- That middle housing options can and must happen.
- Not soon enough. You've driven a lot of developers out with restrictions. Rules are important, but housing is desperately needed here.
- Not much that I didn't already know nor have concerns.
- It was great. The folks from the city here were very knowledgeable.
- Got information on ADU's.
- I love it!
- The city and Opticos has done lots of work on this concept. The plan seems well thought-out and thorough.
- Much needed long overdue.
- That some residents who live in the more affluent parts of the traditional neighborhoods are only concerned about their immediate few streets and not the entirety of the area. This is a well thought out plan and I appreciate the staff taking as much time as needed to answer our questions.
- These are smallish projects that will hopefully deter corporate investment though we cannot control or forbid it.
- I would like to see some focus on our abandoned commercial corridors.

What do you think is most critical for Knoxville related to Missing Middle Housing?

- Money. I fear that national big real-estate investment companies will change the character of communities in a negative way.
- To speed the process up and implement it asap.
- To streamline the process in such a way that prevents delays and allows housing to be built on the ground faster to help with the ongoing affordable housing issue in the city.
- A restriction is needed to prevent a big out of state or even instate developer from dropping a ton of money and then build something that the middle-class can't afford.
- Abolish R1 zoning and expand the MMH target zones. Abolish parking minimums. Beef up KAT and micro mobility/bike/walk facilities.
- Knoxville needs to densify and take advantage of the infrastructure of its older neighborhoods to create better urban environments.
- Promote all types of housing within standards to fill current demand which will help lost housing types to be more reasonable to design build and purchase. Continue to educate workshop and inspire infill development so developers and residents can visualize possibilities.
- Being able to incentivize development for the missing level of housing. Preferably at a smaller and more local scale. Being able to rapidly increase housing stock in Knoxville in order to address the housing crisis and absurd rental hikes.
- Finding a delicate balance to easing restrictions on infill sites while avoiding the demolition of existing housing stock and combining of lots for this housing type. Old school developers will want to do things the way they have while taking advantage of the benefits laid out in the middle housing code changes.

- What is most critical for Knoxville is to involve the entirety of Knoxville. To place the burden of a need this large on one section of the city is again short sighted and creates an inequity from the beginning. If, in fact, the goal is to create more housing of different types among existing housing—look to the neighborhoods that actually have the SPACE. A city that is truly invested in Middle Housing looks way beyond the immediate and simple solutions. It looks to the entire city and to the future of that city. It spends more than six months building a plan and involves as many citizens as possible—the people that will have to live with the decisions—not just developers and real estate companies.
- Need to provide more housing within existing infrastructure.
- Look to the corridors and create incentives to build housing on some of the large abandoned areas.
- Use main corridors to start this missing middle. Like Chapman highway Kingston pike near the mall. Use areas that have bus lines and job markets already built.
- Affordability and mixed income.
- Incorporating a variety of the middle housing types across all eligible neighborhoods.
- Diminishing the nimby attitude and good education about how middle housing works does help.
- I think a careful approach is good, and it seems like this is doing that.
- Less need for New builds.
- I think we need it but we don't need developers in charge of it.
- To not change character of the existing areas while giving more options to people.
- Simple guidelines without the need and expense for an approval process.
- Important tool for increasing supply of smaller scale housing. As this seems to be a market-drive/developer driven program, the number of units which will actually be built, may be small.
- Empowering the community to be able to buy investment properties to enrich their families and lives.
- Let's do it right. While not an expert, I feel the plan touches on the interests of all areas of the community and provides future opportunities. I was pleased to see the interest in keeping our neighborhood character.
- Keeping housing affordable and safe.
- Not destroying our dense small lot neighborhoods that already have parking problems, lack driveways, etc. Use caution with the heart of Knoxville Neighborhoods.

Community Input, Comments, Suggestions:

- A suggestion: provide resources for home owners who choose to age in place and or want to downsize their housing footprint. Specifically downsize by altering the house to allow for renting out a portion of the house. Maybe an added bathroom or mini kitchen.
- As a resident of Parkridge its refreshing to learn of other opportunities other than historic zones/overlays.
- It would be awesome to have pre-approved designs by unit type available for use in MMH area. Preapproved plans would aide smaller developers in helping to streamline the development process.
- One of my concerns is that we definitely have an affordable housing crisis right now. But for how long? The housing market goes up and down.
- On the other side of the coin, guidelines are needed to prevent a super cheaply built structure from going up that doesn't look like the rest of the neighborhood and only craters to the poor.

The inner city has absorbed almost all the social services programs within the city of greater Knoxville. How about a greyhound station in Farragut?

- Provide a listing of all vacant lots in the desired target area that makes it easy for investors/builders to find them. Invite current lot owners to workshops or another event to connect them with builders or investors.
- I'm thankful the city is reaching out to the community and trying to get people on board.
- Find ways for the city property owners and neighborhoods to work on infill developments early on. Are there ways in this proposal and standards to limit large property grabs whose goals are inflated rates?
- Missing middle is residential in scale and exterior design. How do we maintain a residential feel without going as far as requiring or enacting a form-based code?
- I'm concerned this could destabilize existing neighborhoods by enabling the conversion of single-family residences into duplexes/triplexes. Encouraging infill housing that is design appropriate to the location within the neighborhood that could be more than single family I'm ok with. But changes that allow the conversion of single-family back to multi-units is a very bad idea.
- Keep bringing these proposals. Knoxville needs housing and while this may be very slow to have a long-term effect, that makes it easier for neighborhoods to absorb and accept.
- Put in requirements to protect the tree canopy. We already have lost too much. Parking behind houses will take away trees and green space.
- Do not change the old street feel with retail on the street and an apartment or two above the street. Any new building done should be brick and have the feel and look of the 1920's at least.
- If Knoxville habitat can partner in any way. We are ready.
- I disagree with the proposal of conversion of existing homes to multifamily. If the proposal only applied to new construction, I could support it. Why is this not applied to RM-1 and EN? The city guided Opticos to the densest neighborhoods. Why did the city allow the east Tennessee realtors association to invest 1/3 of the money for the study? Seems like a conflict of interest. Why was there no public input before the study?
- Will this eventually expand outside city limits? Development out west could use this type of housing and expanded bus routes. Is there possibility of mixed -type neighborhoods in the large land grabs happening out west?
- Please bring this to marble city! Sutherland Ave, any possible spots. Questioning the need for 1 off-street parking space per unit. Seems like that isn't needed all the time. For example, the Helen Ross McNabb development on Cox street that has more space allocated for parking than building almost no one ever parks there except drug dealer. Why not approach parking requirements on an as-needed basis? Street parking is a really great traffic calmer.
- As many missing middles in East Knox South Knox units has been abandoned to blight properties sat and still sitting because they're not profitable. Never any talks about outsiders are taking over our city because its profitable. Never admit that incomes determine our housing. Let's partner with increase min wage and livable wages. Parking but not our problem if you are not rich. Can't wait to see the city of Knoxville/County missing middle affordable housing initiative.
- Consideration needs to include our infrastructure.
- We absolutely need more housing now. Simple construction process is good.
- This may not create any affordable housing, but the need for this type of housing exists.

- This provides opportunity for ambitious individuals to create wealth with small multifamily cash flowing assets. Another avenue for members of the community to level up their income producing abilities.
- Fear of corporate owned housing takeover and corresponding absent/difficult to reach/slow to respond landlords.
- I'd like to see RN-1 included in the duplexes and triplexes. More can be done to help low and low middle-income people. Maybe tax relief for people over 55 years old and raising the income threshold to \$65-70,000 this might off-set some of the worst of inflation.
- I like the plan and support this in my neighborhood. OLP
- All residences under this code must be designed and sited for solar installation, primarily that one pitch of the roof facing south and have a steep pitch. Residences must have connecting sidewalks installed by the builder in the right of way along all streets in the development. The developer must pay for any needed infrastructure improvements before building begins to be certain that the increased number of new residents don't make life worse for existing residences this includes street widening intersection improvements water sewer electrical improvements and etc. There must be a formula in the code, for example for every 2 market value residences there will be one affordable housing residence build by the same developer to the same standards as the market residences in the subdivision or very near the 2 market value residences. The affordable residences must be available to section 8 housing and other qualifying persons who are identified by federal government, or other agencies, as in need of housing and qualified to buy/rent a residence. The affordable residences must remain as affordable housing for at least 20 years, and occupied by the owner. To be clear, the affordable residences cannot be sold to or brought up by for-profit corporations, or individuals, to be resold at a profit and taken out of the affordable housing market. The affordable units may not be used for short term rentals. There must be a code mandating a certain number of trees per unit, or per acre, of development, so that the tree cover is maintained or added to. All of this must be written in the code.
- That once again the inner-city neighborhoods are being TARGETED for change because the political push back isn't as strong here as it is in other parts of the city. Why else would it be a "good idea" to create more density in the most densely populated neighborhoods in the city? The plan is short sighted. A quick fix with little regard to what these neighborhoods will look like and more importantly LIVE like in 25 years. Was nothing learned from the public housing built in the 50s and 60s that created slums and repression? The arguments for selecting these neighborhoods because of walkability are as unrealistic as this plan's hope for affordable housing. What is the hurry? Spend more time thinking and designing, looking to the future and the big picture. I see this as counterproductive. Regressive. All the identified neighborhoods have struggled to overcome the effects of the automobile, interstate expansion and suburban flight. A great amount of the preservation and rehabilitation to stabilize these old neighborhoods has been accomplished by returning these buildings to their original use as single family homes and creating livable, desirable places to live. This change in zoning produces the risk of losing what we have accomplished and reverting to an instability.
- What is most critical for Knoxville is to involve the entirety of Knoxville. To place the burden of a need this large on one section of the city is again short sighted and creates an inequity from the beginning. If, in fact, the goal is to create more housing of different types among existing housing —look to the neighborhoods that actually have the SPACE.
- A city that is truly invested in Middle Housing looks way beyond the immediate and simple solutions. It looks to the entire city and to the future of that city. It spends more than six months

building a plan and involves as many citizens as possible—the people that will have to live with the decisions—not just developers and real estate companies.

- The plan introduces risk and possible instability to Knoxville's pre-automobile neighborhoods that have struggled for the past half Century to fight the impacts of the auto, the interstates and suburban flight. All the identified neighborhoods have made great progress in this battle under the current set of rules. The single biggest risk is that single family houses will be converted/subdivided into more units as was done in the early and middle part of the 20th Century. A great amount of the preservation and rehabilitation work that has been done these last 50 years to stabilize these old neighborhoods has been accomplished by returning these buildings to their original use as single family homes. This slow process under the current rules has led to communities that are now quite livable and desirable to both owner occupants, renters and investors. To further elaborate on the issue, the conversion option has the potential to lure absentee landlords into this market. It is interesting to note that the New York Times ran an article on September 16th of this year documenting the major increase of institutional investors buying single family houses for rentals. According to the article 17% of all home sales in Charlotte in 2022 were by investors, with 21% in Atlanta and 11% in Nashville. This action will bring instability to the affected communities.
- I wish our fellow neighbors in this area under discussion were able to see the area as a whole. At this event, I was frankly shocked at how some residents in the historic neighborhoods of this geography don't seem to care about the whole area. Not all neighborhoods have historic protections. This plan appears to me to at least try to support not tearing down the houses in my neighborhood specifically. The historic areas don't have to worry about that. For what looks like the majority of the traditional neighborhood area, Oakwood Lincoln Park, Belle Morris, Edgewood, etc. the conversion options help us keep our current buildings and homes. There is no perfect solution but I think this plan balances the perspectives. I appreciate the work that has gone into this and to move our city forward positively but in a sustainable manner.
- It is a public policy plan that places the burden of solving a city-wide problem on only part of its citizens. A policy plan to make the densest parts of town denser while leaving things alone in the suburban ring, the least dense part of town, seems wrong. The city has offered three main reasons for making this policy choice. I find those arguments to be less than compelling.
 - Argument 1; The old neighborhoods already have some of these housing types, so it is a good place to put more of it. It is true the old neighborhoods have more of these type units, and nobody is asking that that they be removed. They help bring balance and diversity to our communities. The cities RN1 and EN neighborhoods do not have these structures and if we are being asked to accept the burden for the good of the community so should they. As the old saying goes. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.
 - Argument 2; The consultant told us to do it. That is only partially accurate. The Optico planning document on page 56 clearly states "The following analysis focuses on the four zones (RN-2, RN-3, RN-4 and RN-5) selected by the City for this Study." Clearly the City made the first decision to restrict the Missing Middle concept to the older denser neighborhoods. Their input, as always, guided the consultant's recommendations. The City has made the policy choice to pursue this course of action.
 - Argument 3; These type units are best suited for more walkable neighborhoods. According to the study one of the goals of Missing Middle types is to achieve more density to support more neighborhood amenities. Many of the old neighborhoods already have the sufficient density and walkable amenities but most folks still use their

cars routinely to access those properties. Along these same lines, the study identifies some areas outside the 640 loop that could be transformed into more walkable areas. The city proposal does not touch that concept. The walkability argument is thin at best.

- The process appears to have been top down from the beginning. Here are just a few questions on that topic.
 - What if any community input was taken before Opticos was hired to do the initial study of the “Missing Middle”?
 - Why was this option for solving Knoxville's housing problems pushed to the top of the administration's agenda instead of a focus on Transit Oriented Development along the corridors which has a much better chance of producing housing in sufficient numbers to handle the problem?
 - What role has the East Tennessee Realtors Association played in this process besides funding 1/3rd of the cost of the original study?

Chart Paper Comments:

- “Conversion” of existing single-family homes by absentee landlords/developers will eventually destabilize these neighborhoods. Build along the corridors of the neighborhoods and empty lots. Don't pull apart the interior of these neighborhoods that already have density and a diversity of rental to home-ownership
- The proposed dimensions for new housing on the 45-50' wide lots leave only the backyards for parking pads. More concrete and asphalt will increase the heat retention and create higher utility bills – not environmentally or people friendly
- More concrete and asphalt also contributes to flash flooding - permeable pavement is an effective option for mitigating floods
- Start here and have some success. Then build geographically. I appreciate doing this in phases. This is a good step for Knoxville
- The FBC was not followed. Variances for zero setbacks, double the density and loss of neighborhood character became a heat-sink, lack of tree lines and wildlife. Vision Plan was not followed for the neighborhoods. Also, one example of a poor development at Phillips and Dixie with the development behind South Coast Pizza
 - No parking which impacts neighborhoods
 - Water run off – floods houses and businesses around it
 - Building height and modern design does not meet character of Old Sevier
 - Narrow streets help with traffic control
 - No sidewalks on Phillips Ave allows for yards with trees and landscaping on an old street
 - Sevier Ave needs to stay retail on bottom, one or two apt. above and keep the 1920's feel
- While it's true we currently have a major affordable housing crisis, what does the future hold?
 - Is this crisis temporary?
 - Is there a danger to making major changes to our zoning code and ending up with a housing glut in the future?
- How are we going to keep big corporate landlords like Open Door, Zillow, Redfin, etc. from buying up existing housing stock and being absentee landlords sending \$\$\$ to CA and destroying incentives to invest in single family historic neighborhoods? How did this work out in CA??
- “Missing” Middle Housing is consistent & characteristic of Knoxville's oldest neighborhoods.