



City of Olympia  
Community Planning & Development Department  
Attention: Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner  
601 4th Ave E, Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 753-8314  
jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us

Henderson Ridge Home Owner's Association  
President, Michael F. Lorich  
1685 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE  
Tumwater, WA 98501  
(360)570-2161  
michael.f.lorich@gmail.com

June 21, 2017

In response to the request for comment from the city of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department (CP&D), the Henderson Ridge Home Owner's Association (HRHOA)[We] offer the following points:

In December of 2016 the Director of the Community Planning & Development Department, Keith Stahley, issued the following Message: "We protect and enhance quality of life, sustainability, and safety through our plans, regulations, and programs."

We provide the following response to the request for comment from the City of Olympia CP&D concerning the rezoning proposal in the area of Henderson Blvd and Yelm Hwy.

It is our position that rezoning from Single Family Residential 4-8 (R-4-8) current to the proposed Professional Office/Residential Multifamily (PO/RM) does not protect, enhance, or sustain our quality of life; nor our safety. We are an established neighborhood. Sustainability in a larger sense may fit the City's consideration for diversification but this does not sustain the local neighborhood environment.

We offer the following points:

Intro:

Current zoning provides for Single Family Residential 4-8 Units per Acre

OMC 18.04.020 Purposes

B.4. Residential 4-8 Units per Acre (R 4-8). To accommodate single-family houses and townhouses at densities ranging from a minimum of four (4) units per acre to a maximum of eight (8) units per acre; to allow sufficient residential density to facilitate effective mass transit service; and to help maintain the character of established neighborhoods.

Future zoning allows for Professional Office/Residential Multifamily

OMC 18.06.020 Purposes

B9. Professional Office/residential Multifamily District (PO/RM).

This district is intended to:

a. Provide a transitional area, buffering residential areas from more intensive commercial uses. Development within this district should be compatible with residential uses and generate low vehicular traffic characteristic of less intrusive uses.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "MJG", is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

OMC 18.06.020 Purposes (continued)

b. Provide for a compatible mix of office, moderate- to high-density residential, and small-scale commercial uses, in order to provide opportunities for people to live, work, and recreate in a pedestrian-oriented area.

Specific Concerns:

Our concerns will obviously be driven by specific use plans as they are submitted for consideration to the CP&D Department however, as this is not required of the requestor at the present time our general concerns are delineated below and are not necessarily listed in order of merit.

- 1) Water Run-Off: Where will the water go (retention ponds, storm water drains, etc) and what is the capacity to handle the volume in a 100-year flood scenario. This does not appear to enhance the quality of life, sustainability, or safety of our neighborhood.
- 2) Noise: Construction and post construction considerations are relevant. The duration, intensity, and timing throughout the day will again be plan specific. In any event, this will be a significant change from current practice and does not appear to enhance the quality of life, sustainability, or safety of our neighborhood.
- 3) Traffic: Street volume, foot volume, and parking lot capacity will all be impacted. Currently, this is a very busy corner especially during commute hours and poses a significant hazard to pedestrian movement. Increased density and use changes will only increase this safety risk. The proposed change with expected higher traffic is not environmentally friendly given current commuter standards. However, proximity to local established public transportation may enhance use and economy of this system. Overall, this does not appear to enhance the quality of life, sustainability, or safety of our neighborhood.
- 4) Set-backs: Again, this is variable given possible business, light industry, and high density housing facilitated by possible rezoning. We submit that any of these developments will negatively impact the quality of life and sustainability of our neighborhood.
- 5) Buffers: Once again, this is variable given possible business, light industry, and high density housing facilitated by possible rezoning. We submit that any of these developments will negatively impact the quality of life and sustainability of our neighborhood.
- 6) Property values: Local property values have not yet recovered. Any further drop would impact each of the individual Homeowners however the aggregate decreased loss of tax revenue is likely less than the overall increase in revenue generated by increased utility of the land under new zoning.
- 7) Tax revenue vs Increased use of public services: Does tax revenue off-set increased public service use (are there enough support mechanisms for local Police & Fire Departments, schools, traffic volume, sewage, trash collection, etc?). Recent developments, apartments and townhomes in the Briggs area, have already severely strained the local school system and additional townhomes are pending construction. As an example, class size in the local schools has already exceeded sustainable quality standards; our children are paying a price. Will there be sufficient revenue to support new school construction or expansion of existing schools as well as support future teacher hiring and sustainment?
- 8) Crime: This is simple. Increased population density and/or traffic volume for businesses is accompanied by an increase in crime. Again, We submit that this will negatively impact the safety, quality of life, and sustainability of our neighborhood.



Summary: This is a fundamental change that impacts our neighborhood. While there are some pluses (increased tax revenue, increased housing availability, more opportunity for local school attendance), there are significant minuses (list above). In total, the minuses outweigh the pluses. Growth is not always a good thing (cancer grows slowly and steadily too).

Conclusion: This is not an action that We, the HRHOA, can support as it does little to protect and enhance quality of life, sustainability, and safety of our neighborhood and the surrounding area.

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,



Michael F. Lorich  
President, HRHOA  
michael.f.lorich@gmail.com



Cc: Treasurer, HRHOA      Dennis Morr      dnmorr@comcast.net  
Secretary, HRHOA      Andrew Easley      apeasley3@gmail.com

