

**Final Review and Evaluation Criteria**  
**Olympia Municipal Code - Section 18.59.040**

City of Olympia LBA Woods/Bentridge Village Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone Request  
Project #: 17-1231

Chapter 18.59 of the Olympia Municipal Code addresses the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process. Sections 18.59.040 and 18.59.050 identify the final review and evaluation criteria to be used during the review and decision-making process for such applications, including when a concurrent rezone is requested.

**18.59.040 Final review and evaluation**

A. The Department shall distribute the final docket of proposed amendments, including rezones, to any state or local agency which is required by law to receive notice of proposed amendments and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing development regulations within the time required. In addition, the Department shall distribute the final docket of proposed amendments to recognized neighborhood associations and other affected interests identified by the City Council. The Department shall include issues identified in amendment proposal analyses and conduct any review required by SEPA of the proposed amendments, including rezones, listed on the final docket.

*Routed to State Agencies: March 31, 2017*

*60 Day Notice of Intent to Adopt Comment Period Ends: May 31, 2017*

*Routed to Recognized Neighborhood Associations: April 13, 2017*

*Notice of Application Published in the Olympian: April 19, 2017*

*Planning Commission Briefing: April 17, 2017*

*SEPA Determination Issued: June 23, 2017*

*SEPA Determination Notice Published, Mailed, and Posted: June 28, 2017*

*SEPA Comment Period Ends: July 12, 2017*

*SEPA Appeal Period Ends: July 19, 2017*

B. The Department shall prepare a report including any recommendations on each proposed amendment, including rezones, on the final docket and forward the report to the Planning Commission. At a minimum the Planning Commission recommendation and the Council decision should address the following:

1. Does the proposed amendment or revision maintain consistency with other plan elements or development regulations? If not, are amendments or revisions to other plan elements or regulations necessary to maintain consistency with the current final docket that will be considered by the Planning Commission and the City Council?

*Staff Opinion: The proposed amendments are consistent with the community request to retain trees and expand LBA Park and open space around the park (a petition with over 5,000 signatures was submitted to the City Council to support the request). The recently updated Parks, Arts, and Recreation Plan, which included an extensive public involvement process, also supported efforts that resulted in this purchase of parks and open space within the City of Olympia.*

*This proposal acknowledges and provides for the extension of Log Cabin Road between Boulevard Road and Wiggins Road, which is a street connection identified as being needed in both the City of Olympia Comprehensive Plan and in the Regional Transportation Plan for Thurston County.*

*The ten acre area proposed for future residential development and the potential for a small neighborhood retail area is consistent with the provisions in the comprehensive plan that call for additional residential development with the potential for a neighborhood retail area that could serve the site and surrounding residential properties.*

2. Is the proposed amendment or rezone consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan?

*Staff Opinion: Staff believes the amendments as proposed, and as recommended by staff (which includes an additional map amendment and an OMC text amendment), are consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Plan.*

3. Is the proposed amendment or revision consistent with the county-wide planning policies?

*Staff Opinion: Yes, the proposed amendment is consistent with the county-wide planning policies adopted by Thurston County and the cities within its borders.*

4. Does the proposed amendment or rezone comply with the requirements of the GMA?

*Staff Opinion: Yes, the proposed amendment and rezone is compliant with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). Consistent with the Act, the proposal was routed to the Washington State Department of Commerce and other state agencies for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposal. No comments were received.*

## 18.59.050 Decision criteria for rezone requests

The following criteria will be used to evaluate each rezone request. A zoning map amendment shall only be approved if the Council concludes that at minimum the proposal complies with subsections A through C. To be considered are whether:

A. The rezone is consistent with either the Comprehensive Plan including the Plan's Future Land Use map as described in OMC [18.59.055](#) or with a concurrently approved amendment to the Plan.

*Staff Opinion: The rezone proposed is consistent with the concurrently proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.*

B. The rezone will maintain the public health, safety, or welfare.

*Staff Opinion: The rezone, if approved, will maintain the public health, safety, and welfare.*

C. The rezone is consistent with other development regulations that implement the comprehensive plan.

*Staff Opinion: As recommended by staff, the proposed rezone is consistent with the development regulations that implement with comprehensive plan.*

D. The rezone will result in a district that is compatible with adjoining zoning districts; this may include providing a transition zone between potentially incompatible designations.

*Staff Opinion: Staff believes the rezone will result in residential zoning districts that are compatible with the adjoining zoning districts.*

E. Public facilities and services existing and planned for the area are adequate and likely to be available to serve potential development allowed by the proposed zone.

*Staff Opinion: Public facilities and services are or will be adequate and available to serve potential development allowed by the proposed zone. Overall the proposed zoning districts are less intensive than what was approved under the Bentrige Village Master Plan. However, extension of sanitary sewer to serve any future development area may still be needed. S.T.E.P. sewer is available to serve park uses. In accordance with OMC 13.08.090, only existing lots of record can be served by S.T.E.P. systems - any future subdivision would likely require the extension of gravity sewer lines to the site.*

