

**Summary of Public Comments from the Planning Commission’s Public Hearing**

	TOPIC	ISSUE or SPECIFIC REQUEST	ORIGIN	STAFF COMMENT	OPC RECOMMENDATION
<b>GENERAL</b>					
1	Positive Response	Several comments included overall support for the Downtown Strategy	Oral Testimony; Written Comments		
<b>SUMMARY/ INTRODUCTION</b>					
<b>LAND USE</b>					
2	Sea Level Rise	Urge collaboration with experts who have the most current data regarding sea level rise and the importance of not missing any available data when implementing the Downtown Strategy	Oral Testimony (Sauerhoff)	The DTS recommends the City initiate a Sea Level Rise Response Plan (LU-1), which is set to kick off in 2017. The effort includes consideration of how SLR impacts and mitigation relate to the current and future plan for Downtown.	
3	Sea Level Rise	Currently, there are two distinct and disparate time-frame horizons evident in the DTS planning documents that do not correspond to each other in their impact outcomes, as relates to Sea Level Rise Response Planning. (The Comp Plan/housing target is 20 years, the DTS action plan is 5 years and the SLR response plan is 50 years.) Thus, the implications for scenario development vary.	Written Comments (Freeman)	These plans will inform each other as they are updated iteratively over time. The DTS aims to move forward the Comp Plan vision for Downtown and will be updated every 5 years or so. At this time the Comprehensive Plan has goals and policies stating that the north area of Downtown will have an urban development pattern and be protected from the effects of SLR. The SLR response plan aims to set a course for how the City will adapt over a 50 period, asking what is the level of risk we want to manage and how do we get there? This adaption plan could lead to infrastructure investments or changes in the land use plans and regulations for Downtown.	
4	Sea Level Rise	Concerns about building structures (as well as	Written	These concerns are addressed in existing	

	and Building Construction	street-scape structures), and how building materials and equipment can be designed and located to protect them from flooding.	Comments (Freeman)	ordinances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance outlines provisions for damage reduction within section 16.70.050 - this covers those questions asked about utilities, construction, underfloor water and flow-through.</li> <li>• The Sea Level Rise Ordinance does the same thing. Section 16.80.050 - Provisions for Sea Level Rise Flood Damage Reduction - mirrors the requirements of the flood damage prevention ordinances and provides for very similar protections.</li> </ul>	
5	Environmental Impacts of Light Industrial Activity	How would technological/environmental risk be assessed in the Art/Tech area with a SEPA exemption? Would effluent discharge be monitored in the dilution zone of East Bay discharge outfall or in the confluence of East Bay/West Bay discharges, or be routed to the LOTT facility?	Written Comments (Freeman)	This is addressed by OMC 13.20 – Wastewater System - a variety of regulations about wastewater pretreatment and discharge.  The SEPA exemption will not apply to Industrial uses, so environmental impacts and mitigation for those uses would be addressed through SEPA if not otherwise addressed in City Codes.	
6	Isthmus  (Also relates to design section)	Urges that the DTS should include a recommendation to remove the Capitol Center Building from the isthmus and replace it with a grand public open space. And develop the Fountain Block and west parcels in as open a way as possible.	Public Hearing (Jacobs); Written Comments (FOW)	The DTS recommends an isthmus plan to determine how the city owned land should be used and how this relates to the plans of private land owners (LU-2). The Capitol Center property is privately owned. The issue of purchasing it has been raised to Council before, but they have not directed it.	
7	Waterfront setbacks and stepbacks	Urge larger setbacks and stepbacks to enhance public access and openness of the waterfront. The Shoreline Master Program	Public Hearing (Jacobs,	The Shoreline Master Program adopted in 2015 includes regulations that affect “the shoreline” (land within 200’ from the ordinary	

		minimum 30-foot setback is insufficient for a pathway and the setback distance should be increased an additional 25' (55' total) along Percival Landing. Substantial setbacks above the second story are needed to provide an open, airy, bright space for waterfront users.	Jacobs); Written comment (FOW)	high water mark (OHWM). Within the Percival Landing area, buildings must be set back at least 30' from the OHWM and the maximum building height is 35'.  In both the UW and DB zones, If the 2 story residential height bonus is utilized the added floors are required to have 8' setbacks.	
<b>DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES</b>					
8	2-story height bonus for residential	Request that all "height bonuses" be removed from the development code for the area within the DTS planning boundary. I believe there are enough other incentives in place to encourage development, without adding to heights downtown and on the Port Peninsula. Lower allowable heights will improve the skyline, as well as present less of a liability in terms of overall building mass when sea-level rise becomes a problem and the downtown may be forced to retreat from the shore.	Written Comments (Richmond)	The DTS identifies the need for development incentives, and other than areas where the height bonus is recommended to be removed for view protection there does not seem to be a problem with the existing bonus. In fact, two recent developers informed us that the height bonus was key to their project moving forward: 123 4 <sup>th</sup> and Columbia Place.	
<b>DESIGN</b>					
9	View of Capitol Dome	Urges the Dome and Drum together make a real visual statement and need protection. Refers to page 59 where it is recommended the Capitol Dome view be defined as the Dome only, rather than the Dome and Drum.	Public Hearing (Jacobs); Written Comments (FOW)	Landmark views to the Capitol could be defined as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dome only</li> <li>• Dome and Drum, or</li> <li>• On a case by case basis.</li> </ul> <p>Staff and consultants have reviewed the prior analysis to confirm that Capitol views within the Downtown planning area that have been identified as 'unlikely to be affected' by maximum zoning development would include both the Dome and Drum. This includes the</p>	

				<p>view from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Madison Scenic Park</li> <li>• Puget Sound Navigation Channel</li> <li>• Percival Landing</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> Ave Bridge</li> <li>• Deschutes Parkway</li> <li>• Heritage Park (Simmons St)</li> <li>• West Bay Park</li> <li>• Henry &amp; St (development within DT evaluated only)</li> <li>• Quince &amp; Bigelow</li> <li>• Priest Point Park</li> <li>• Port Plaza</li> </ul> <p>Prior to the March 20 meeting, consultants will further evaluate the view from the East Bay Overlook and the effect of removing the 2 story height bonus on affecting properties.</p> <p>How the Capitol view is defined will also affect any future regulations to protect views of the Capitol from outside of the Downtown planning area. A citywide views analysis will take place in the future.</p> <p>An earlier typo in the DTS report that stated the landmark view has been defined as the Capitol “Drum” has been corrected to “Dome.”</p>	
10	View of Budd Inlet from State Capitol Campus Promontory	View 1 – State Capitol Campus Promontory to Budd Inlet – is defined too narrowly and should include northward views from the north basin of Capitol Lake. (Urges that the DTS should include a recommendation to	Public Hearing (Jacobs); Written Comments	The DTS process made clear that the intent was to determine existing views important to protect into the future, not to open up views that are obstructed by existing structures	

		remove the Capitol Center Building from the isthmus and replace it with a grand public open space)	(FOW)		
11	View of Capitol Dome from Percival Landing	View 7, Percival Landing to Capitol Dome. Only one observation point was established and analyzed, but urge that the entirety of Percival Landing be analyzed for view protection.	Written Comments (FOW)	The policy in the Comprehensive Plan is to establish views from specific observation points, so the most prominent view to the Capitol Dome was selected for analysis. However, due to its waterfront location, there are several places along the route where views of Puget Sound and the Olympic Mountains can be seen.	
12	Views from Waterfront Route	Views from the entirety of the Waterfront Route should be analyzed, and language inserted to provide view protections as the Big W Trail is completed in the future.	Written Comments (FOW)	The policy in the Comprehensive Plan is to establish views from specific observation points	
13	Views from East Bay Drive	Along East Bay, a stretch of street, rather than a point along the street should be the view analyzed. Specifically, from the southernmost residence along East Bay Drive to the East Bay Overlook.	Written Comments (FOW)	The policy in the Comprehensive Plan is to establish views from specific observation points	
14	Views from I-5	Recommend analysis of views from I-5 to Capitol for possible additional view protection	Written Comments (FOW)	This could be part of a citywide views analysis anticipated in the future	
15	Capitol Heights District	The Capitol Height District ordinance should be reviewed	Written Comments (FOW)	This could be noted for future action	
16	Language about economic impacts in the draft	The report’s mention of potential legal problems and “unfair economic impacts” seem without merit.	Written Comments (FOW)	Direct staff to soften language in report to make clear this is a general implication to consider, and not a legal determination	
17	Bias of surveys re: views	Throughout the public process, noted a clear bias of development over view protection and the surveys were also not statistically valid. Urge that development over views	Written Comments (FOW; Bardin)	The online surveys offered another venue for participation, but were not intended to be statistically valid. Some demographic information was collected and is included in	

		survey results be significantly discounted.		the survey summaries which are available online.	
18	Parklets	There is no uniform design and they are not consistently maintained by the partnering businesses. Using PBIA money to help fund the parklets is taxing one business to give a subsidy to another business that benefits plus street parking is lost.	Written Comments (Richardson)	We have included crafting design standards for parklets as part of this year’s update to Downtown design guidelines. Initial direction includes that these should not be DIY, should be made of durable materials and always reviewed by the Design Review Board. The PBIA liaison tells me there is no money in the PBIA’s budget for parklets or parklet grants and there is no foreseeable plan for that. On-street parking needs and a variety of other impacts associated with parklets locating in front of businesses are important considerations that warrant siting decisions be made following a transparent public process including Downtown business owners.	
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>					
19	4 <sup>th</sup> Ave couplet	Comment that the Plan doesn’t include Jerry Parker’s dream of changing 4 <sup>th</sup> Ave from a 1-way to 2-way street.	Written Comments (Huber)	Although exploring the “one-way couplet” of 4 <sup>th</sup> and State was brought up by members of the public during the DTS process, the Strategy does not include this as an action within the next 5 years. The reason: Five other street segments are recommended to be transformed over this period (these are in the core and can leverage dedicated pavement management funds to create a transformational impact.) Two of these streets require a traffic study; studying conversion of the couplets now would add significant time and complexity to those studies as changing traffic flow on 4 <sup>th</sup> would have impacts to the regional transportation system. The thought is to focus on completing the improvements to the five streets first, and if deemed a priority	

				by Council study 4 <sup>th</sup> as part of the next Comp Plan update.	
<b>HOMELESSNESS</b>					
<b>HOUSING</b>					
20	General Edit	Concern about word “directing” in the following sentence: “The City’s Comprehensive Plan includes a target of directing ¼ of the city’s forecasted population growth into downtown.”	Public Hearing (Drebick)	Direct staff to soften language in final draft. Comp Plan policy PL14.2 states, “At least one-quarter of the forecasted growth is planned for downtown Olympia.”	Y
21	Preserving low cost market rate units	Concerned about the City mandating owners of existing lower income rentals from remodeling these units and raising the rent.  Concerned about how Olympia might implement its goal of maintaining affordable units. He does not want to see the City implement rent control.	Public Hearing (Drebick; Baxter)	The DTS recommends the City identify actions to encourage property owners, housing agencies and non-profit housing providers to retain current inventory of affordable units (H.4). This would likely be associated with a the housing program described in H.2. Doubt the City has authority to <i>mandate</i> rents stay low, but the concept is to find ways to encourage it (e.g., by offering rehabilitation grants or other financial incentives. )	
22	Costs associated with rehabilitation of existing buildings	Concerned that the costs associated with rehabilitation or demolition of existing buildings make this not a realistic option.	Public Hearing (Drebick)	We heard that during the DTS process. The Development Incentives chapter outlines several tools that are currently or could be used by the City to help reduce costs of rehabilitation/adaptive reuse.	
23	Effect of view protection on housing	Current restrictions on building height might create a challenge of obtaining the goal of increasing housing units.	Public Hearing (Baxter)	Building heights in Downtown range from 35’ along some parts of the shoreline to 75’ + a 2-story residential height bonus in the Downtown core. Much of Downtown allows heights of 65’ with a 2-story bonus. The economic studies completed as part of the DTS determined heights are sufficient for the Downtown market. The views analysis led to a recommendation to take steps to protect	

				three views that could be impacted by future development under current zoning. The steps include design standards to frame and enhance the views along with removing the 2-story height bonus on blocks associated with two views (there the height would be limited to 65'). Given the market support for 5-6 story buildings in these locations, the removal of the height bonuses is not anticipated to have much effect on development or housing goals.	
24	Implementing affordability goals	When considering affordable housing incentives an actual affordable housing dollar amount needs to be established in order to determine if a developer can meet this goal of supplying affordable units.	Public Hearing (Baxter)	The DTS recommends the City further develop a Downtown Housing strategy (HS-1). Part of that work would be to determine the range of incomes we are planning for and what would be affordable within that range.	
<b>RETAIL/BUSINESS &amp; ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>					
25	The Port	Would like to see a study that shows the economic benefits from converting the marine business and terminal property to highest and best use (i.e., housing, retail, office, restaurants, hotel, extended Percival Landing, community swimming pool, etc.)	Written Comments (Richardson)	The Port recently completed a study about the economic impacts of their existing operations. Not sure if they completed any further study to compare this with an alternative scenario, but that would be outside of the scope of the Downtown Strategy.	
26	Downtown Welcome Center	Emphasize in the report the importance of a Downtown welcome/information center for reasons outlined in letter.	Written Comments (Horn)	There have been recent discussions about the future of the Welcome Center, including representatives from the City, Visitors & Convention Bureau, Olympia Downtown Association, Parking & Business Improvement Area and Capitol Recovery Center. The intent is to move forward with having a Welcome Center, but perhaps in a new location that has a public restroom and other to be determined attributes that will meet best meet the intent of <i>a welcoming place for residents and visitors.</i>	