

Summary of Planning Commission Position Statements

Note: This table represents a summary of individual and collective recommendations set forth in the Planning Commission position papers. For a complete description of recommendations, see the Planning Commission position papers distributed at the May 1, 2012 City Council Study Session.

TOPIC	COLLECTIVE CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS (shared by more than one Commissioner)	INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS
Heights	Heights and setbacks should be consistent around the downtown shoreline and that heights should be capped at 35' within the jurisdiction of the SMP. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i>	<p>Heights should not be restricted in the SMP to protect all views. Without development along the shoreline, economic growth is infeasible. Ultimately heights are too restrictive. – <i>Muller</i></p> <p>Establish 35' height limit in Reach Budd 4. – <i>Tousley</i></p> <p>Establish 30' height limit in first 100' from OHWM, but allow additional 5' in second 100' as a bonus. – <i>Reddick</i></p> <p>Establish sightline from North Point to the Justice Building and cap heights to 30' in downtown to preserve views. – <i>Reddick</i></p> <p>Along Budd bay shoreline, create a development profile that is no more than 35 feet high nearest the shoreline. – <i>Horn</i></p> <p>For Urban Intensity reaches, stair-step height levels with a maximum height of 35 feet closest to the water and a 50 foot height limit beginning halfway between the setback and 200 feet. Assume 65 foot height beyond the 200 feet. – <i>Horn</i></p> <p>For Urban Conservancy reaches create a low profile with 35' height limits within the entire 200 foot shoreline jurisdiction. – <i>Horn</i></p>
Mitigation	Amend the City's Critical Areas Ordinance to address mitigation requirements of the SMP. – <i>Tousley, Thomas</i>	
Overwater Structures/Docks	Establish clearer guidelines for docks; new development of these structures should include mitigation. – <i>Tousley, Thomas</i>	

TOPIC	COLLECTIVE CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS (shared by more than one Commissioner)	INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS
Parking	Parking should be no closer than 150 feet from the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM). – <i>Thomas, Ingman, Richards, Derricott, Reddick</i>	
Reach Designations	<p>SMP context – treat the shoreline as it currently stands today or what it will be someday? – <i>Muller, Leveen</i></p> <p>Cap 3B, Budd 5C and Budd 6A should be designated Urban Conservancy to be consistent with the remainder of the reaches on the shoreline in the downtown, Capitol Lake, and West Bay. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott, Leveen</i></p> <p>Reach Cap 3B (steam plant) should be Urban Conservancy. – <i>Leveen, Tousley, Law</i></p> <p>Reaches Budd 5A and Budd 5B should have an “urban edge” characterized by high density uses. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i></p> <p>Reaches Budd 5A, Budd 5C and Budd 6A should be designated Urban Intensity. Reach Budd5 should be Port Industrial to allow for Port operations. – <i>Tousley, Law</i></p>	<p>Reach Budd 4 should not be extended to the east. There is no basis for changing a clearly urban area to Urban Conservancy. – <i>Muller</i></p> <p>Budd 3A should be restored to its former state with area of fill removed. – <i>Leveen</i></p> <p>Budd 6A should be designated Urban Conservancy due to its environmental sensitivity. – <i>Leveen</i></p> <p>Reaches Budd 3A, 4 5A and 5C do not meet the criteria for an Urban Conservancy designation. – <i>Law</i></p> <p>Heed the advice of the city attorney regarding designations, heights, and setbacks to avoid lengthy and costly litigation. – <i>Law</i></p> <p>Establish 35’ Urban Intensity designation for Budd 4 with a 35” height limit. – <i>Tousley</i></p>
Restoration Plan	The Restoration Plan should include the rehabilitation of natural estuarial functions at Moxlie/Indian and Schneider Creeks and include a 50’ setback from any estuary including areas of potential rehabilitation. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i>	
Roofs and Rooftop Equipment	The City’s design standards should address roofs and rooftop equipment that protrude above height limits. – <i>Tousley, Thomas</i>	

TOPIC	COLLECTIVE CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS (shared by more than one Commissioner)	INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS/RECOMMENDATIONS
Sea Level Rise (SLR)	<p>Many commissioners reflected in their reports SLR was not addressed thoroughly enough. Most agreed more research was needed and that the Commission would need more time to review SLR research to properly assess its potential impacts. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott, Thomas, Tousley</i></p>	<p>There should be a minimum 30' setback to address level rise. – <i>Tousley</i></p> <p>Reserve minimum 35' plus 15' vegetated area for SLR protection measures. – <i>Horn</i></p> <p>Commissioners took issue with SLR regarding the equity of financial burden, more specifically concerned with taxpayers being held financially liable to fix the destruction of poorly sited or unwisely permitted buildings and infrastructure. – <i>Leveen</i></p>
Setbacks	<p>Setbacks should be no less than 150 feet from the OHWM. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i></p> <p>Property owners should be notified if they will be affected by increased setbacks and height provisions. – <i>Tousley, Muller</i></p>	<p>Setbacks should not infringe on the rights of property owners. – <i>Muller</i></p> <p>In Urban Conservancy areas, setbacks should be a minimum of 70 to 75 feet to allow for greater open space. – <i>Horn</i></p>
View Protection	<p>View protection did not get a proper amount of time to explore/deliberate. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott, Thomas, and Muller</i></p> <p>Conduct further analysis of view protection standards. Establish a clear mandate for view protection throughout the City. – <i>Leveen, Carol, Thomas</i></p> <p>Establish a 35' height limit on all building heights in all reaches except Budd 5A and Budd 5B. This limit should include ancillary structures and height bonuses and also include a hard and fast rule to avoid undue discretion and variances. – <i>Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i></p> <p>Utilize form based codes as a way to address heights and protect views. – <i>Tousley, Ingman, Richards, Reddick, Derricott</i></p>	<p>Develop view corridors first through the Comprehensive Plan update, with subsequent amendments to the SMP. – <i>Tousley</i></p> <p>Establish building heights that create viewing opportunities from upland residential and commercial buildings. Building design should minimize view blockage from residential and public viewing locations. – <i>Horn</i></p>

OTHER INDIVIDUAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Muller:

- Address integrated pest management in Section 5.11.

Law:

- Concerned with proposed height reductions and limiting options that would encourage residential units over commercial and office uses in mixed use buildings.
- Bonus residential floors could be used as “bargaining chips” for private property owners to allow public access for the proposed biking and walking trail along the West side of Budd Inlet in Budd 3A

Thomas:

- All elements of the SMP should be written in language that enables citizen/community understanding.

Tousley:

- Existing public right-of-way and infrastructure facilities should not be hindered for the purposes of maintain necessary levels of service by the SMP.
- Ensure reasonable use or variance provisions that provide the jurisdictional nexus for reducing development potential by the proposed SMP.
- Ensure the City’s ability to implement the adopted Parks Plan for Priest Point, Ward Lake, West Bay and others
- Establish vegetation conservation areas of 30’ and 50’ to improve shoreline ecology.
- Conduct a cumulative Impact Assessment based on Council’s adopted SMP. Conduct fiscal impact assessment on implementation of the SMP.
- Establish a mitigation bank for restoration projects.

Horn:

- *Visions for shorelines along Budd Bay and Capitol Lake:*
 - Include residential, shops, working waterfront, marinas, parks and paths to create a unique character for Olympia
 - Create a single, continuous shoreline urban park
 - Serve as a gateway to the state’s capital city for people who approach from the water
 - Provide a series of sub-districts along the water
 - Protect and enhance water quality, marine and terrestrial flora and fauna
- *Guiding Principles:*
 - A clean, health, well-functioning aquatic environment through restoration projects, minimizing uplan pollutants, ensuring new development is constructed sustainably and removing current shoreline armoring
 - Vegetated buffers; minimum high functioning 15-foot vegetated area along shorelines
 - Setbacks; reserve minimum of 35 feet + addition to a 15 foot vegetated buffer for sea level rise
 - Work with the Port to allow pedestrian access as close to the shorelines as Port operations and public safety concerns will allow
 - Water Recreation; support marinas in area where high functioning vegetated areas will not be affected, encourage water use by non-motorized watercraft and land-based boats, create clean beaches safe for swimming
 - Uses; support economic viability of private development in the shoreline jurisdiction, buildings along the shoreline should be mixed-use with water-related retail and restaurants and office buildins, provide incentives for shoreline use development