



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8447

Meeting Agenda

Land Use & Environment Committee

Thursday, August 28, 2014

5:30 PM

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL

2. CALL TO ORDER

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 3.A [14-0713](#) Approval of June 19, 2014 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

4. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 4.A [14-0829](#) Comprehensive Plan / Action Plan

Attachments: [Performance Measure Criteria Checklist](#)
[Draft Action Plan Performance Measures](#)

- 4.B [14-0814](#) Development Code Amendments for Comprehensive Plan Update Consistency

Attachments: [Specific Code Amendments](#)

- 4.C [14-0820](#) Comprehensive Plan Update - Energy Comments and Issues

- 4.D [14-0733](#) Vacating Street and Alley Right-of-Way

- 4.E [14-0825](#) Status Reports and Updates

5. ADJOURNMENT

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Council Committee meeting, please contact the Council's Secretary at 360.753-8244 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8447

City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Approval of June 19, 2014 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 3.A
File Number:14-0713

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of June 19, 2014 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8447

Meeting Minutes - Draft Land Use & Environment Committee

Thursday, June 19, 2014

5:30 PM

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL

Present: 2 - Chair Steve Langer and Committee Member Julie Hankins

Excused: 1 - Committee Member Jeannine Roe

OTHERS PRESENT

Public Works Director of Water Resources Andy Haub
Planning Commissioner Roger Horn
Community Planning and Development (CP&D) Director Keith Stahley
CP&D Program and Planning Supervisor Karen Kenneson
Public Works Director Rich Hoey
Public Works Project Engineer Diane Utter
Assistant City Manager Jay Burney
Executive Senior Program Specialist Bonnie Herrington
CP&D Associate Planner Stacey Ray

2. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Langer called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 3.A 14-0615** Approval of June 5, 2014 Land Use and Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved.

4. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 4.A 14-0578** Briefing and Discussion about Comprehensive Plan / Action Plan Process

Ms. Ray gave an update on the Action Plan and reviewed the process for identifying performance measures for the Action Plan's five action areas. She discussed considerations critical to identifying effective measures and described measures under consideration by staff.

Ms. Herrington presented examples of graphics currently being developed.

Discussion:

- Poor infrastructure on the Martin Way corridor and addressing problems of economically disadvantaged areas.
- Regulation matches consistent with Comprehensive Plan.
- Current approach being used to measure performance.
- Importance of capturing meaningful statistics.

Mr. Burney answered questions about current projects, plan measurement, and explained measures will be applicable to future projects.

Mr. Stahley discussed how measures will be implemented .

The discussion was completed.

4.B 14-0580 Briefing about Parking Improvements, Lot Upgrades, and Rebranding

Ms. Kenneson gave a briefing on the status of parking improvements made over the past several months, and discussed parking lot upgrades, rebranding efforts, and planned future parking initiatives.

Discussion:

- Dealing with abandoned vehicles and car camping in City parking lots.
- A new discounted eastside zone 9-hour permit which will serve as overflow parking for area agencies and businesses.

The discussion was completed.

4.C 14-0571 Briefing on Recommended Changes to Waste Water Regulations for Onsite Septic

Ms. Utter discussed the 2007 Wastewater Management Plan and described subsequent regulatory changes which place appreciable constraints on repairing existing septic systems and installing new ones. She detailed results of work done by the Thurston County Health Department in 2013 which revealed surface and ground water contamination due to onsite systems in Olympia may be limited to specific locations rather than widespread. She explained potential and limited modifications of current regulations and how ensuring public and environmental health would be maintained.

Mr. Stahley spoke about difficult situations homeowners have faced and efforts to alleviate some of the financial costs when they convert to sewer.

Mr. Hoey acknowledged Ms. Utter and her outstanding research and work.

The Committee supports changing the City's regulations to allow more, but still few, new onsite systems and recommends the following criteria for implementation:

- **Allow on-site systems to be constructed on vacant lots in existing**

neighborhoods with a predominance of septic systems.

- Reduce the requirement to connect to sewer from 300 feet to 200 feet.
- Modify sewer extension requirements.
- Fund a limited number of small-scale sewer extensions through the Wastewater capital facility program to make it more affordable for residents.
- Allow the City to set up payment plans for City General Facility Charges and potentially LOTT Capacity Development Charges.

The recommendation was completed.

4.D 14-0616 Status Reports and Updates

The Committee discussed how to communicate with downtown business owners who are unaware of the Downtown Project.

Mr. Stahley invited Councilmembers to the Planning Commission retreat on June 21, 2014.

Mr. Wilson gave an update on the Downtown Project (DP) and distributed the brochure "Strategic Priority: Champion Downtown" outlining DP goals and opportunities for citizen engagement.

The report was completed.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.



City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Comprehensive Plan / Action Plan

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.A
File Number: 14-0829

Type: report **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Comprehensive Plan / Action Plan

Recommended Action

City Manager Recommendation:

Receive briefing from staff; provide guidance on next steps.

Report

Issue:

Staff has started work on a Draft Action Plan to carry out the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of this agenda item is to provide LUEC members with an update and receive direction as needed on draft performance measures, public participation concepts, and an updated project timeline.

Staff Contact:

Stacey Ray, Associate Planner, 360.753.8046

Presenter(s):

Stacey Ray, Associate Planner, Community Planning and Development

Background and Analysis:

This year Olympia is adopting a new Comprehensive Plan with updated goals and policies that reflect our community's vision. Early in the *Imagine Olympia* process, the City Council identified a vital next step: ensure the goals and policies become reality and have real "on the ground" impact by creating an "Action Plan."

In November 2013, LUEC provided staff with direction to begin work on an Action Plan, and some initial draft concepts were reviewed and approved by the full City Council at their 2013 retreat in January. Staff returned to LUEC in February to introduce the interdepartmental staff team that was formed to develop the Action Plan and receive additional guidance and feedback on a new brand: "*Imagine Olympia | Take Action*".

In April, LUEC provided staff with guidance on public participation and a refined structure for the Action Plan designed around five key Action Areas: Downtown, Neighborhoods, Economy, Environment, and Community. LUEC's direction to staff was to move forward with a comprehensive

and collaborative approach to participation including focus groups, community meetings, and the online platform *Olyspeaks!* Additionally, LUEC approved summaries that characterize each of the five Action Areas and capture the goals and policies from the Comprehensive Plan.

Performance Measures

Since having received direction from LUEC in April, staff has developed a draft set of performance measures for the Action Plan. Performance measures represent a variety of data the City or a community partner will collect to help us better understand the progress we are making in implementing the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

When reviewed on a regular basis, our performance measures will provide valuable information on whether or not the actions in the Action Plan are moving us closer to our goals. If yes, measures can help us share stories of success to attract community momentum, involvement, and energy. If no, we will have the information needed to consider what new or difference actions can be taken to more effectively 'move the needle' on our measures.

Performance Measure Criteria

There is an incredible amount of data available community-wide from which to select performance measures for the Action Plan. To ensure an effective selection process, staff reviewed current best practices in improving organizational performance and sought guidance from the Washington State Department of Commerce Center for Local Government Performance to identify key considerations for developing effective performance measures.

That research led to development of a Performance Measure Criteria Checklist (Attachment A) tailored to Olympia's unique needs. In June, LUEC directed staff to move forward with using the checklist to identify an initial list of potential performance measures. The checklist helped ensure that each potential measure was methodically selected and reviewed against the following criteria:

- **Is the performance measure significant and meaningful?** Does this measure help us determine if we are achieving the goals and policies identified in the Comprehensive Plan, and is the data meaningful for making decisions?
- **Is the performance measure understandable?** Does the measure tell a clear and easy-to-understand story?
- **Can the City or a community partner impact the performance measure?** Does the City or a community partner have a significant enough impact over the measure that we can make a difference in what is reflected by the data?
- **Is the data available long-term?** Can the measure be replicated and maintained by the City if the original owner of the data is no longer available?
- **Are the five 'Action Areas' represented in a balanced way?** Are there any significant Comprehensive goals and policies that are not represented by the list of draft performance measures?

Draft Performance Measures

Using the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and the Performance Measure Criteria Checklist,

staff has identified 24 potential performance measures (Attachment B) to be included in the Draft Action Plan.

Additionally, highlighted for each draft measure in the attached table is which of the twenty Action Area goals the measure demonstrates progress towards achieving. Those linkages are critical to understanding if the measures we select accurately reflect what we aim to accomplish in the Comprehensive Plan.

While staff has included some detail for each measure, they are in draft form with more specificity to be determined. For example, volunteer hours may be measured as a total number of hours or as number of hours per household; which method we will have has not been finalized. Some measures may need further investigation into what data is readily available, what options we have for graphically representing the measure, and what feedback is received from community members.

Next Steps: Performance Measures, Action Items and Public Participation

Staff has already begun identifying draft actions for the Action Plan; the next step after establishing performance measures. The action items are predominantly being drawn from the goals and policies in the Draft Comprehensive Plan currently under review by the City Council, but also from the incredible amount of community input received during *Imagine Olympia*. Other sources for draft actions include existing department work plans, Master Plans, and Council goals.

In addition to identifying draft actions, staff proposes for LUEC's consideration that the next steps in development of the Action Plan include holding a series of focus meetings this fall with key partners, potential partners, and community members. The focus meetings will serve to provide staff and LUEC with targeted feedback on the draft performance measures and draft actions.

Once focus meeting input is collected and integrated into the draft measures and actions, staff proposes returning to LUEC in October to review what was heard and seek further direction on issuing a draft Action Plan in January 2015.

Options:

1. Direct staff to move forward in hosting a series of focus meetings to seek feedback on the draft list of performance measures (Attachment B) and draft action items (to be identified by staff).
2. Direct staff to move forward in hosting a series of focus meetings to seek feedback on the draft list of performance measures with revisions as directed by LUEC and draft action items (to be identified by staff).
3. Direct staff to move forward in hosting a series of focus meetings to seek feedback on a draft list of performance measures; however, return in September to review with LUEC draft actions prior to the focus meetings.
4. Direct staff to not move forward in hosting a series of focus meetings; instead, with direction from LUEC, release a complete draft Action Plan in fall 2014.



Performance Measure Criteria Checklist

Question #1: Is the performance measure significant and meaningful?

- Does this measure link directly to one or more of the 20 desired outcomes?
- Does this measure assist in decision-making (i.e. is it actionable)?
- Is the measure valid? Does the City or community partner output lead to a desired outcome(s)? Ask the '5 Why's,' create a 'Logic Model' or 'So That...' diagram.
- Does the measure represent trends, or potentially isolated or narrow impacts?

Question #2: Is the performance measure understandable?

- Does the measure need further explanation or context?
- Can the measure be described in terms of wanting it to increase or decrease?
- Can it be displayed in an easy to understand way that tells a clear story?

Question #3: Is the data for the performance measure available?

- Can the necessary data be collected in cost-effective manner?
- Is the data available long-term?
- Is the measure a basic measure, composite (index) measure, or a complex measure?
- Could the data collection be replicated by someone other than the originator?

Question #4: Can the City or a community partner impact the performance measure?

- Will the measure provide timely results?
- Can decision-makers, staff, or partners exert some leverage or control over moving the measure in the desired direction (e.g. through actions)?

- Will this measure intentionally or unintentionally promote attention or resources away from other important programs or projects? If yes, is this okay?

Question #5: Are the set of approximately 12 draft performance measures balanced and comprehensive?

- Are the five action areas addressed in a balanced way?
- Are all the “key” topic areas addressed (transportation, public safety, neighborhoods, etc.)?
- Can some measures be applied to multiple action areas?
- Is there a variety of measurement systems represented (examples: measurements for outcomes, cost effectiveness, number of outputs, efficiency, quality, and satisfaction.)?
- Can this list be narrowed to approximately 12 total measures?

DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

NEIGHBORHOODS	Associated Action Area Goals**
Features available for community members to use in City parks (such as shelters, playgrounds, sports courts, and water features)	1B, 3D, 4D
10-minute neighborhoods—Neighborhoods in Olympia that have services residents can walk or bike to within a ½-mile	1B, 1C, 1D, 2B, 2D, 3C
Neighborhood residents involved in City and neighborhood-based activities and events (such as sub-area planning, neighborhood grant projects, and neighborhood block parties)	1A, 2A, 3A
Residents who feel their neighborhood is safe and a desirable place to live	1A, 1B
ENVIRONMENT	Associated Action Area Goals
Waste received at the landfill	2B, 2C
Land preserved as undeveloped for passive or active activities (such as community gardens, wellhead protection areas, wildlife habitat, play structures, sports fields, and neighborhood parks)	2A, 2B, 2C, 2D
Development occurring in areas targeted for it in the Comprehensive Plan (such as downtown and the around Capital Mall)	1C, 1D, 2B, 2D, 5A, 5B
Developed land in the City where the storm-water runoff is currently being treated prior to draining to a stream, lake, or Puget Sound	2B, 2C
Vehicle miles traveled (per capita)	1C, 1D, 2B, 3D, 5A
COMMUNITY	Associated Action Area Goals
Streets that are built to safely accommodate a variety of transportation types (including walking, biking, and taking the bus).	1C, 1D, 2B, 3D
Emergency fire and police response times	1B, 3B, 3C, 4B, 5C
City and community organization volunteer hours	1A, 2A, 2C, 3A,3D,4C
Community member satisfaction with participating in City decision-making	1A, 3A
The range of different housing types available in the City (such as apartments, accessory dwelling units, single-family homes, and senior housing)	1A, 1D, 2D, 3C, 5C

*See page 2 for the Action Area Goals.

ECONOMY	Associated Action Area Goals
City revenue	
Residential property values	1B, 4B
City infrastructure condition rating (including infrastructure like water pipes, sewer pipes and pumps, City roads, and City buildings)	1D, 4B, 5D
Commercial and retail vacancy rates	5A, 5B, 5D, 4D, 4B
Median community member income	3C, 4A, 4B
Creative Vitality Index (a combination of measures representing arts and culture activity in Olympia)	4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 5B, 5D
DOWNTOWN	Associated Action Area Goals
Public and private investment in downtown (such as a new development project or improvements to an existing building or space)	1A, 1D, 4A, 4B, 4D, 5A, 5D
New jobs downtown	1D, 4D, 5A
New residential units downtown	1A, 1B, 1D, 5A
Community members' perception of downtown as a safe and welcoming place to live, work, and spend time	4C, 4D, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D

Action Area Goals:

1. Neighborhoods

- A. The City plans collaboratively with neighborhoods, involving a broad spectrum of community members through a variety of outreach and public engagement methods.
- B. Neighborhoods are recognizable places with unique identities; people feel safe and have a sense of pride in their neighborhood.
- C. Neighborhoods have retail and community services within ten minutes, nearby places to spend time and gather together, and many different options for how to get around.
- D. Development is focused in areas that enhance the community, have the space and infrastructure needed to support it, and that contribute to Olympia's goals for growth and development.

**See page 2 for the Action Area Goals.*

2. Environment

- A. Everyone has the opportunity to experience the natural environment, and to participate and invest in its long-term stewardship.
- B. As a community and as individuals, we make choices that lessen our impacts to the natural environment and reduce our carbon footprint.
- C. We protect and restore natural areas to protect wildlife habitat, maintain or restore natural hydrologic processes, and preserve healthy ecosystems.
- D. Olympia plans for and accepts population growth and denser development, preserving larger expanses of natural areas, such as forest, wetlands, and prairie in the rural area.

3. Community

- A. Community members engage in respectful and productive discussions on city issues; they feel that their opinions and ideas are heard, valued, and have impact on the City's decision-making processes.
- B. Olympia's health, safety and public welfare are protected by predictable and reliable police, fire, and other vital services.
- C. Residents have access to what they need to meet their basic needs, including a quality education, healthy food, a safe place to live, and clean water.
- D. Olympia's neighborhoods and community programs offer opportunities for community members to choose healthy ways in which to live.

4. Economy

- A. Olympia strives for a balance of diverse businesses, investments that support family-wage jobs, and opportunities for entrepreneurship.
- B. Olympia has a stable economy with a strong revenue base that funds city services, healthy schools, social services, and other community goals.
- C. The Olympia community produces and invests in the production of local food, goods, arts, and entertainment.
- D. Olympia is a place that people choose to visit, and spend time and money.

5. Downtown

- A. More people live, work, and shop downtown.
- B. Downtown is a regional destination.
- C. Downtown is safe and welcoming for all.
- D. Downtown's unique character, historic buildings, and waterfront are protected and enhanced.



City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Development Code Amendments for Comprehensive Plan Update Consistency

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.B
File Number:14-0814

Type: report **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Development Code Amendments for Comprehensive Plan Update Consistency

Recommendation

City Manager Recommendation:

Briefing only; no action requested.

Report

Issue:

Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that development regulations be "consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan." Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.040. The City Council is expected to adopt an updated version of Olympia's Comprehensive Plan later this year. In anticipation of that action, the staff proposed and the Planning Commission is reviewing a set of development code amendments to maintain consistency between the regulations and the updated Plan. This briefing is intended to provide the Committee with an overview of that activity in advance of specific amendments being presented to the full Council in the coming months.

Staff Contact:

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department, 360.753.8597

Presenter:

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department

Background and Analysis:

Although GMA requires 'consistency' between the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, the Act does not specify how quickly regulations must be amended when the Plan is revised. The City is seeking to minimize any period of inconsistency between the current regulations and the updated Plan now being considered by the City Council. Thus, as the updated Plan was being reviewed by the Planning Commission, the staff identified regulatory changes that might be needed to maintain such consistency. In 2013 the Council directed that the Commission and staff begin work on those code amendments so that they could be brought before the Council as soon as possible after the updated Plan was adopted.

That effort resulted in potential amendments being classified as either:

- 1) Probably needed for consistency and resulting from relatively noncontroversial amendments to the Plan, i.e., those Plan amendments likely to be approved by Council;
- 2) Probably needed for consistency, but where due to their controversial nature the Council's final decision might differ from the Commission's recommendation; or
- 3) Development regulation amendments not needed for strict consistency, but which may better implement the updated Plan.

For purposes of efficiency, those in the first group have been presented to the Planning Commission for review and public hearings while the Council reviewed the Comprehensive Plan update. Those in the second group are to be scheduled for Planning Commission review as soon as possible after the Council makes a decision on the Plan update. This report focuses on those two groups.

Those in the third group are expected to be prioritized as part of establishing the Planning Commission's and Community Planning and Development Department's 2015 work programs or in the upcoming new 'Action Plan' establishing the City's strategy for implementing the Plan. This third group may include amendments such as new scenic view regulations, a process for providing long-term development approval for campuses such as SPSCC, consolidation and revision of the HDC 1 and 2 zones, and revision of home occupation standards, as well as others being considered.

Near-term Issues

The first two groups include potential amendments of five development regulations:

#	Topic	Summary of Development Regulation Amendment	Related Plan Amendment	Status
1	Mixed Residential Threshold	Require variety of housing types in RM-18 and RMU zones when projects exceed 5 acres -- instead of 10 acres	Land Use & Urban Design Policy 16.12	Commission held hearing and issued recommendation
2	Rezone Criteria	Revised decision criteria to be applied when zoning map amendments proposed	Land Use Introduction - paragraph 10	Commission held hearing and issued recommendation
3	LOTT Rezone	Change zoning of wastewater treatment plant site from Industrial to Urban Waterfront	Change in Future Land Use Map	Commission held hearing and issued recommendation
4	Capitol Campus Rezone	Change zoning of all of Capitol Campus to 'Planned Unit Development'	Change in Future Land Use Map	Commission held hearing and issued recommendation
5	Design Review Areas	Expand Design Review to all commercial projects along public streets	Land Use & Urban Design Policy 6.1	Awaiting Council's Comprehensive Plan action

Schedule

Although a specific schedule has not been established, the staff anticipates scheduling items 1 through 4 above for Council consideration within weeks of the Council taking final action on the

Comprehensive Plan update. In addition, although not needed for consistency with the Plan, the Council will also be presented with the Planning Commission's related-recommendation regarding who - Commission or Hearing Examiner - should review 'rezone' proposals. Item 5 will probably be presented a few months later.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

All of these development code amendments, as well as the related Comprehensive Plan amendments, have been subjects of public interest. Among them, probably the rezone criteria and the scope of design review have received the most attention.

Options:

No action required; provide direction as Committee deems appropriate.

Financial Impact:

All amendments are within scope of existing Community Planning and Development budget.

ATTACHMENT

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

RECOMMENDED BY OLYMPIA PLANNING COMMISSION

August 28, 2014

1. Mixed Residential Threshold

Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 18.04.060.N Large Multifamily Housing Projects

To ensure that large multifamily housing projects provide a transition to adjoining lower density development, multifamily projects shall be subject to the following requirements:

1. Mix of Dwelling Types.

a. In the RM-18 and RMU districts, no more than seventy (70) percent of the total housing units on sites of ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) or more acres shall be of a single dwelling type (e.g., detached single-family units, duplexes, triplexes, multi-story apartment buildings, or townhouses).

....

2. Rezone Criteria

OMC 18.59.050 Decision criteria for rezone requests

The Department shall forward rezone, i.e., zoning map amendment, requests to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation and to the City Council for consideration for review and action. The following criteria will be used to evaluate ~~the~~ 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: [Drafter's note: To avoid confusion, letter labels for the criteria below are based on earlier drafts; finally labelling, etc. would be determined prior to a Council decision.]

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. and

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

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

~~D. The rezone is warranted in order to achieve consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, or because of a need for additional property in the proposed land use district classification, or because the proposed zoning classification is appropriate for reasonable development of the subject property. and~~

~~E. The rezone will not be materially, detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.~~

F. 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.

G. 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.

OMC 18.59.055 Consistency between the zoning map and the future land use map [New code section]

1) Although the Future Land Use map is not specific with regard to the edges of Land Use designations, the zoning map boundaries should not vary more than 200 feet from the land use designation shown on the Future Land Map.

2) Each Neighborhood Retail or Neighborhood Center district, if any, shall be no further than four blocks (approximately 1000 feet) from a Neighborhood Center location indicated on the Future Land Use Map or is at a location proposed pursuant to the Subarea Planning process described in the Comprehensive Plan.

3) Districts on the zoning map shall correspond to categories of the Future Land Use Map in accordance with the following table and be consistent with the purposes of each designation. Only those districts listed below are deemed to be consistent with the corresponding Future Land Use map designation, provided that zoning districts in locations enacted prior to January 1, 2014, may remain.

<u>FUTURE LAND USE MAP DESIGNATION</u>	<u>ZONING DISTRICT(S)</u>
<u>Low Density Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Residential--1 Unit per 5 Acres</u> <u>Residential Low Impact</u> <u>Residential - 4 Units per Acre</u> <u>Residential -- 4 to 8 Units per Acre</u> <u>Residential - 6 to12 Units per Acre (only when adjacent to similar or higher density zoning district)</u>
<u>Medium Density Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Residential Multifamily-- 18 Units per Acre</u> <u>Residential Multifamily-- 24 Units per Acre</u>
<u>Mixed Residential</u>	<u>Mixed Residential 7-13 Units per Acre</u> <u>Mixed Residential 10-18 Units per Acre</u>

<u>Neighborhood Centers</u>	<u>Neighborhood Retail</u> <u>Neighborhood Center District</u>
<u>Residential Mixed Use</u>	<u>Residential Mixed Use</u> <u>Urban Residential</u> <u>Urban Waterfront – Housing</u>
<u>Planned Developments</u>	<u>Planned Unit Developments</u> <u>Neighborhood Village District</u> <u>Community-Oriented Shopping Center</u> <u>Urban Village District</u>
<u>Professional Office & Multi-family Housing</u>	<u>Professional Office / Residential Multi-family</u>
<u>Urban Corridor</u>	<u>High-Density Corridor - 1</u> <u>High-Density Corridor - 2</u> <u>High-Density Corridor – 3 (only within area designated High Density Neighborhood Overlay)</u> <u>High-Density Corridor - 4</u> <u>General Commercial</u> <u>Commercial Services – High Density</u> <u>Manufactured Housing Park</u> <u>Mixed Residential 10 to 18 Units per Acre</u> <u>Residential Multifamily 18 Units per Acre</u> <u>Residential Multifamily 24 Units per Acre</u>
<u>Urban Waterfront</u>	<u>Urban Waterfront</u> <u>Urban Waterfront - Housing</u>
<u>Central Business District</u>	<u>Downtown Business</u>
<u>General Commerce</u>	<u>General Commercial</u> <u>Commercial Services – High Density</u>
<u>Auto Services</u>	<u>Auto Services</u>
<u>Medical Services</u>	<u>Medical Services</u>
<u>Light Industry</u>	<u>Light Industrial / Commercial</u>
<u>Industry</u>	<u>Industrial</u>

Rezoning requests not accepted for review may be resubmitted by the proponent, subject to the timelines contained in this chapter.

3. **LOTT Rezone** – zoning map amendment rezoning site from ‘Industrial’ to ‘Urban Waterfront.’ See map below.



4. **Capitol Campus Rezone** – zoning map amendment rezoning all of Capitol Campus from various zones to ‘Planned Unit Development Capitol Campus;’ detailed map not yet available.

5. **Design Review Areas** – not yet reviewed by Planning Commission, to be scheduled early in 2015.



City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Comprehensive Plan Update - Energy Comments and Issues

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.C
File Number:14-0820

Type: recommendation **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Comprehensive Plan Update - Energy Comments and Issues

Recommendations

City Manager Recommendation:

Move to recommend that Council adopt Energy section of Land Use and Urban Design Chapter as proposed.

Report

Issue:

In reviewing public comments regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan update, the Council concluded that some policies and proposals related to energy should receive further review. The Council referred these issues to its Land Use and Environment Committee for review and discussion. In particular, the Council suggested that policies related to solar access by development and alternatives to fossil fuels should receive attention.

Staff Contact:

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department, 360.753.8597

Presenter(s):

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department

Background and Analysis:

Municipal plans often address local energy production, consumption or conservation, or all three. In the last few decades the energy crises of 1973 and 1979 brought on by reduced oil output, Washington State solar access legislation of 1979, and the Washington Public Power Supply System nuclear-power bond default of 1983, led to further interest in this topic. As a result, by 1988 Olympia's Comprehensive Plan included an Energy chapter. That chapter was readopted with little change in the City's 1994 Comprehensive Plan update responsive to the Growth Management Act. The continuing need to address air pollution issues associated with energy derived from fossil fuels - especially the resulting changes in climate - have led to continued attention on local energy issues.

The 1988 Energy chapter generally described the state of energy issues in Olympia, and made recommendations for various means of addressing them. As a result, the policies of Olympia's

current plan are generally advisory - and focus on potential actions, for example ERG 2.4 reads “The City should conduct energy audits of city buildings, evaluate potential conservation measures, then carryout out those measures that are applicable.”

To achieve a shorter more accessible document three of the style changes incorporated in the Plan now being reviewed by Council were to generally move background information to supporting documents, to remove policies that do not establish a clear policy (such as ‘consider studying’ statements) and to move potential implementing actions to a new ‘Action Plan.’ The result of applying this approach to the Energy chapter was a more concise statement of the City’s plans for energy. Because development was a focus, energy is largely addressed in the expanded Land Use and Urban Design chapter. That ‘energy section’ of the plan begins after policy 1.13 with the heading, “Land Use Patterns and Building Forms Determine Whether Energy is Used Efficiently.”

Parties commenting on this proposed energy section noted that it was much shorter than the current chapter. And they specifically called the Council’s attention to the potential change in the level of City activity described by the policies. Others noted the need to balance energy policies, like solar access, with other public interests such as trees and urban density.

Specific Solar Access Policies

Current policy ERG 5.2 reads, “Olympia shall support efforts to protect solar access in existing structures and to incorporate solar access provisions into new development projects. (a) The City should require all new subdivision to maximize the number of lots with solar access. (b) The City should establish residential height limits and setback standards which maximize solar access. (c) The City should facilitate the recording of solar access easements, in order to guarantee access to sunlight for existing users of solar energy.”

Note that like many of the City’s other current energy policies, ‘a’ through ‘c’ of this one suggest potential implementation alternatives. The City has not taken these actions in the over twenty years since this policy was adopted. Accordingly, the staff proposed and the Planning Commission recommended that the revised versions of these policies not emphasize a potential regulatory approach. Specifically the Plan update being reviewed by Council includes a goal that in Olympia “site designs use energy efficiently.” The related policies read:

- Policy L2.4 **Encourage** buildings and site designs that result in energy efficiency and use of solar and other renewable energy.
- Policy L2.5 **Support** efforts to protect solar access in existing structures and to incorporate solar access provisions into new development projects.

[Emphasis added.] Although ‘support’ may include adopting regulations, unlike ‘require’ it does not directly call for a regulatory approach. At least one comment submitted to the Council directly recommends changing these policies to “**Require** buildings and site designs ...” and “**Require** protection of solar ...”.

Regulatory Options

There have been many efforts by local governments to achieve ‘site designs that use energy

efficiently.’ In discussing this issue, Council members requested more information about viable means of regulating development to achieve solar energy opportunities and access protection, as well as other alternatives to fossil fuel consumption. To-date solar energy has been the most productive alternative energy source within urban areas (small-scale wind, nuclear, and hydropower are some of the other possibilities) most municipal efforts have focused on the solar option, which may be ‘passive’ (heat absorbing) or ‘active’ (energy production) facilities.

Among these have been:

1. Providing flexibility and code exceptions to allow installation of solar energy facilities
2. Removing barriers to solar facility installation, and expediting review and lowering fees
3. Ensuring that such facilities are clearly permitted uses
4. Providing solar access by easement, permit provisions, or development limitations
5. Requiring subdivision and site designs that optimize solar access
6. Requiring that new buildings be ‘solar ready,’ e.g., wired and plumbed for solar energy
7. Requiring solar energy use by new development

Most jurisdictions have focused on ensuring that solar energy facilities are allowed and providing incentives and alternative design options, rather than mandating solar access or energy production. The success of these various types of approaches is still being evaluated by City staff. More information regarding the most successful efforts by other jurisdictions and viable options for Olympia will be presented at the Committee meeting.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Planning for local energy conservation and production has been a topic of continuing public interest. A couple members of the public commented specifically on this topic during the Council’s Comprehensive Plan update review (for example, see Thad Curtz’s comments), while many others referred to the importance of sustainable designs, greenhouse gases, alternative energy, or climate change in general.

Options:

1. Recommend that energy section of Comprehensive Plan be adopted as proposed.
2. Recommend an alternative version of energy section, such changing Policies L 2.4 or L 2.5 or both, as described above.

Financial Impact:

No direct financial impacts; costs of implementation of updated Comprehensive Plan will depend on direction chosen by Council.



City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Vacating Street and Alley Right-of-Way

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.D
File Number: 14-0733

Type: information **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Vacating Street and Alley Right-of-Way

Recommended Action

City Manager Recommendation:

Briefing only; no action required.

Report

Issue:

To provide a briefing on the process to vacate street and alley right-of-way.

Staff Contact:

Fran Eide, P.E., City Engineer, Public Works Engineering, 360.753.8422

Presenter(s):

Fran Eide, P.E., City Engineer, Public Works Engineering, 360.753.8422

Ladd Cluff, P.L.S., City Surveyor, Public Works Engineering, 360.753.8389

Background and Analysis:

Street vacation is a process to remove the public's interest in streets that are no longer needed. A petitioner must complete an application asking the City to consider the request.

Councilmembers have asked for a briefing on current process and procedures.

The following topics will be addressed:

- Application process
- Criteria for approval
- Staff review and evaluation
- Fee structure

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

The intention of the Municipal Code is to ensure that vacating city streets and alleys, or portions thereof, will not have negative effects on private properties or the general public. The process is intended to assure the city's long range transportation and land use goals are met. City streets and alleys are considered community resources and their abandonment through this process should

uphold the public's interest.

Options:

Not applicable at this time.

Financial Impact:

Not applicable at this time.



City of Olympia

Land Use & Environment Committee

Status Reports and Updates

Agenda Date: 8/28/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.E
File Number: 14-0825

Type: report **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Status Reports and Updates

Recommended Action

Receive and discuss status report; provide guidance.

Report

Issue:

Throughout the year, Land Use & Environment Committee receives an oral status report on the Downtown Project and other issues referred to the committee or scheduled on the committee's work plan.

Staff Contact:

Brian Wilson, Downtown Liaison, Community Planning & Development, 360.570.3798

Presenter(s):

Brian Wilson, Downtown Liaison, Community Planning & Development
Keith Stahley, Director, Community Planning & Development

Background and Analysis:

Downtown Project: The Downtown Project is a multi-pronged approach to achieving City Council's goal of creating a safe and welcoming downtown for all. Staff will brief the Land Use and Environment Committee on the latest progress of several projects including Alcohol Impact Area data collection, Artesian Commons programming, and alleyway lighting.

Retreat Report: Councilmembers have agreed to report status of 2014 work plan items and emerging committee issues at the Council's mid-year retreat, Saturday, August 30. The purpose of today's discussion is to develop the report from LUEC.