

## PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS AND URBAN CORRIDORS

### Summary:

- OPC's 'Urban Neighborhoods' goals and policies were incorporated into the Future Land Use map (FLU.)  
(The FLU recommended by OPC and staff has a different format than the FLU in the existing, adopted Comp Plan. For more information about this recommendation, see the [Final Environmental Impact Statement](#), page 103.)
- The Urban Corridor (UC) land use designation is now defined by three categories:
  - Removed category (from July Draft) that applied to ¼ mile along Capitol Boulevard south of I-5 (this area now designated as Low Density Residential)
  - Areas nearest downtown (Harrison Avenue west to Division, and 4<sup>th</sup>/State east to Martin Way/Pacific Avenue) narrowed from ½ mile wide to various widths consistent with underlying High Density Corridor zoning (for an average ½-block width from arterials)
  - Areas west of Division/Black Lake Blvd to Cooper Point Road, and east of Martin Way/Pacific Avenue intersection to Lilly Road transition from auto-oriented to more walkable, pedestrian-friendly
  - Outer portions west of Cooper Point Road, east of Lilly Road, and south of Pacific Ave primarily accessed by automobiles with more gradual transition from existing suburban character
- Includes policy-level criteria for rezones (especially applies to LDN)
- Low-Density Residential (LDN) designations re-defined to include up to 12 dwelling units/acre (from <8 du/acre).
  - Would allow *potential* rezones from R4-8 to R6-12 without a Comp Plan amendment, *subject to rezone criteria*
- Medium-Density residential Designations (MDN) re-defined to 13 – 24 dwelling units/acre (from 6-24 du/acre).
- Medium density neighborhood centers allowed in low- and medium-density neighborhoods. These centers emerge from a public process.  
(OPC plans to request they examine neighborhood center policy and regulations in more detail in their 2014 work program.)
- New High-Density Neighborhood (HDN) overlay applied to Capital Mall area, Martin Way/Pacific Ave intersection east to Lilly Road, and in the downtown. Greater than 25 dwelling units/acre required for residential and mixed commercial/residential uses.
- Entry/exit "gateways" and "civic boulevards" identified along eight streets, and definitions provided.

### Rationale for the Recommendation:

#### From the December 16, 2013 OPC Staff Report:

"Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known): According to the record, the primary intent of the 'Urban Neighborhoods' proposal was a response to public concern about the impacts of increasing density near or in existing single-family neighborhoods. Specifically, residents of the Carlyon, Wildwood and Governor Stevens neighborhoods (all situated south of I-5 along Capitol Way) provided a large percentage of the total comments to the Planning Commission in regard to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

In summary, these residents expressed:

- Concern that parts of their neighborhood are designated "Urban Corridor (UC)" on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map. Policies

in the draft plan describe the UC as extending about a ¼ mile into neighborhoods from either side of the arterial;

- Concern regarding additional policies that describe the UC as having more intensive land uses within the first 400' from the arterial, including multi-story and commercial buildings.
- Questions about whether this is an appropriate vision for their neighborhoods, or the city-at-large;
- Fear about negative impacts to their neighborhoods, including: loss of historic homes and neighborhood character; impact to wildlife; traffic; and decreased safety.
- Confusion about the minimum and maximum densities allowed in UC, as well as in the R4-8 zone.”

### Land Use Chapter

Date discussed/recommended	Recommended Text	Rationale
Confirmed December 16, 2013 Accepted December 9, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>GL13:</b> Attractive urban corridors of mixed uses are established near specified major streets.	Never really a big topic of discussion <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> <i>-It was agreed that all issues with no recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.</i>
Revised December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PL13.1:</b> Establish urban corridors as shown on the <a href="#">Future Land Use Map</a> with potential employment and residential density to support frequent transit service, encourage pedestrian traffic between businesses, provide a large customer base and minimize auto use for local trips.	<u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> <b>PL13.1:</b> It was moved by Chair Parker, seconded by Commissioner Andresen, to adopt the language of option 2 with the removal of "(over 15 housing units per acre)". The motion passed unanimously. <b>No written record of the rationale for this</b>
Confirmed December 16, 2013 Accepted December 9, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PL 13.2</b> Coordinate urban corridor planning and development regionally to ensure a continuous, consistent and balanced approach to redevelopment, and improvement of these areas and associated public facilities and services.	Never really a big topic of discussion <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> <i>-It was agreed that all issues with no recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.</i>
Confirmed December 16, 2013 Accepted December 9, 2013	<b>PL 13.3</b> Transform urban corridors into areas with excellent transit service; multi-story buildings fronting major streets with street trees, benches and landscaping; parking lots	Never really a big topic of discussion <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> <i>-It was agreed that all issues with no</i>

Initially adopted March 18, 2013	behind buildings; and a compatible mix of residential uses close to commercial uses.	recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.
Confirmed December 16, 2013 Accepted December 9, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PL 13.4:</b> Establish minimum housing densities in urban corridors that provide sufficient density for frequent transit service and to sustain area businesses.	Never really a big topic of discussion <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> -It was agreed that all issues with no recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.
Revised December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PL13.5:</b> Ensure appropriate transitional land uses from high intensity land uses along the arterial streets of the urban corridors to the <del>less intensive land</del> uses adjacent to the corridors; corridor redevelopment should enhance both the corridor and quality of life in adjacent residential neighborhoods.	<u>From the December 16, 2013 Staff Report, Attachment 2:</u> In many cases, the reduced Urban Corridor area along Harrison, State and 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenues does not provide for less intense transitional land uses between the HDC and adjacent single family.  <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> <b>PL13.5:</b> It was moved by Commissioner Horn, seconded by Commissioner Brown, to keep the language of option 1, with the removal of "less intensive land". The motion passed unanimously. Discussion: -Ensure that appropriate transitional land uses remain.
Confirmed December 16, 2013 Accepted December 9, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PL 13.6</b> Focus public intervention and incentives on encouraging housing and walking, biking and transit improvements in the portions of the urban corridors nearest downtown and other areas with substantial potential for redevelopment consistent with this Plan.	Never really a big topic of discussion <u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u> -It was agreed that all issues with no recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.
Revised December 16, 2013	<b>PL13.7</b> Designate different categories of corridors	<u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u>

Initially adopted March 18, 2013

generally as follows:

- Areas nearest downtown along Harrison Avenue east of Division Street and the upper portions of the State Street/Fourth Avenue corridor to the intersection of Martin Way and Pacific Avenue should blend travel modes with priority for pedestrian, bicycle and transit systems. These areas should provide for a mix of low-intensity professional offices, commercial uses and multi-family buildings forming a continuous and pedestrian-oriented edge along the arterial streets. There shall be a 35' height limit if any portion of the building is within 100' from a single family residential zone, provided that the City may establish an additional height bonus for residential development.
- The area along Harrison Avenue west from the vicinity of Division Street to Cooper Point Road -- and the portions of Martin Way and Pacific Avenues from Lilly Road to the intersection of Martin Way and Pacific Avenue -- will transition away from cars being the primary transportation mode to a more walkable environment, where bicycling and transit are also encouraged. Redevelopment of the area will create more density and new buildings that gradually create a continuous street edge and more pedestrian-friendly streetscape.
- The outer portions of the urban corridors west of the vicinity of the Capital Mall and east of Lilly Road will primarily be accessed by motor vehicles with provisions for pedestrian and bicycle travel; gradual transition from existing suburban character is to form continuous pedestrian-friendly streetscapes, but more regulatory

PL13.7: It was moved by Commissioner Bateman, seconded by Chair Parker, to adopt the language of option 2. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.

It was moved by Commissioner Bateman, seconded by Chair Parker to replace the wording in option 2 of "three-story" with "35- feet". The motion passed unanimously.

**Why 35' vs. 3-stories not in the written record**

From the December 16, 2013 Staff Report,

Attachment 2:

*In Option 2, staff proposes edits to the definition provided in the OPC Recommended Draft, for clarity and consistency with the current deliberation map.*

*Original recommendation had 5 bullets:*

*Bullets 1 & 2 expressed essentially the same vision, so they were combined. Proposed height expresses what is consistent with current HDC zoning in these areas.*

*The third bullet was changed to reflect the more pedestrian-oriented vision for these areas.*

*The last bullet describing the area south of I-5 as part of the Urban Corridor was removed per OPC direction on the map.*

	<p>flexibility will be provided to acknowledge the existing suburban nature of these areas (see Capital Mall special area below).</p>	
<p>Revised December 16, 2013</p> <p>Initially adopted March 11, 2013</p>	<p><b><u>OLYMPIA’S NEIGHBORHOODS</u></b></p> <p><b>GOAL 14:</b> Olympia’s neighborhoods provide housing choices that fit the diversity of local income levels and life styles. They are shaped by thorough public planning processes that involve citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials.</p> <p><b>POLICIES:</b></p> <p><b>PL14.1:</b> Establish eight gateways with civic boulevards that are entry/exit pathways along major streets to downtown Olympia and our Capitol.</p> <p><b>PL14.2:</b> High-density Neighborhoods concentrate housing into three designated sites: Downtown Olympia; Pacific/Martin/Lilly Triangle; and the area surrounding Capital Mall. Commercial uses serve high-density neighborhoods and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. High-density neighborhoods are highly walkable. At least one-quarter of the forecasted growth is planned for downtown Olympia.</p>	<p><i><u>From the December 9, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u></i></p> <p>On item L14 replaced the language “continuously” with “thorough”. <i>Removed the word, “continuously” because it seems to imply something beyond the reality of our planning process. For example, most planning processes have points when the record is closed and citizens are not being involved because the City needs time to focus on analyzing the proposal and the public comments and to prepare materials for the next stage of review.</i></p> <p><b>L14.1: It was moved by Chair Parker, seconded by Commissioner Andresen, to adopt the language in Option 2. Vote - Chair Parker and Commissioners Andresen, Bateman, Watts and Brown in favor. Commissioners Bardin and Hoppe opposed, Commissioners Richmond and Horn abstained.</b></p> <p><b><u>PL14.2</u></b></p> <p><b>It was moved by Commissioner Horn, seconded by Commissioner Brown, to adopt the language of option 2 with the removal of the word "West". The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.</b></p> <p><i><u>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC staff report, Attach 2:</u></i> Chair Parker confirmed he thought OPC’s intent was to make these areas more walkable, not to reduce vehicle drive options ... Notes from April reflect OPC intended ¼ of growth <u>could be</u> accommodated and will be encouraged to go downtown, but not that it</p>

	<p><b>PL14.3:</b> Preserve and enhance the character of existing established Low-density Neighborhoods. Disallow medium or high density development in existing Low-density Neighborhood areas except for Neighborhood Centers.</p> <p><b>PL14.4:</b> Allow medium-density Neighborhood Centers in low- and medium-density neighborhoods to include both civic and commercial uses that serve the neighborhood. Neighborhood centers emerge from a neighborhood public process.</p>	<p><i>must be. The Addendum proposed changing "shall" to "is planned for."</i></p> <p><b>PL14.3:</b> <i>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC minutes:</i>  <b>It was moved by Commissioner Horn, seconded by Commissioner Brown, to adopt the language of option 2. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.</b> Discussion:  -Maintaining the original language of "protect and preserve".  -Staff explained the recommended change was made because the original wording could indicate that no change was desirable and so [the change] establishes greater flexibility.  -Intention of the Planning Commission is for the neighborhood to be responsible in determining the look and direction of growth.</p> <p><b>PL14.4:</b> <b>It was moved by Chair Parker, seconded by Commissioner Horn, to adopt the language of option 2 with the addition of the word "medium". The motion passed unanimously.</b>  <i>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC staff report, Attach 2: 14.4: No changes proposed at this time. However, discussion is needed about the vision for these centers.</i>  (OPC has requested to work further on neighborhood center code in their 2014 Work Plan)</p>
<p>Confirmed December 16, 2013</p> <p>Initially adopted March 18, 2013</p>	<p><b>PL16.9:</b> In all residential areas, allow small cottages and townhouses, and one accessory housing unit per home—all subject to siting, design and parking requirements that ensure neighborhood character is maintained.</p>	<p>Never really a big topic of discussion  <i>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</i>  -It was agreed that all issues with no recommendation changes [in the packet] will be accepted.</p>

<p>Revised December 16, 2013</p> <p>Initially Tabled March 18, 2013 for future work</p>	<p><b>Appendix A at end of Land Use &amp; Urban Design Chapter: Low-Density Neighborhoods (LDN).</b> This designation provides for low-density residential development, primarily single-family detached housing and low rise multi-family housing, in densities ranging from twelve units per acre to one unit per five acres depending on environmental sensitivity of the area. Where environmental constraints are significant, to achieve minimum densities extraordinary clustering may be allowed when combined with environmental protection. Barring environmental constraints, densities of at least four units per acre should be achieved. Supportive land uses and other types of housing, including accessory dwelling units, townhomes and small apartment buildings, may be permitted. Specific zoning and densities are to be based on the unique characteristics of each area with special attention to stormwater drainage and aquatic habitat. Medium Density Neighborhoods Centers are allowed within Low-Density Neighborhoods. Clustered development to provide future urbanization opportunities will be required where urban utilities are not readily available.</p> <p><b>Medium-Density Neighborhoods (MDN).</b> This designation provides for townhomes and multi-family residential densities ranging from 13 to 24 units per acre. Specific zoning is to be based on proximity to bus routes and major streets, land use compatibility, and environmental constraints. Specific zoning will include minimum and maximum densities to ensure efficient use of developable land and to ensure provision of an adequate variety of types of housing to serve the community. Higher densities should be located close to major employment or</p>	<p><u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u>  <b>DEFINITION OF LDN: It was moved by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Chair Parker, to retain the language of option 1. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed. Chair Parker moved, seconded by Commissioner Horn to amend the language and substitute the number "12" for the number "14". The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.</b></p> <p><i>There was a lot of discussion about what the minimum and maximum densities should be in the LDN. 1 unit per five acre is current minimum for zoning, and is needed for environmentally sensitive areas, although it currently only applies to a small area. Main topic of conversation was whether to set the max at 8 or 12 units per acre. 8 u/ac would result in a different FLU – with areas currently zoned R6-12 showing as MDN (bright yellow.) Ultimately, it was decided to set the cap at 12 u/ac. This means there is potential for rezoning of R4-8 to R6-12 without a Comp Plan amendment (still would require a public hearing/rezone process.) OPC felt this might be appropriate for areas closer to the core - over time – as a way to gradually build density in residential neighborhoods, but perhaps not as appropriate for areas on the fringe. Thus, they established rezone criteria (see below.)</i></p> <p><u>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u>  <b>DEFINITION OF MEDIUM DENSITY</b>  <b>It was moved by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Chair Parker, to adopt the language of option 2 with the replacement of "15 to 30" to "13 to 24"</b></p>
---	---	--

	<p>commercial areas. Clustering may be permitted.</p> <p><b>Urban Corridors.</b> This designation applies to certain areas in the vicinity of major arterial streets. Generally more intense commercial uses and larger structures should be located near the street edge with less intensive uses and smaller structure farther from the street to transition to adjacent designations. Particular 'nodes' or intersections may be more intensely developed. Opportunities to live, work, shop and recreate will be located within walking distance of these areas.</p>	<p><b>units. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.</b></p> <p><i>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</i>  <b>It was moved by Commissioner Bateman, seconded by Chair Parker, to adopt the language of option 2. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed. It was moved by Commissioner Watts, seconded by Commissioner Horn, to remove the language of "1/4 mile". The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <p><i>From the Dec 16 OPC Staff Report:</i>  ... [On October 13, 2013] Commissioner Horn clarified the intent of the previous Urban Neighborhoods proposals ... The intent was <b>not</b> to replace the mixed residential/ commercial land use along the arterials with a purely residential designation, nor was it to render existing commercial uses in those areas non-conforming ... Intent is that the Urban Corridor designation along Harrison, State and Fourth Avenue match underlying High Density Corridor zoning.</p>
December 16, 2013	<p><b>Definition of Gateways:</b> Gateways to Olympia are located at the entry/exit points of the landscaped civic boulevards, at city boundaries, topographical changes, transitions in land use, and shifts in transportation densities. Three of the eight gateways are located at the city limits, and may include, "Welcome to Olympia" signage. Gateways provide a grand entrance into the capitol city of the State of Washington. Gateways are densely planted with trees and native understories; consideration will be given to the maximum landscaping and amenities feasible.</p>	<p><i>From the March 11, 2013 OPC Minutes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trees would create a cohesive theme, while more natural vegetation means landscaping besides green lawn</li> <li>- Intent is to demarcate where low-density areas transition to high-density areas.</li> <li>- Gateways can be viewed as a greenbelt that indicates a more subtle shift than signage would. The proposed locations are governed by topography or where streets intersect. They are</li> </ul>

		<p>intended to draw one into downtown and create a distinction between high-density areas/urban corridors and more suburban, or low-density areas.</p>
<p>Confirmed December 16, 2013  Initial recommendation March 18, 2013</p>	<p><b>Neighborhood Centers.</b> This designation provides for neighborhood-oriented convenience businesses and a small park or other public space. Although the locations shown on the Future Land Use Map are approximate, these centers should be along major streets and generally near areas of higher residential densities. The exact location and mix of uses of the centers in these areas will be established at the time of development approval. In general they should be focused on serving nearby residents, be well integrated with adjacent land uses, and have excellent pedestrian and bicyclist access with minimal car parking.</p>	<p><i>Currently, Neighborhood Centers are anticipated to be small-scale neighborhood commercial centers with a small park or public space. During their 2013 retreat, OPC toured the 17 neighborhood center areas identified on the proposed Future Land Use Map; they preliminarily explored the feasibility of Neighborhood Center criteria listed in the Municipal Code, and identified some potential barriers to implementation. Also, during their Comp Plan deliberations, the OPC recognized that for these centers to be viable, they will need a sufficient enough customer base living within a ½ mile radius. This relates to OPC’s recommended policy: <b>PL14.4:</b> Allow medium-density Neighborhood Centers in low- and medium-density neighborhoods to include both civic and commercial uses that serve the neighborhood. Neighborhood centers emerge from a neighborhood public process.</i></p> <p><i>OPC has requested a 2014 Work Plan item to further review and make recommendations for the neighborhood center Code. If approved by Council, they will kick off this work with a briefing and discussion at the joint OPC/Coalition of Neighborhoods meeting on April 14.</i></p>

<p><b>Civic Boulevard Definition:</b> December 16, 2013</p>	<p><b>Civic Boulevards:</b> Each civic boulevard will have a distinct special environmental setting that is shaped by a public planning process that involves citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials. Civic Boulevards are densely planted with trees and native understories; consideration will be given to the maximum landscaping and amenities feasible.</p>	<p><u>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC Staff Report, Attachment 2:</u>  <i>OPC previously clarified the term “civic boulevards was to be interpreted in a general or generic sense and did not mandate the creation of medians or other specific design features. The use of the words “tree lined” was agreed to be illustrative of an intended ambiance. [There is <u>no</u> intention of requiring the City to purchase additional right-of-way to support tree growth.]</i></p> <p><u>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Giving communities more freedom to determine the type of landscaping.</li> <li>-Element of public input</li> <li>-Street trees are recommended for certain characteristics considering growth, maintenance, etc.</li> </ul>
<p>December 16, 2013</p>	<p><b>High-density Neighborhoods (Overlay):</b> High-density Neighborhoods are multi-family residential, commercial and mixed use neighborhoods with densities of at least 25 dwelling units per acre. Specific zoning may provide for densities higher than 25 units per acre. The height in these neighborhoods will be determined by zoning and based on the "Height and View Protection Goals and Policies."</p>	<p><u>From February 11, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intent is to create high density neighborhoods in three designated areas [as listed]. This will encourage and direct growth to those areas and limit it elsewhere.</li> <li>- Result would be beneficial environmentally and revitalizing for downtown. Denser areas would be designed and developed “green cities.”\</li> <li>- Don’t focus higher densities along the connections between focus areas, where there are existing low-density neighborhoods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Chair Parker moved, seconded by Commissioner Andresen, to specify the intent in language of "single use residential, single use commercial or mixed use". The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Brown moved, seconded by Chair Parker to change the number "30" with "at least</b></p>

		<p><b>25". The motion passed unanimously.</b>  <u>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC Minutes:</u>          -Specifying the intention so commercial developers do not find the barrier too great to create residential.  <i>(Intent is that individual developments in the HDN can be exclusively commercial, exclusively residential or mixed residential.)</i>  <u>From the Dec 16, 2013 OPC staff report, Attach 2:</u>          A question has arisen about what it means for the High Density Neighborhood areas to be considered "an overlay" rather than a formal land use designation ... The land use designations shown on the Future Land Use map and defined in the Land Use chapter show approximate locations of various residential, commercial, industrial and mixed use land uses in the city and its growth area. (This map provides guidance for establishing zoning and other regulations and ensures land use and development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.) ... An overlay area on a map depicts a specific area where additional criteria for regulations or incentives will apply.</p>
<p>Revised December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013</p>	<p><b><u>Future Land Use Designations Table:</u></b>  <b>Low-density Neighborhoods (LDN) <i>(name change)</i></b>  <b>Density: Up to 12 units per acre</b>   <b>Medium-density Neighborhoods (MDN) <i>(name change)</i></b>  <b>Density: 13 to 24 units per acre</b>   <i>(OPC did not make specific recommendations about building heights in these areas, nor act to remove approximate heights from the table. A note in the table includes that the number of stories included in the table are</i></p>	

	<i>"approximate size of the taller buildings anticipated in each category. Specific height or stories limits should be established by development regulations.")</i>	
December 16, 2013	<p>Proposed rezones shall meet all of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistency with the applicable land use designation description in the comprehensive plan.</li> <li>2. Will clearly implement applicable policies in all elements of the comprehensive plan. If there are clear inconsistencies between the proposed rezone and specific, applicable policies in the comprehensive plan, the rezone should not be approved.</li> <li>3. Consistency with the applicable general and specific purpose statements in Title 18 of the OMC.</li> <li>4. The proposed zoning shall be identical to an existing zoning district that is adjacent to the subject property. The proposed zoning may also be approved if it clearly fulfills the specific purpose statement of an adjacent zoning district that is not identical.</li> <li>5. Clear evidence that the maximum density of development permitted in the proposed zoning district can be adequately served by infrastructure systems as described in the city's adopted master plans for sanitary sewer, potable water, transportation, parks and recreation, stormwater and public safety services; and in the applicable facilities and services plans of the Olympia School District, Intercity Transit, and other required public service providers.</li> </ol>	<i>This criteria was drafted by staff for OPC discussion, however there was not enough time for OPC to fully consider it. The main intent was to establish criteria to limit rezone opportunities in the LDN – to ensure higher density growth is focused in core areas rather than randomly throughout or at the fringes of the city.</i>
<b>Transportation Chapter</b>		
Revised December 16, 2013	<b>GT 14:</b> The Urban Corridors of Martin Way, Pacific Avenue, east 4th and State Avenues, portions of Harrison Avenue,	<i>From the December 16, 2013 OPC Minutes: It was moved by Commissioner Horn, seconded by</i>

Initially adopted March 18, 2013	Black Lake Boulevard and Cooper Point Road are vibrant mixed-use areas where a large portion of trips are made by walking, biking and transit.	<b>Commissioner Andresen, to adopt the language of option 2. The motion passed 6 to 1. Vice Chair Bardin opposed.</b> Points raised: -"Capital Way/Boulevard" is part of the May addendum and clearly defines transportation corridors. -A continuous wall of buildings that front the street is undesirable. -The critical importance of planning for walkability.
Confirmed December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 11, 2013	<b>PT14.1:</b> Retrofit City streets in Urban Corridors to City Street Standards to attract new development and increase densities.	Never really a big topic of discussion
Confirmed December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PT14.2</b> Request the State of Washington include Urban Corridors in the State's preferred leasing area, so that state buildings are easily accessible by walking, biking and frequent transit.	Never really a big topic of discussion
Confirmed December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 18, 2013	<b>PT14.3:</b> Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit and support the City's transportation-efficient land use goals.	Never really a big topic of discussion
Revised December 16, 2013  Initially adopted March 11, 2013	<b>PT 14.4:</b> Partner with the cities of Lacey and Tumwater to pursue the coordinated transportation and land use objectives identified for the urban corridors of Martin Way,	<i>Revised to remove the portion of Capitol Way south of I-5 from the Urban Corridor</i>

	east 4th and State Avenues and Pacific Avenue.	
--	--	--