

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT**  
**of MAJORITY of the OLYMPIA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**to the COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**May 8, 2013**

TO:

Mayor Buxbaum and City Councilmembers:

The purpose of this report by members of the Olympia Planning Commission is to emphasize the current status of the Comprehensive Plan Update's public review process to the City Council and to the people of the City of Olympia.

Judy Bardin

Paul Ingman

Agnieszka Kiswa

James Reddick

Rob Richards

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **I. OVERVIEW**

- 1.1 The Olympia Planning Commission (the Commission) was not able to Review the Entire Comprehensive Plan
- 1.2 The Commission Followed Council's Directives
- 1.3 The Commission has Concerns about Revisions to the 1994 Plan
- 1.4 Documents for Review
- 1.5 Planning Commission did not review Internal Consistency
- 1.6 Extensive Public Comments were Received and Policies Drafted in Response to Comments
- 1.7 The Commission is Available as a Resource to Council
- 1.8 The Commission Would Like to Request a City Code Amendment in Relation to the Future Land Use Map
- 1.9 The Downtown Master Plan is a Priority
- 1.10 The Commission Would Like to Have a Major Role in the Implementation/Action Plan
- 1.11 A Final Word

## **II. PLANNING COMMISSION POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 Urban Green Space
- 2.2 Urban Agriculture
- 2.3 Heights and View Protection
- 2.4 Urban Neighborhoods
- 2.5 Public Participation
- 2.6 Preparedness for Earthquakes and Liquefaction
- 2.7 Sea Level Rise
- 2.8 Vision and Values
- 2.9 Transportation

### **III. APPENDICES**

A - Urban Neighborhoods – Future Land Use Designations and Research

B – Urban Green Space Background

C – Urban Neighborhoods

D – Future Land Use Map

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT**  
**of Majority of the OLYMPIA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**to the COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

May 8, 2013

**I. OVERVIEW~**

**1.1 The Commission Was Not Able to Review the Entire Comprehensive Plan~**

The Commission to the best of its ability fulfilled all the tasks outlined in the procedural document “*Comprehensive Plan Update Recommendations for the Final Deliberation Process*”. They addressed specific areas of the Comprehensive Plan including, Vision and Values, Staff’s Substantive Changes List of 62 items intended to summarize changes from the existing 1994 Comprehensive Plan to the July Draft Comprehensive Plan, Trends and Highlights, high level issues from the broader community and commissioners. On March 18, 2013 the Commission unanimously approved the “*Olympia Planning Commissions Preliminary Recommendations*”. These recommendations included revisions to the Visions and Values, 26 of the 62 items on the Substantive Changes List not sent to the Consent Calendar, and a number of newly drafted Commission policies in response to public comment or identified as a need by the Commission. These recommendations are the *only* policies that the Commission has voted on and approved. The Commission did not review or approve the July Draft in its entirety

**1.2 The Commission Followed Council's Directives~**

The Commission followed the Charter to the best of its ability but was constrained by the limited time period for review. According to the Council’s Charter it was important the Commission’s review process be limited. The review was accomplished in two phases. The first phase consisted of initial meetings that established a review process, obtaining public input and conducting a high level review of topics. The second phase consisted of eight final deliberation meetings (six scheduled meetings and two additional meetings added by the Commission). Additional meetings were not an option for the Commission due budget staffing constraints and the Charter time-frame. The Land Use and Environment Committee Chair emphasized to the Commission that its main task was to evaluate the Substantive Changes List. The Commission was to address public comments only if there was time available to fit in with the March 18<sup>th</sup> deadline. Councilmember Langer indicated that Commission's review was to be high level and anything not addressed by the Commission would be taken up in the future by the Implementation Plan or the neighborhood subarea plans.

### **1.3 The Commission has Concerns about Revisions to the 1994 Plan~**

The 2010 Scope of the Plan Update outlined ten items that were to be addressed in updating the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. The Substantive Changes List was created by Staff to highlight the major changes between the existing and revised plan. The Commission was never directed to review the 1994 Plan or the outcomes of the scope of work. However, in spot checking selected topics in the 1994 plan, it appears that a considerable number of the current plan policies have either been removed or abbreviated. Abbreviated policies were often more concise, but altered the intended purpose, meaning and nuances of the original policy. The 1994 policies were no longer intact, and emerged as a policy shift without public review. For example, the 1994 Plan had an entire Urban Forestry chapter which has been reduced in the draft to six policies. Other 1994 Plan Chapters were deleted, such as “Historic Preservation” “Port” and “Energy”.

The Commission was informed that policies were removed for two reasons, policies are in regulations or policies are better suited for an implementation strategy. There is no crosswalk between the two documents to track what policies are revised, moved or removed. The Commission requested that staff provide a list of policies removed from the 1994 Plan. The list is to clarify the disposition of the removed policies. Without such a list, removed policies suitable for implementation may be lost. A thorough review of the revised documents would ensure that changes to urban issues in the 1994 Plan are accountable. The Commission was neither directed nor had the time to do this.

### **1.4 Documents for Review**

The City Council is scheduled to receive two documents from Staff. One document will be the work of the Commission including new and revised policies and vision and values statements. The second document will be the July draft in a legislative markup form highlighting the Commission revisions. The Commission will not be given a chance to review either document. The signatories of this letter feel it is important that the Council review the Commission’s work separately. It represents the policies the Commission was able to develop or review in the assigned time. Since time was limited, the Commission focused on policies that addressed themes frequently expressed in public comment and/or critical issues identified by the Commission. The section II of this letter contains major policies written by the Commission.

### **1.5 Planning Commission did not review Internal Consistency**

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Plan be internally consistent, yet given the restrictive time frame there was not enough time to ensure that the existing policies in the Staff’s July draft were consistent with the new policies drafted by the Commission.

Moreover, coordination and synthesis of multiple city urban programs did not occur, e.g., the GMA, Community Renewal Area, Shoreline Management Program (SMP),

Comprehensive Plan Update, Downtown Plan, Isthmus sub-area planning, Port of Olympia plans, Capitol Vista Park, State of Washington Capitol Campus, Park plans, and neighborhood plans. This is especially relevant to the City's SMP coming up for final approval. Piece-meal development to manage public policy within 200 feet of the shoreline violates the SMA (RCW 90.58.20).

**1.6 Extensive Public Comments were Received and Policies Drafted in Response to Comments~**

The Planning Commission received extensive written comments from the public, held a hearing and then allocated an hour for continued public comment (hearings) at seven of its winter meetings. Through continued public input the Commission gained a deeper understanding of planning issues of concern to the community. Based largely on this input the Commission identified key topics to address. For each of these topics, the Commission did research, produced extensive background documents and drafted policies. Policies were reviewed and revised in Commission meetings. Revisions were done so they met the approval of members. All policies drafted by the Commission were approved by a super majority of the Commission.

Many urban issues were not addressed.

- Affordable Housing Downtown
- Port Property
- State Capital Campus
- Historical Preservation
- Downtown Plan, Isthmus, and SMP
- Climate Change
- Sea-level Rise (only partially addressed)
- Disaster Protection (only partially addressed)
- Diminished State Work Force

**1.7 The Commission is Available as a Resource to Council~**

Many Commission members feel that the extensive time they spent reviewing and listening to the public and then drafting policies can be useful to the Council as it engages in a similar exercise. At present, the Commission is scheduled to meet with the Council in July, relatively early in your review process. Members would like to offer their assistance as a resource at the time that Council formally reviews these policies.

### **1.8 The Commission Would Like to Request a City Code Amendment in Relation to the Future Land Use Map~**

In the existing 1994 Plan the Future Land Use Map (the MAP), mirrors the zoning map. In the July Draft, the MAP anticipates planned future land uses. The Commission approved the map because it liked the concept that the MAP reflected the intent of future land uses. However in approving the MAP, the Commission had concerns that it would no longer have the opportunity to review rezones. According to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the draft Comprehensive Plan, rezones and other regulatory code amendments for the plan would be heard by the Olympia Hearings Examiner instead of the Commission. The Commission voted and approved a request that the Council consider a City Code Amendment to allow the Commission to continue to hear rezones and other regulatory code amendments. The Commission feels they are the appropriate body to do this work since they are nine members with a broad perspective and chosen to represent the public; whereas, the Hearing Examiner is a single person with a narrow legal perspective.

### **1.9 The Downtown Master Plan is a Priority**

The Commission, as suggested by Staff, decided to take the Downtown Master Plan (Downtown Plan) out of the Comprehensive Plan. The decision was made because it was felt that having the Downtown Plan outside of the Comprehensive Plan would give the community more flexibility to do planning. If the Downtown Plan was left in the Comprehensive Plan, the Downtown Plan would have retained more legal authority, but could only be revised yearly through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. The Commission feels that the downtown planning activities should be started quickly. Additionally, they feel that it is important that a broad community participatory process be established that reaches out to all members of the downtown community and the rest of the city. There are concerns that other community planning efforts such as the Community Renewal Area are starting before the Downtown Plan is developed. There is the need for cohesion between these two and other planning activities.

### **1.10 The Commission Would Like to Have a Major Role in the Implementation/Action Plan**

The Commission was assured that they would have a role in the implementation/action plan. The Commission welcomes the opportunity to work on this plan. Incumbent Commission members bring with them a depth of knowledge of the Comprehensive Plan and the policies the Commission drafted for the plan. New members bring vitality and a different facet of the community perspective. Together we can assist the Council, planning staff, and the community in formulating the implementation plan.  
(See next page)

### **1.11 A Final Word**

The signatories of this report consider their work and the public review process unfinished. They did not have time to vet or approve the entire July Draft Comprehensive Plan. The “Supplemental Majority Report” represents important background information that involves the context for developing the Commission’s policies. The signatories of this report feel it is important that the Commission’s work be viewed as a completely separate document. This report provides most of the major policies that were developed, written and approved by a super-majority of the Commission. Please see sections II and III for policies and supporting documentation.

Members of the Olympia Planning Commission worked very hard on this project as did members of the Olympia Planning Department. While Commission and staff disagreed on points of policy and process on occasion, the Commission is indebted to staff for their professional work and demeanor, their prompt response to requests, and their guidance in helping Commissioners understand the technical issues and legal considerations of the task on the work bench.



## **II. Planning Commission Recommendations**

### **2.1 Urban Green Space**

**GOAL:** Urban green space is available to the public and located through the community and incorporates natural environments into the urban setting, which are easily accessible and viewable so that people can experience nature daily and nearby.

#### **POLICIES:**

**P1:** Provide urban green spaces in which to spend time. Include such elements as trees, garden spaces, variety of vegetation, water features, green walls and roofs and seating.

**P2:** Provide urban green spaces that are in people's immediate vicinity and can be enjoyed or viewed from a variety of perspectives.

**P3:** Establish a maximum distance to urban green space for all community members.

**P4:** Increase the area per capita of urban green space and the tree canopy-to-area ratio within each neighborhood.

**P5:** Establish urban green space between transportation corridors and adjacent areas.

### **2.2 Urban Agriculture**

**GOAL:** Local Thurston County food production is encouraged and supported to increase self-sufficiency, reduce environmental impact, promote health, and the humane treatment of animals, and to support our local economy.

#### **POLICIES:**

**P1:** The City will actively partner with community organizations to provide education and information about the importance of local food systems.

**P2:** The City will encourage home gardens as an alternative to maintaining grass/lawn and other landscaping that is either non-productive for local food systems or not supportive of native ecology.

**P3:** The City will collaborate with community partners to ensure that everyone within Olympia is within biking/walking distance of a place to grow food.

**P4:** The City will encourage for-profit gardening/farming in the community.

**P5:** The City will support local food production with its own purchasing power.

**P6:** The City will allow rooftop food production and consider incentives for providing food-producing greenhouses atop buildings.

**P7:** The City recognizes the value of Open Space and other green spaces as areas of potential food production.

**P8:** The City will partner with community organizations to measure and set goals for increasing local food production, and develop strategies to accomplish these goals.

**P9:** The City will work with other local governments throughout the region to encourage the protection of existing agricultural lands, offer educational opportunities for promotion, and encourage the development of a vibrant local economy.

**P10:** Partner with community organizations to provide education to citizens raising animals for food in the City to ensure protection from predators, and to provide sanitary conditions and humane treatment for these animals.

**P11:** Educate and encourage citizens to purchase from local farms and small producers as an alternative to factory farms that engage in humane treatment of animals.

### **2.3 Heights and View Protection**

**GOAL:** Community views are protected, preserved, and enhanced.

#### **POLICIES:**

**P1:** Implement public processes, including the use of Olympia’s digital simulation software, to identify important landmark views and observations points.

**P2:** Utilize Olympia’s digital simulation software to identify view planes and sightline heights between the landmark view and observation point.

**P3:** Prevent blockage of landmark views by limiting the heights of buildings or structures on the west and east Olympia ridge lines.

**P4:** Height bonuses and incentives shall not interfere with landmark views.

**P5:** Set absolute maximum building heights to preserve views of landmarks from observation points, such as those identified in the following matrix, as determined through public process:

Landmark Views: (Landmark views involve State Capitol Campus, mountains, waterways, and hills.)

- . Black Hills
- . Capitol Lake/ Estuary
- . Deschutes Valley treed hill slopes

- . Mt. Rainer
- . Olympic Mountains
- . Puget Sound
- . State Capitol Campus Promontory

Observation Points: (Observation points are either static or dynamic from: Puget Sound, State Capitol Campus, public parks, public right-of-ways, Olympia Waterfront Route Map, downtown Olympia surrounding community.

- . Puget Sound’s Navigational Channel
- . State Capitol Campus Promontory
- . Parks: West Bay Park, Priest Point Park, North Point, Sunrise Park, Madison Scenic Park, and Percival Landing.
- . Streets: State, 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, Harrison, Deschutes, West Bay, East Bay Drive, 4<sup>th</sup> Ave Bridge, Olympic Ave, Pacific Ave, Martin Ave, Brawne, Foote, and Capitol Way. (Portions of)
- . Washington “W” walkway and bikeway system (Portions of)
- . Downtown: Hands-on Museum, and old/new City Hall

## **2.4 Urban Neighborhoods**

**GOAL:** Olympia’s Neighborhoods provide housing choices that fit the diversity of local income levels and life styles. They are shaped by public planning processes that continuously involve citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials.

### **POLICIES:**

**P1:** Establish eight gateways that are entry/exit pathways along major streets to downtown Olympia and our Capitol. These streets will act as tree-lined civic boulevards that present a unified streetscape that enhances the grandeur of our Capital City.

**P2:** High-density Neighborhoods concentrate housing into a number of designated sites: Downtown Olympia; Pacific/Martin/Lilly Triangle; and West Capital Mall. Commercial uses directly serve High-density Neighborhoods and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. High-density Neighborhoods are primarily walk-dependent. At least one-quarter of the forecasted growth is planned for downtown Olympia.

**P3:** Protect and preserve the existing established Low-density Neighborhoods. Disallow medium or high density development in existing Low-density Neighborhoods except for Neighborhood Centers.

**P4:** Allow Medium-density Neighborhood Centers in Low-density Neighborhoods to include both civic and commercial uses that serve the neighborhood. Neighborhood centers emerge from a neighborhood public process.

**MAP:** “Olympia Planning Commission’s Future Land Use Map – March 11, 2013”  
(See Appendix D)

## **2.5 Public Participation**

**Goal:** Citizens and other key stakeholders feel their opinions and ideas are heard, valued, and used by policy makers, advisory committees, and staff.

**Policy:** Build trust between all segments of the community through collaborative and inclusive decision making.

**Policy:** Replace or complement three-minute, one-way testimony with participation strategies that facilitate rich dialogue between and among interested citizens, other key stakeholders, City Council members, advisory boards, and staff.

**Policy:** Clearly define public participation goals and choose strategies specifically designed to meet those goals.

**Policy:** Evaluate public participation strategies to measure their effectiveness in meeting desired goals.

## **2.6 Public Preparedness and Earthquake Liquefaction**

**PS13.9:** Educate citizens about the possibility, and potential impacts, of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake and actions they can take to prepare for such an event.

**PS13.10:** Address the severe and extended impacts of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake in the City’s emergency response plans and preparations.

**PS13.11:** Continue to gather best available information on the impacts of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake, including the potential magnitude and impacts of vertical movements and tsunamis.

The final Commission approved language for the new goals and policies to the Transportation Chapter is not available electronically for this letters.

## **2.7 Sea Level Rise**

### **Natural Environment Chapter:**

**Goal:** The City has used best available information to devise and implement a sea level rise strategy.

**Policy 1:** Evaluate all options, including retreat, to deal with the impacts of sea level rise in Olympia.

**Policy 2:** Consider different scenarios for varying amounts of sea level rise, and the accompanying adaption and response options for each scenario.

**Policy 3:** Perform a cost-benefit analysis for each adaptation strategy. Consider the physical, environmental and social factors as well as costs in the analysis.

**Policy 4:** Evaluate different financing options for adaption strategies.

**Policy 5:** Use the best available science and the experiences of other municipalities in formulating future plans for sea level rise.

**Policy 6:** Engage the community in a discussion of the different mitigation scenarios and adaptation strategies and response and the cost.

### **Utility Chapter:**

**GU 11:** The City has used best available information to devise and implement a sea level rise strategy.

**PU 11.2:** Coordinate with other key stakeholders, such as downtown businesses, LOTT Clean Water Alliance and the Port of Olympia, environmental and other public interest groups, and downtown residents.

**PU 11.3:** Incorporate flexibility and resiliency into public and private infrastructure in areas predicted to be affected.

**PU 11.4:** Maintain public control of downtown shorelines that may be needed to serve flood management functions.

**PU 11.5:** Engage the community in a discussion of the different mitigation scenarios and adaptation strategies together with the cost.

## **2.8 Vision and Values**

### **INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The City of Olympia’s Comprehensive Plan builds upon our community’s values and our vision for the future. A set of goals and policies provides more detailed direction for the realization of the values and vision. In turn, these serve as the framework upon which City regulations, programs and other plans are formed.

As many as 20,000 additional people are expected to join our community over the next two decades. This Plan is our strategy for maintaining and enhancing our high quality of life and environment while accommodating both the changes since the 1994 Comprehensive Plan was adopted and the changes projected over the next 20 years.

The Comprehensive Plan is not just a plan for City government. Developed out of input from thousands of people in our community at different times over decades, the Comprehensive Plan truly is the community’s plan. Many of the goals and policies listed call for coordination and collaboration among individual citizens, neighborhoods and civic groups, and City government. As always, there will be challenges and change, but the intent is to build on the creativity and strength of our community to shape how we develop.

#### **How to Use this Document**

This Comprehensive Plan is separated into nine chapters:

- Olympia’s Vision;
- Public Participation and Partners;
- Natural Environment;
- Land Use and Urban Design;
- Transportation;
- Utilities;
- Economy;
- Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation;

#### **Public Services.**

There are many issues that connect these chapters. For example, policies related to trees exist in the Natural Environment chapter as well as under Land Use, Transportation, Utilities and even Economy. Likewise, policies related to walk-ability are included under both Land Use and Transportation. If viewing an electronic version, use the ‘search’ function to find all of the policies related to specific topics.

The goals in this Plan are the end states we hope to achieve as a community; some will take longer than others to realize. Policies describe how the City will act in a broad sense to achieve these goals. At times, goals or policies may seem to be in conflict with each other. For example, a goal to increase density may seem to conflict with a goal to

preserve open space. The complex challenges and opportunities we face as a community often require us to strike a balance between different goals and policies to provide the best outcome for the community as a whole. Thus, individual goals and policies should always be considered within the context of the entire Plan.

There may be a period of time after the City Council adopts changes to the Plan before staff, the public and policy makers are able to take action to implement the plan. The City will make every effort to quickly and reasonably develop, review and adopt any new or revised regulations to conform to this Plan.

### **Implementation**

This Update to the Comprehensive Plan does not include specific actions or measurements. A companion document to the Plan is an "action plan" or "implementation strategy" that includes specific timeframes and actions for implementing the Plan. This strategy will establish priorities, set responsibility and determine how we will measure progress toward our goals. This is also an important tool for communicating and tracking what the City and Olympia residents are doing to help our community achieve its vision.

The City looks for partners from all sectors of the community: residents, businesses, developers, non-profits, the faith community, schools, neighborhood associations, other government agencies and organizations to help implement the Comprehensive Plan. Partnerships will help our community work together to realize our common vision.

There are many different types of actions that could be taken to implement this Plan. Some elements in the Plan are implemented through the development code and Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), which, along with other government actions, must be consistent with the Plan under state law. Other elements in the Plan depend heavily or exclusively on community involvement.

### **Context for the Comprehensive Plan**

In the early 1990s, the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) was passed in response to rapid and sprawling growth in many parts of the state that was causing a decrease in quality of life, negative effects on the environment, and increased costs for municipal infrastructure and maintenance. Revision of our Comprehensive Plan was a requirement for Olympia under GMA and Olympia adopted a revised Comprehensive Plan under the Act in 1994.

The Act requires most urban counties and cities in the state to prepare comprehensive plans to address how they will manage expected growth. It directs urban areas, like Olympia, to absorb more of the state's population growth than rural areas, thereby preserving forests, animal habitat, farmland, and other important lands. Focusing growth in urban areas also reduces traffic, pollution, and the costs of providing city services that protect the health, safety and quality of life of citizens.

The Act defines 13 goals, plus a shoreline goal, to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans. These focus on "smart growth" principles that maximize use of

land and existing utilities, protect historic and natural resources, and lower traffic and housing costs. Fortunately, Olympia has been taking this approach for a long time.

Olympia has long understood the merits of planning for the future and had a Comprehensive Plan as early as 1959. In many ways, our earlier plans created the community we have today.

For example, during community outreach for the 1994 plan, citizens expressed a desire for Olympia to become a “City of Trees.” In response, the community developed several goals and policies to guide a new Olympia Urban Forestry Program. Since then, we’ve planted thousands of street trees, and been consistently recognized by the National Arbor Day Foundation as a Tree City USA.

### **A Changing Community**

Since the 1970s, the population and economy of the Puget Sound region have been growing. According to the Thurston County Profile , the county’s population more than doubled between 1980 and 2010. Forecasters expect Olympia’s population and employment will continue to increase over the next 20 years. In 2010, the estimated population of Olympia and its Urban Growth Area was 58,310 residents. Forecasters expect our population will increase to 84,400 by 2035, a rate of approximately 2% per year. A majority of this increase will be due to in-migration. People are attracted to living here because we have a relatively stable economy, a beautiful environment, friendly and safe neighborhoods, good schools and lower living costs than our neighbors to the north. Many of these new residents will work within the current City limits and the unincorporated Urban Growth Area.

### **Olympia and its Urban Growth Boundaries**

In 2012, Olympia’s urban growth area was about 16,000 acres. This includes about 12,000 acres within City limits and 4,000 acres in the unincorporated area, which may eventually be annexed into the City. In cooperation with Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater, Thurston County has established and periodically reviews Urban Growth Areas. In these areas, urban growth is encouraged; outside of them, rural densities and services will be maintained.

Much of the land in the City is already developed, but there is still adequate room to accommodate our expected population and employment growth. This land capacity analysis can be found in the Thurston County Buildable Lands Report.

### **Preserving Our Sense of Place and Connections**

The City embraces our Comprehensive Plan as an opportunity to enhance the things Olympians care about. As we grow and face change, Olympians want to preserve the unique qualities and familiarity of our community. We draw a sense of place from the special features of our city: walk-able neighborhoods, historic buildings, views of the mountains, Capitol and Puget Sound, and our connected social fabric. These features help us identify with our community, enrich us, and make us want to invest here socially, economically and emotionally.



During development of this Plan, many people expressed a desire to maintain a “small town feel.” Olympians want to feel connected to each other and to our built and natural environment. We want to live in a friendly and safe community where we know our neighbors and shopkeepers, and run into friends along the sidewalk. We value harmony with nature, thriving small businesses, places to gather and celebrate, and an inclusive local government.

Olympians expressed that they are willing to accept growth as long as our environment and sense of place is preserved. That means protecting the places and culture that we recognize as “Olympia,” even if those things are a little different for each of us. It also means focusing on our community values and vision as we grow.

### **Key Challenges**

Beyond our community's values and vision are other influences that present both challenges and opportunities. Implementation of this Plan will require creative solutions to:

**Become a More Sustainable City:** The City needs to make investments based on an integrated framework that compares lifecycle costs and benefits of all City investments and to encourage sustainable practices by individuals and organizations through education, technical assistance, and incentives.

**Accommodate Growth:** Increased growth in Olympia is anticipated. Citizens need to integrate the: quantity of new residents, demographics, likely places of residence, housing typology, and prevention of rural and city sprawl. In addition, citizens need to identify housing and service programs for increased populations of seniors and homeless.

**Integrate Shoreline Management Program (SMP):** Special coordination is necessary to integrate the SMP with the Comprehensive Plan. Olympians value ample public space along their marine shoreline and waterways to balance growth downtown.

**Revitalize Our Downtown:** Located on Puget Sound and along the Deschutes River, downtown is the site of many historic buildings and places, and is home to many theaters, galleries, and unique shops as well as the State Capitol. At the same time, Olympia’s downtown has yet to become the walkable, comfortable place the community desires. To add vibrancy while retaining our desired small town feel will require more downtown residents, better amenities, attractive public places, green space, thriving local businesses, and integrated standards for design. public places, green space, thriving local businesses, and integrated standards for design.

**Conserve and Protect Limited Natural Resources:** As we grow, Olympia will become a higher density city and our land and water supplies will need to support more people. We can take advantage of growth as a tool to reshape our community into a more sustainable form; to do so we must balance growth, use our resources wisely and consider the carrying capacity of the land.

**Address Climate Change and Sea-Level Rise:** Sea-level could rise in Olympia by 50 inches or more over the next century due to warming of the oceans and settling land. This will put much of Olympia's downtown at risk of flooding since it lies only one to three feet above the current highest high tides. Over the next 20 years, the City will continue to explore how to address sea-level rise impacts on our downtown.

**Fund a Long-term Vision:** The economy fluctuates and funding circumstances change. This affects our ability to carry-out planned actions over the years. Present resources are already stretched thin, and there is little ability to take on new programs without new revenue sources. We must identify funding strategies, explore operating efficiencies and develop partnerships to provide the diversity and flexibility to fund our vision.

### **For More Information**

The Washington State Growth Management Act establishes rules to guide the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations that shape growth over a 20-year horizon

The Buildable Lands Report prepared for Thurston County by the staff of the Thurston Regional Planning Council helps Olympia to determine the quantity of land to provide for population and employment growth.

The City of Olympia Sustainability web pages have information about what the City is doing to put sustainability into action.

## **COMMUNITY VALUES AND VISION CHAPTER**

### **Community Values**

Through extensive public participation in *Imagine Olympia*, members of the public have expressed the values they wish to see reflected in the Comprehensive Plan. These are distilled for each of the chapters in the Plan.

**Public Participation:** Olympia residents value meaningful, open, respectful, and inclusive dialogue as a shared responsibility to make our community a better place.

**Natural Environment:** Olympia residents value our role as stewards of the water, air, land, vegetation, and animals around us and our responsibility to our children, our children's children, and all life, to restore, protect, and enhance our environmental birthright.

**Land Use:** Olympia residents value accommodating growth without sprawl or excessive reliance on automobiles; neighborhoods with distinct identities; historic buildings and places; a walkable and comfortable downtown; increased urban green space; local production of food; and public spaces for citizens in neighborhoods, downtown, and along shorelines.

**Transportation:** Olympia residents value moving people and goods through the community in a manner that is safe, minimizes environmental impacts, enhances connectivity, conserves energy, and promotes healthy neighborhoods.

**Utilities:** Olympia residents value a water supply under the ownership and control of the City, effective treatment of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge to the Puget Sound, and the role that reuse, reduction and recycling plays in conserving energy and materials.

**Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter:** Olympia residents value the role of parks, open space, and the arts to our physical, spiritual and emotional well-being and to our sense of community.

**Economy:** Olympia residents value our community's businesses as a source of family wage jobs, goods and services and recognize the importance of our quality of life to a healthy economy.

**Public Services:** Olympia residents value protection provided by police, fire, and emergency medical services; code enforcement to maintain neighborhood quality; adequate and affordable housing for all residents; community gathering places and recreational centers.

## **Community Vision Statements**

**Natural Environment:** Recognizing that gifts of nature define in large measure its greatness, Olympia works closely with the surrounding governments to preserve, protect and restore our natural heritage.

A dense tree canopy throughout the City provides aesthetic, health, environmental, and economic benefits. Despite the increased population, Olympia's air and water are cleaner. Seals, sea lions, orcas, and otters roam the waters of southern Puget Sound. Wildlife habitat has been preserved to maintain a biologically healthy diversity of species. As a result, salmon return to the streams where they were born to spawn and to die.

**Land Use and Urban Design:** Pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, livable and affordable neighborhoods, safe and meaningful street life, and high-quality civic architecture have made Olympia a showcase, fulfilling its potential as the capital city of the Evergreen State.

Olympia has collaborated with Tumwater and the Port of Olympia to make our urban waterfront a shared and priceless asset. This shoreline follows the Deschutes River from Tumwater's historic buildings, past Marathon and Heritage parks to Percival Landing and the Port Peninsula.

People walk throughout downtown, shop at its small businesses, enjoy its artistic offerings and gather at its many fine restaurants and meeting places. The historic Capitol

Way boulevard linking the waterfront and downtown to the Capitol Campus invites and attracts residents to enjoy the City's civic space. Plazas, expanded sidewalks, and art in public places have stimulated private investment in residential development, which, in turn, has greatly increased downtown's retail and commercial vitality.

Olympia has established "urban nodes" characterized by higher density and mixed use development, walkability, transit feasibility and lower costs for urban services. Infill projects and remodels help to meet the demands of population growth while creating more walkable communities. Older neighborhoods have been rejuvenated. Historic buildings are valued, preserved and adapted to new uses.

Olympia achieves its development and redevelopment goals through "sub-area planning." These plans determine where and how to increase density, how to retain green space, and how to enhance mobility. They assure safe and convenient access to the goods and services needed in daily life - grocery stores selling local products, schools, neighborhood parks, community gardens and neighborhood gathering places.

**Transportation:** Olympians, young and old, walk and bike to work, school, shopping, and recreation. Bike lanes and sidewalks are found on arterials and collectors throughout the city; all sidewalks and many bike lanes are separated from vehicular traffic by a buffer. Pedestrians and bicyclists also use trails and pathways through open areas, between neighborhoods, and along shorelines.

Sidewalks in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods, including downtown, are filled with walkers who stop at small shops and squares in lively centers near their homes. Trees lining the streets and awnings on storefronts provide comfort and protection for walkers. Nearly all residents are within easy walking distance of a transit stop.

Most people commute to work on foot, bicycle, transit, or carpool. Those who drive to work do so in small vehicles fueled by renewable resources. Comfortable electric buses arrive every ten minutes at bus stops along all major arterials.

Parking lots are located on the edges of downtown, hidden from view by storefronts and office space. Convenient short-term bike parking for visitors/shoppers and long-term bike parking for employees is found onsite or near all developments. Street faces are no longer broken up by surface parking lots.

Variable pricing of street meters and off-street facilities ensure that street spaces are available for downtown shoppers and visitors, while workers who car-commute make use of the peripheral off-street facilities.

Driving lanes throughout town are not excessively wide and streets provide room for bike lanes and parking and slow down traffic. System efficiencies, demand management and intersection improvements allow smooth traffic flow.

Due to slower speeds, frequent safe crossings, and well-managed intersections, deaths and serious injuries from car/pedestrian and car/bicycle collisions have been nearly eliminated.

**Utilities:** Olympia has been able to meet the water needs of an increased population through increased water use efficiency, conservation based rates, and use of reclaimed water. As a result of the improved treatment and reduction of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge, Budd Inlet and our streams support increased aquatic life.

A majority of Olympia households use urban organic compost on their landscapes. Artificial fertilizers no longer contaminate local water bodies. State and national packaging standards, local solid waste incentives, and voluntary citizen actions reduce the volume of materials in Olympia requiring landfill disposal.

**Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation:** Parks and other public open space in every neighborhood play a key role in maintaining our health. The Olympia School District works with the City to allow maximum feasible public use of School District gyms and playgrounds.

The School District, local and state health agencies and the City provide programs to encourage good nutrition and exercise. These programs complement the City regulations to encourage both urban agriculture and markets for sale of local and regional produce.

Olympia has continually expanded and upgraded the bicycle facility network and has witnessed major increases in bike use for both commuting and recreation. The City has provided bike facilities on selected streets where there are high levels of use or potential conflict with motorized traffic.

All neighborhoods have sidewalks on at least one side of major collector streets. This, together with continued pedestrian crossing improvements and neighborhood pathways, use of traffic calming devices and enforcement of traffic laws, contributes to the dramatic increase of walking in Olympia.

The City sponsors and supports music and art events and festivals. These attract widespread involvement of Olympia residents and residents of surrounding communities. The City takes advantage of provisions in state law to fund art throughout the City.

**Economy:** The Olympia economy is stable in relation to the economies of comparable cities throughout the state and region. The City's investment in the downtown has led to many specialty or boutique stores. Regional shopping nodes, such as Capital Mall, provide high-density housing and transit and pedestrian access.

Young entrepreneurs, attracted by the amenities of the City and its open and accepting culture, have created new businesses and helped existing businesses expand.

The increased commercial activity and the number of small start-ups have diversified the job market and the economy, making it less vulnerable to downturns in state government employment.

Continued expansion of small farms at the urban fringe and local food producers provide additional diversity in local employment and reduces the vulnerability of local residents to the rising cost of imported food.

**Public Services:** The City has assured that all residents have achieved their basic housing needs by adopting “affordable” housing program criteria. One consequence has been the virtual disappearance of homelessness. This, in turn, has reduced the cost of City police and social services and has made the downtown more attractive for commercial activity. The City’s diverse housing typology accommodates the needs of young adults, middle class families, and aging populations.

Within each neighborhood, a strong code enforcement program has assured the protection of the distinct identity of all neighborhoods. Code enforcement emerges from citizen and neighborhood involvement

## **2.9 Transportation**

*A number of new transportation policies were adopted by the Commission however it was not possible to easily separate out new policies, from revised or unchanged policies in the July draft. Therefore transportation policies are not listed in this document.*

### III. APPENDICES

#### Appendix A

##### Urban Neighborhoods – Future Land Use Designations and Research

**Low-density Neighborhoods:** Protect and preserve the existing established Low-density Neighborhoods by grandfathering in current zoning limits and will not limit each neighborhood or its streets. Residential density range, which is primarily single-family detached housing and low-rise multi-family housing, is from a minimum of four to fourteen dwelling units per acre. This maintains and safeguards the current zoning which reflects specific qualities associated with each neighborhood. Low-density neighborhoods are shaped by the public planning process that continuously involves citizens, the neighborhood, and city officials. Low-density neighborhoods disallow medium or high density development, except for Neighborhood Centers, but allows for ADU. The maximum height in low-density neighborhoods is 35'-0".

**Low-density Neighborhoods (LDN)**

**Use: Single-family Residential**

**Density: 4 to 14 units per acre, while protecting existing LDN zoning density.**

**Height: 35 foot maximum**

**Medium-density Neighborhoods:** Medium-density Neighborhoods involve multi-family residential densities between 15 to 30 units per acre as determined by the neighborhood public process. Suggested housing land uses including townhouses, small apartment buildings. Clustering may be permitted.

**Medium-density Neighborhoods (MDN)**

**Use: Multi-family Residential**

**Density: 15 to 30 units per acre**

**Height: 35 foot maximum**

**Medium-density Neighborhoods Centers:** Medium-density Neighborhood Centers, that include both civic and commercial uses in the serve of the neighborhood, are allowed in Low-density Neighborhoods. Neighborhood centers emerge from the neighborhood public process where low-density neighborhood centers are proposed. The neighborhood public process will involve all necessary parameters to ensure street improvements, transit access, setbacks, and the level of public need for each center.

Medium-density Neighborhood Centers provide residential, commercial, and civic spaces. Suggested housing includes townhouses, small apartments, and other multi-family buildings. Low-density commercial neighborhood centers will have a maximum 35'-0" height for both low and medium density neighborhoods. [Note: Tumwater

Brewery District, a medium density commercial center, and transit hub could serve as a neighborhood center for southeast Olympia residents.]

**Medium-density Neighborhood Centers (MDNC)**

**Use: Multi-family Residential and limited low-density Commercial**

**Density: 15 to 30 units per acre**

**Height: 35 foot maximum**

**High-density Neighborhoods:** High-density Neighborhoods are Multi-family Residential and Commercial neighborhoods with densities of more than 30 dwelling units per acre. High-density Neighborhoods concentrate housing into a number of designated sites: Downtown Olympia; Pacific/Martin/Lilly Triangle; and West Capital Mall. Commercial uses directly serve the high-density neighborhoods and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. High-density neighborhoods are primarily walk dependent services. The height in this neighborhood would be based on the “Height and View Protection Goals and Policies.

**High-density Neighborhoods (HDN)**

**Use: Multi-family Residential and Commercial**

**Density: > 30 units per acre minimum**

**Height: See Note 1**

**Gateways & Civic Boulevards:** Establish eight gateways that are entry/exit pathways along major streets to downtown Olympia and our Capitol. These major streets act as tree-lined civic boulevards that present a unified streetscape that enhances the grandeur of our Capital City.

Gateways to the Deschutes River Valley are located at entry/exit points and along the green civic boulevards that enter the state capital city of the State of Washington. They are located 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. An option, at the three entrances allow for “Welcome to Olympia” signage. Gateways are densely planted with native trees and under stories that form the transition between distinct land uses and the formal green civic boulevards. Each civic boulevard forms a unique urban space of its own.

## **Urban Gateways and Civic Boulevards**

1. Priest Point Park Gateway: East Bay Drive at City Limits  
Single-family and Multi-family Residential, and Natural
2. Mt. Rainier Gateway: Martin Way and Pacific Intersection  
Corridor Land Uses -Low density Mixed Use in Single-family Residential



3. Interstate Gateway: Henderson and Plum St. Intersection  
Corridor Land Uses -Commercial and Multi-family Residential
4. Watershed Park Gateway: Henderson at North Street  
Corridor Land Uses-Single-family residential, public schools, and natural
5. Capitol Gateway: Capital Boulevard at City Limits  
Corridor Land Uses - Single-family Residential and low-density commercial
6. Deschutes Gateway: Deschutes Park Way at City Limits  
Corridor Land Uses –Natural – Passive Recreation – and Public Use Area
7. Black Hills Gateway: Harrison and Division Intersection  
Corridor Land Uses -Low-density Mixed Use compatible with Single-family Residential
8. Schneider Creek Gateway: Schneider Hill Rd.& West Bay Drive Intersection  
Corridor Land Uses -Multi-family Residential and Commercial

**Note 1:** Delete all heights limitations from staff draft on LU Table 1, except as identified above. Specific height limits shall be established by development codes, which are based on the Comprehensive Plan’s “OPC - Height and View Protection Goals and Policies.”

**Note 2:** Each Civic Boulevard will have a distinct spatial environmental setting that is shaped by the public planning process that continuously involves citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials. Urban Corridors will be primarily accessed by transit and motor vehicles with provisions for pedestrian and bicycle travel. City of Olympia’s consistent theme along all civic boulevards will be “Urban Green Spaces.”

## Appendix B

### Urban Green Space Background

Green space provides a number of benefits including ecological, environmental, health, economic, and social. It is an essential component of the urban environment and will become even more important for people's well-being as Olympia's population increases and the region becomes denser.

**Ecological and Environmental** – Green space provides habitat for a variety of birds, fish and other animals. Trees can remove air pollutants that are prevalent in the urban environment such as particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide. They also sequester the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide<sup>1</sup>. A tree can remove 48 pounds of carbon dioxide a year and sequester a ton of carbon dioxide by the time the tree reaches age 40<sup>2</sup>. The heat island effect is caused by large areas of heat-absorbing surfaces in combination with high energy use. Heat islands are likely to occur as Olympia becomes more urbanized and climate change causes warmer temperatures. Trees provide natural air conditioning; they shade and cool buildings and streets; and they use evapotranspiration (tree sweating) to cool themselves and surrounding areas<sup>3</sup>. Trees also reduce energy costs for buildings, both for heating and cooling. Increased vegetation reduces storm water runoff and improves water quality by filtering water. A mature tree in a year can intercept about 760 gallons of rainwater and cause evapotranspiration of 100 gallons of water<sup>4</sup>. Trees will also help diminish the flooding predicted with climate change. Noise reduction is another benefit of trees. Wide tree belts can reduce noise by 4-8 decibels<sup>5</sup>.

**Health** – Green space has a direct effect on people's health. Studies have shown a relationship between the amount of green space in the living environment and the degree of physical and mental health and longevity<sup>6</sup>. Increased green space has been found to decrease death rates<sup>7</sup>. People living closer to green space have greater levels of physical activity and are less likely to be obese<sup>8</sup>. Fifty percent of Washington's population is either overweight or obese. Having places where people want to exercise will aide people in living healthier life-styles. The public's perception of their general health has been found to be related to the amount of green space in their environment<sup>9</sup>. Views of nature can improve people's health and well-being by providing relief from stress and mental fatigue<sup>10</sup>. Hospital patients have been found to make quicker recoveries and need less pain medications when they have a view of a park compared to patients who only had a view of a wall<sup>11</sup>.

**Economic** – Green space increases property values<sup>12</sup>. Property values are directly related to the distance to green space and the type of green space. People living in multi-unit dwellings value living near an area with green-space while people in houses value living near a park<sup>13</sup>. Businesses are more likely to locate near an area having green or open spaces<sup>14</sup>. Places with urban natural capital tend to attract skilled workers. Having a

skilled work force further enhances the attractiveness of an area for businesses<sup>15</sup>. Places that are beautiful also increase tourism.

**Social Capital** – Urban green spaces provide opportunity for people to gather and interact with family, friends and neighbors. People living near these areas feel a greater sense of cohesion and are more likely to help their neighbors<sup>16</sup>.

References:

- 1 D.J. Nowak, D.E. Crane, J.C. Stevens. (2006) Air pollution removal by urban trees and shrubs in the United States. Elsevier. Urban Forestry and Greening 4:115-123. Accessed 01/24/13 from <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/urban-forests/docs/Air%20pollution%20removal%20by%20urban%20trees%20in%20the%20US.pdf>
- 2 American Forests. Tree Facts. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.americanforests.org/discover-forests/tree-facts/>
3. New York State, Department of Environmental Conservation. Heat Island Effects: The Effect of Trees on Urban Health Islands. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/30344.html>
4. United States Department of Agriculture and the United States Forest Service. (2006). Urban Watershed Forestry Manual, Part 2 Conserving and Planting Trees at Development Sites. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.forestsforwatersheds.org/storage/part2forestrymanual.pdf>
5. Chih-Fang, F., Der-Ling, L. (2005). Guidance for noise reduction provided by tree belts. Elsevier. Landscape and Planning 71:29-34. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://ir.lib.ncut.edu.tw/bitstream/987654321/2473/1/2005-Guidance%20for%20noise%20reduction%20provi>  
<http://ir.lib.ncut.edu.tw/bitstream/987654321/2473/1/2005-Guidance%20for%20noise%20reduction%20provi>
6. Groenengwegen, PP, van den Berg, A. E., de Vries, S., Verheij, R. A. Vitamin G: effects on health, well being, and social safety. BMC 6:149 Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1513565/>
7. Villeneuve, P.J., Jerret, M., Su, J.G., Burnett, R.T., Chen, H. et al.. (2012). A Cohort study relating urban green space with mortality in Ontario, Canada. Environ Res 115:51-58. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22483437>
8. **Toftager M**, Ekholm O, Schipperijn J, Stigsdotter U, Bentsen P, Grønbaek M. et al.. Distance to green space and physical activity: a Danish representative national survey. (2011). J. Phy Act Health 8(6):741-749.
9. Maas J, Verheij RA, Groenewegen PP, de Vries S, Spreeuwenberg P. (2006). Green space, urbanity and health: how strong the relation? J. Epidemiol Community Health 60(7) 587-592. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16790830>
10. Groenewegen, *op. cit.*
11. Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. Science 224(4647): 420-421. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.majorhospitalfoundation.org/pdfs/View%20Through%20a%20Window.pdf>

12. Active Living Research. (2010). The economic benefit of open space, recreational facilities and walkable community design. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://atfiles.org/files/pdf/Economic-Benefits-Active.pdf>

13. University of Aberdeen. (2007). Urban parks, open space and residential property values. Accessed 01/07/13 from <http://www.jrbp.missouristate.edu/rippleeffect/pdf/UrbanParksOpenSpaceandResidentialPropertyValues.pdf>

14. Gensler, Urban Land Institute. (2011). Open space an asset without a champion. Accessed 01/07/13 from [http://www.gensler.com/uploads/documents/Open\\_Space\\_03\\_08\\_2011.pdf](http://www.gensler.com/uploads/documents/Open_Space_03_08_2011.pdf)

15. Roach, R. (2004). Green among the concrete: the benefits of urban natural capital. Accessed 01/107/13 from

<http://biology.duke.edu/wilson/EcoSysServices/papers/GreenAmongtheConcrete.pdf>

16. Roach, *op.cit*, 8.

## Appendix C

### URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS~

#### Introduction

Today, in a decade of global uncertainty, social inequity, and environmental degradation, we have brought into question the conventional wisdom, calling for reassessment of traditional notions of urbanity.<sup>11</sup> The concept of High Density Corridors is one of those notions that compounds issues of urban inequity, “internal city sprawl”, and other multifaceted problems that threaten Olympia: climate change, growth, sea-level rise, and earthquakes. As an alternative, *Green City* models compact and concentrate life’s needs into High Density Neighborhoods (HDN) and replaces the traditional frame and antiquated ‘business as usual’ paradigm formed by the *fossil-based urban modes* that represent: linear spatial configuration of the High Density Corridor (HDC); “...strip commercial ...”; dependency on motorized vehicles; and the dislocation and decentralization of single family neighborhoods.

This proposal summarizes some of the negative impacts, both health and social, that are associated with High-density Corridors and linked to the obsolescence of the fossil-based planning. An alternative in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is the renaissance of a Green City. Although the following briefly outlines a few negative impacts of HDC on Health and Neighborhoods, it does not address many important issues affected: greenhouse gases; energy; mobility; convenience; density; outdoor spaces; images of our state capitol city; social support systems; economic revitalization of downtown; treatment of HD arterials; and affordable housing.

Formal public hearings on the Comprehensive Plan for HDC identified the public’s lack of support for them and the “...contradictions ...”and “...conflicts...” associated with HDC. The purpose is to identify some problems associated with the HDC. The weakness of this proposal is that it does not represent all the HDC problems, and does not represent HDC’s problems in an exhaustive or in depth analysis

Although Olympia has the spatial capacity to accommodate a number of large-scale High Density Neighborhoods, the City of Olympia does not have a single High Density Neighborhood (HDN). To understand the concept and benefits of HDN, the city’s work plan requires time to reveal the countless internal inconsistencies and contradictions of antiquated fossil-based urban model of a HDC.

Urban achievements, similar to Howard’s Garden City, recognized the importance of relatively circular city plans. It established structural, social, and economic parameters of the city. Although urban reform requires physical arrangement, urban life is enhanced

when the physical environment works in harmony with human needs rather than against them.<sup>25</sup>

## **Problem Statement**

On January 12, 2013, the City Council developed work plans for 2013, which revealed that the “Olympia council wants people downtown...”.<sup>2</sup> The City Council wants to find “...ways to promote Olympia and its downtown core to attract visitors, but to make it more inviting to residents again.”<sup>2</sup> At the same time, the Comprehensive Plan demonstrated that the total planned growth over the next 25 years in the downtown is dramatically inadequate to achieve the City Council’s objectives.

First, the total planned growth for the City of Olympia in 2035 is 26,087 people. However, Olympia’s downtown’s total planned growth is less than 4% for the next 25 years. In other words, 24 out of every 25 new residents to Olympia will live anyway but downtown. Further, more than 2 out of every 3 new residents to Olympia within the planned growth are to live near the edges of the city limits, which exasperated urban sprawl, rather than encouraging more centralized growth in the City of Olympia’s downtown urban core.

Second, testimony from formal public hearings verified that neighborhoods oppose the HDC concept.

Third, the total planned growth of the HDC, excluding the HDN, is 251 people or less than one percent of the growth for the next 25 years, while HDC land uses consume almost 1,000 acres. In other words, the HDC for the next 25 years adds 1 new resident for every 4 acres. The HDC appears no more than a Low Density Neighborhood (LDN) that is slated for “... redevelopment...”<sup>5</sup> and commercialization of local neighborhoods,<sup>6</sup> and the displacement and relocation of single family residential neighborhoods.

The following are numerous examples of **health science** and **social science research** that challenge the very foundation and assumptions of locating residential neighborhoods near high-density corridors in any urban community of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## **Impacts of High Density Corridors on “Health”**

Traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) has been linked to a number of adverse health outcomes or risk factors that are associated with chronic disease development. Traffic related air pollution has been linked to cardiovascular (heart disease and stroke) mortality and overall mortality (death). Nitrogen dioxide is a TRAP gas. People with higher exposure to nitrogen dioxide from traffic have been found to have a 26% increase risk of

cardiovascular death and 13% increase risk of death overall<sup>13</sup>. When people exposed to more TRAP were compared to those with less TRAP exposure, those with higher exposure showed markers for atherosclerosis (increased carotid artery intima media thickness (CIMT))<sup>14</sup>. Another study in California supported this finding. The study showed that those living within 300 feet of a highway had much more rapid increases in their CIMT<sup>15</sup>. Other research found, that people living within 200 meters (tenth of a mile) or less of roadway with volumes as low as 20,000-40,000 cars a day had increased C-reactive protein levels and increased pulse-pressure. Both are markers for cardiovascular disease development<sup>16</sup>. A study of over 13,000 middle aged men and women found that those that lived within 300 meters (1/5 mile) of a major road for an extended period of time had an increased risk of coronary heart disease<sup>17</sup>.

The strongest most consistent TRAP health risk has been the exacerbation or development of asthma and respiratory symptoms in children. Multiple studies in different countries have shown this risk. Children that breathe more roadway air pollution at home and at schools are at higher risk of developing asthma<sup>18</sup>. Kids that live at a distance of a tenth of a mile or less of a road having relatively low levels of vehicle traffic have been shown to have a 70% increased risk of experiencing wheezing<sup>19</sup>. A study was done in British Columbia of 38,000 children with varying exposure to air pollution in utero and during their first year of life. The study found that children were at increased odds of developing asthma if they were exposed to air pollution and that children exposed to TRAP had the highest risk of asthma<sup>20</sup>.

Traffic-related air pollution has also been found to increase the odds of pre term (early) births and preeclampsia (a pregnancy complication)<sup>21, 22</sup>. A survey study in Sweden found that people who lived near road traffic noise at 64 decibels and above were more likely to report they had high blood pressure<sup>23</sup>.

A British Canadian study looked at neighborhood design and found that urban areas that are designed-for walking may inadvertently expose their residents to higher levels of TRAP. Additionally, people of lower socio-economic status often have the highest levels of exposure. The authors highlight that their research supports policies for locating residential buildings (especially schools, daycare centers, and assisted living facilities) back from major transportation corridors<sup>24</sup>.

## **Impacts of High Density Corridors on Neighborhoods**

Landmark studies have revealed the impact of HDC physical environments on human behavior. These studies have shown that High Density Corridors cause environmental stress in humans and as well as other outcomes. HDC were associated with less social interaction, street activity, and withdrawal from the physical environment as a result of HDC erosion of environmental quality. Further, research by J.M. Thompson calculated that living within 600 feet of a HDC had implications on people who suffered from a deteriorated environment.<sup>9</sup> Contrasts between HDC and Low Density Neighborhoods (LDN) occurred in age, family composition, and the length of residence. Criteria categories for environmental quality: safety at intersections; traffic hazards;

dissatisfaction with noise; vibrations, fumes and soot; dust; stress; noise; pollution; feeling of anxiety; social interaction; privacy; home territory; and environmental awareness of the physical surroundings.<sup>7</sup>

Most importantly, the research showed that those people in HDC with children would move elsewhere for less stressful environmental neighborhoods if they have the financial ability to do so.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, residents in the HDC had a shorter length of residence than a low density street, which were predominately family streets with many children and longer length of residence which spanned decades. Danger and safety issues associated with HDC were an important consideration for residents. Findings revealed that almost no children lived near the HDC and the housing was generally inhabited by single individuals. Traffic volumes produced different human stresses, need for withdrawal, and undermined the human coping mechanism.

Elder's perceptions of the HDC stressors were revealed by descriptive words, "...unbearable..."; It's "...too much..."; "People have moved because of the noise."; and the "Disgusting amount of litter"<sup>7</sup> HDC noise levels were above 65 decibels for 45 percent of the time. "Noise from the street intrudes into my home."<sup>7</sup> Car noises were relatively constant and produced a steady drone of traffic but the random city buses, and the screeching of brakes at the intersections added unnecessary disruptions. High Density Corridor's traffic volumes were destructive factors in urban life.<sup>8</sup>

Relocation of frail resident's and knowing functional level and wellness profiles for the baseline assessment helps determine an effective process to assure due process and protection of a resident's rights. Transfers are traumatic experiences which are often referred to in the literature base as "transfer trauma". Involuntary removing seniors can lead to increased liability.<sup>1</sup>

Social interaction in LDN showed that children played on the sidewalk and in the streets, while HDC residents kept very much to themselves and held no feelings of community. "It's not a friendly street." and "People are afraid to go into the street ..."<sup>7</sup> The concept of neighborhood as social support systems for families and individuals is loss or at least compromised in the HDC. HDC residents had little or no sidewalk activities while LDN were a lively close-knit community whose residents made full use of their streets. HDC residents sense of personal home territory did not extend into the streets, while LDN resident's showed "territorial expansiveness"<sup>7</sup> into the street which was one of the salient findings of the study. HDC residents experienced withdrawal from the street and lived in the back of their home. In contrast, inhabitants on Low Density Neighborhoods streets had more acquaintances. People (LDN) said, "I feel it's home. ... I don't feel alone."<sup>7</sup> People living in LDN had three times as many friends than those along the HDC who had little social interaction and the contacts across the street were much less frequent.



## REFERENCES:

1. Pastalan, Leon, A., Aging in Place: The Role of Housing and Social Support, New York: The Haworth Press, 1990, p.103)
2. Krotzer, Chelsea, “Olympia Council wants people downtown,” *The Olympian*, January 13, 2013, p.A3.
3. City of Olympia, “Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement,” Department of Community Planning and Development, Olympia, Washington, December 4, 2012, p.126.
4. Ibid., p.127.
5. City of Olympia, “Comprehensive Plan Update – July Draft,” Department of Community Planning and Development, Olympia, Washington, July 10, 2012, p. 39 LU
6. Ibid., p. 43 LU
7. Appleyard, Donald, and Lintell, Mark, “The Environmental Quality of City street: The Residents’ Viewpoint,” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol.38, No. 2, March 1972. pp. 84-101.
8. Ward, Barbara, The Home of Man, New York: Norton and Co., 1976.
9. Thompson, J.M., Motorways in London, London: Andworth and Co., Ltd., 1970
10. Walljasper, Jay, The Great Neighborhood Book, Gabriola Island, B.C.: New Society Publishers, 2007, p.7.
11. Ponce de Leon, Monica, “Letter from the Dean”, *Portico*, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Michigan, Spring 2010, p.1.
13. Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Anderson, Z., Jensen, S. et. al. Traffic air pollution and mortality from cardiovascular disease and all causes: a Danish cohort study. *Environmental Health* 2012 11(60). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ehjournal.net/content/pdf/1476-069X-11-60.pdf>
14. Aguilera, M.F., et. al., Association between long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution and subclinical atherosclerosis: The REGICOR study. *Environmental Health Perspective*, December 2012, Retrieved 02/03/13 from: <http://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/ehp.1205146.pdf>
15. Kunzli, N., Jerrett, M., Garcia-Esteban, R., et.al. Ambient air pollution and the progression of atherosclerosis in adults. *PLoS one*, 2010 5(2). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pone.0009096>
16. Rioux, C.L., Tucker, K.L., Mwamburi, M., et.al. Residential traffic exposure, pulse pressure,

- and c-reactive protein: consistency and contrast among exposure characterization methods. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010, 118(6). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2898857/>
17. Kan, H. Heiss, G., Rose, K.M., et.al. Prospective analysis of traffic exposure as a risk factor for incident coronary heart disease: The Atherosclerosis risk in communities (ARIC ) study. *Environmental health perspectives*, 116(11). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592264/>
18. McConnell, R., Islam, T., Shankardass, K., et.al. Childhood incident asthma and traffic-related air pollution at home and at school. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010, 118(7). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2920902/>
19. Anderson, M., Modig, L., Hedman, L. et. al. Heavy vehicle traffic is related to wheeze among school children: a population-based study in an area with low traffic flows. *Environmental Health* 2011, 10(91). Retrieved 02/03/13 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21995638>
20. Clark, N.A., Demers, P.A., Karr, C.A., et.al. Effects of early life exposure to air pollution and development of childhood asthma. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010 118(2). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2831931/>
21. Wilhelm, M., Ghosh, J., Su J., et.al. Traffic-related air toxics and preterm birth: a population-based case-control study in Los Angeles County, California. *Environmental Health* 2011, 10(89). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21981989>
22. Wu, J., Ren, C., Delfino, R.J., et.al. Association between local traffic-generated air pollution and preeclampsia and preterm delivery in the south coast air basin of California *Environmental Health Perspectives*, June 24, 2009. Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2801174/>
23. Bodin, T. Albin, M. Ardo, J., et.al. Road traffic noise and hypertension: results from a cross-sectional public health survey in southern Sweden. *Environmental Health* 2009 8(3). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19744313>
24. Marshall, J.D, Brauer, M. Frank, L.D. Healthy neighborhoods: walkability and air pollution. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, July 2009. Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2801167/>
25. Johnston, Norman, J., Cities in the Round, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983, p.127.
- 

*“A society grows great when ...(elders) plant trees, whose shade they know they shall never sit in.” Greek Proverb<sup>10</sup>*

## Appendix D

### Future Land Use Map (also as electronic PDF “flum”) \*Note some additional small changes may be made to the FLUM

