



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 19, 2013

6:30 PM

Room 207

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Chair Jerome Parker, Vice Chair Judy Bardin, Commissioner Max Brown, Commissioner Roger Horn, and Commissioner Carole Richmond

Absent: 4 - Commissioner Kim Andresen, Commissioner Jessica Bateman, Commissioner Darrell Hoppe, and Commissioner Missy Watts

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Associate Planner Amy Buckler announced the Commission should meet by the front doors at 9:00 AM on Saturday, August 24 for their annual retreat/tour. Coffee will be available.

Commissioner Horn asked if the December 2nd meeting could be moved to December 9th due to the preceding Thanksgiving holiday. The Commission agreed.

5. INFORMATION REQUESTS - None

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

[13-0601](#) Discussion: What Makes a Great Neighborhood Center?

Community Planning & Development Director Keith Stahley gave a presentation with photographs of 'great neighborhood centers.' Examples included Alrich's Market in Port Townsend; Huntington Beach, California; Crystal Springs Neighborhood in Roanoke, Virginia; Grandin Neighborhood Center in Roanoke; Fairhaven in Bellingham, Washington; Nelson's Market in Bellingham; Town Center in Burien, Washington; Freemont in Portland, Oregon; Belmont in Portland; Midvile Plaza Shopping Center in Madison, Wisconsin; Hyde Park Historic District in Boise, Idaho; Vermillion in Huntersville, North Carolina; Delridge Branch Library in Seattle, Washington; Newport Avenue in Bend, Oregon. The examples

include planned neighborhood centers, as well as older, redeveloped centers.

Common elements include: close to residential development; walkable; mixed use; proximity to street; bike parking; small commercial node that is detached from the commercial core and serves local neighborhoods; historic districts. Popular uses include: coffee shops, restaurants, retail, ice cream parlors, and libraries.

Commission Discussion:

- There is information about population around the 17 designated neighborhood centers in the retreat packet.
- Most of Mr. Stahley's examples showed 3 or 4 story buildings, which could be a challenge for Olympia.
- Mr. Stamm commented that in the future, the Commission may be asked to make a recommendation regarding the code requirements for neighborhood centers. At the retreat, think about whether the current requirements are viable as compared to the conditions. The City anticipates sub-area planning processes will spur community discussion of neighborhood centers.
- Mr. Stamm commented that the parking requirements for neighborhood centers are relatively the same as in the HDC's, where it is required to be in the back, with some exception. Finding location of vehicle parking in these areas is a real challenge given the limited space.
- Mr. Stahley commented that one of the needs of a form-based code is a public charette process.
- Current requirements require a master plan proposal for neighborhood centers.
- Might be more economical for all parties if developers know what the public wants before putting in a proposal.
- You could have a standard zone that applies to all neighborhood centers.
- 5 of the 17 neighborhood centers are already approved.

The report was received.

[13-0552](#)

Briefing: Proposed development code amendment relating pending change in Olympia's Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to Zoning Map

On August 5, the Commission asked that the two versions of the urban neighborhoods map be distributed for the benefit of new members, prior to making a decision about the public hearing on the zoning map consistent with the future land use map.

- Chair Parker, and Commissioner Horn and Bardin, were uncomfortable moving forward on this item until the Council considers the land use map.
- Ms. Buckler, staff will discuss with Land Use Committee.
- Mr. Stamm commented we may not need to have to adopt the zoning map consistent with the land use map at the same time, but if we don't it will create problems at the development stage.
- There has been discussion between OPC and Council about OPC requesting a 2014 work item revisiting the Urban Neighborhood's proposal as a 2014 work item. OPC will need to request.

- Even if OPC holds public hearing in September, may need to be revised again. Want more direction from Council before holding the public hearing.
- No Commissioners are opposed to the notion of collapsing the land use categories into 14; the issues with moving forward now are that Council hasn't reviewed the OPC recommendation on the Comp Plan yet, and we don't know who will be the hearing body on rezones yet.
- Would be good to get the Urban Neighborhoods revisit on the 2014 OPC work plan, and address it as early as possible (i.e., first meeting in April).
- Commissioner Bardin asked if there a way to shift something else. Mr. Stamm responded it's up to the Council.
- Direction from Council will precede consideration by the Planning Commission.

The report was received.

[13-0555](#) PUBLIC HEARING: Code Amendment to Change Rezone Hearing Body

Hearing Body - Mr. Stamm gave a briefing on a possible code amendment to change the rezone hearing body. Since the current future land use map and zoning maps are mirrored images of each other, any changes to the zoning map also requires a change to the future land use map (a comprehensive plan amendment). Currently, the Municipal Code grants authority to the Planning Commission (OPC) to make recommendations on any Comprehensive Plan amendments, thus standard practice has been for OPC to review zoning changes.

The Code, which was written decades ago, gives authority to the Hearing Examiner to review zoning changes when a Comp Plan amendment is not required. If the Council ultimately decides to change the format of the land use map (as proposed in OPC's recommended Comp Plan), the Commission would not get to review all zoning changes. OPC has asked for a work item to consider changing the code so OPC is always the review body on zoning changes.

The amendment would not apply to village master plans.

The City typically explores 2-3 zoning changes a year. The difference for staff between having OPC vs. Hearing Examiner review zoning changes is minimal.

The Commission is comfortable with September 23rd as the public hearing date for this item.

The public hearing was received.

[13-0556](#) Briefing: Potential Code Amendment for Buffering Single-Family Housing

Buffering SF - at 8:48 p.m.

Mr. Stamm gave a briefing about a proposed code amendment to change the code regarding buffering single family from multi-family through setbacks and step backs, as described in the staff report.

Council adopted an interim code in December 2012. They also changed the code so that it applies to multi-family adjacent to single family USES, not just single family ZONES, which is a change from current code.

Council's interim measure did not apply to General Commercial zones; however the Planning Commission could, since similar circumstances may exist in that zone.

Current height limit in HDC zones is generally 35' if you're within 100' of a residential zone; up to 60 if not; up to 70' with structured parking; and up to 75' if one story is residential.

In the proposal, the step back requirement for "every third" applies to the 3rd story.

In response to questions posed by staff, the Commission agreed to the following:

- Public Hearing date is October 21.
- Notice public as normal (which includes recognized neighborhood associations) plus targeted to all directly affected property owners.
- Make a recommendation on GC and PO/RM, in addition to HDC zones.
- Propose a menu of regulatory options, as opposed to keeping only within Council's interim regulation. There are other options for buffering.

The report was received.

[13-0557](#) **Briefing: Housing Type Mix in Multi-family Housing Projects**

Mr. Stamm briefed the Commission on a proposed code amendment to change the threshold for requiring buffering between single family and multi-family from 10 to 5 acres. This would pertain to RM-18 and parts of the RMU. This would drive the mix up, likely drive density down a bit. So far, the City has not experienced problems with other existing requirements. Does not pertain to the RM-24 zone; if you invoke this clause in that zone, developer can't meet minimum density. Developers don't build this high yet, because the combination of requirements would ultimately require structured parking.

One of the questions before the Commission tonight is do you want staff to notice all potentially affected property owners?

Tentative hearing is December 2nd, but that date has now been moved to December 9th. Staff will need a lot of lead time to build the notice list if it is to go to all potentially affected property owners.

- At the public hearing, staff will provide pictures to help the Commission visualize 5 vs. 10 acres.
- Is there a better option than "5 acres?" The Comprehensive Plan amendment that is moving forward proposes 5. There are lots of current requirements pertaining to "5" acres.
- Request for staff to consider including other zones that this would apply to, including other commercial zones.
- All of our commercial zones allow unlimited residential development. Current buffering

requirements do not apply to these.

- Is there any attempt to do smaller units (800 sq. ft.)? Staff will provide at hearing. The City doesn't regulate unit size, the market does that. Impact fees apply per unit.
- There are no explicit requirements for how townhouses and multi-family relate to each other, other than connectivity requirements.
- Blending is for both aesthetics and mix of housing options (ideally, a mix of incomes.)
- You can't take an apartment building, and create a condo out of it.

The Commission moved to hold the public hearing on December 9, with notice to all affected developers and adjacent property owners.

The report was held and left open.

13-0622

Discussion: Downtown Master Planning Task Force

Chair Parker announced there was a 3-person committee of the Planning Commissioner (OPC) who drafted a revised Option 2 for the Downtown Master Plan Task Force. They also discussed an Option 3, supported by Commissioner Richmond.

- Option 1 is for just OPC to scope this effort. This was the OPC recommendation made in the 2014 OPC Work Plan.
- Option 2, as revised by the OPC committee, is for there to be a task force of various stakeholders, including 2 representatives from OPC. The original Option 2 was discussed by the Land Use & Environment Committee (LUEC) on July 25, but LUEC did not make a formal decision at the time. A handout was provided at the meeting.
- Option 3 is a hybrid of Options 1 and 2, that sets up more of a collaboration of OPC and the other stakeholders.

Councilmember Brown explained how the committee revised Option 2, including having full OPC review the final proposal on November 4 before it goes to the Council; adding some new stakeholders; review of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, rather than 'Imagine Olympia' wordsmithing. The committee expressed frustration about OPC not doing this alone. This would need to be a budget item for 2014.

Give them the freedom to do what they think is best, but needs to be grounded in reality, not passion. Preferred way is for OPC to do this alone, but option with stakeholders is a concession.

Commissioner Bardin recollects from the July 25 LUEC meeting that at least Councilmember Roe expressed concern that this step would not be completed by OPC only.

Councilmember Richmond wonders why the other stakeholders want to be involved in the planning to plan effort, rather than just the process itself. She views this as an effort to be made by 'resource people,' not just people who are interested. This could be done by OPC, with review by other stakeholders. She proposes a phased approach to planning and development, as well as other ideas for the process. She agrees with the stakeholders

identified in Option 2. Planning process, timeline and budget would be the deliverable; followed by the RFQ.

OPC is a recommending body, and City Council will make the final decision.

Commission Discussion:

- What does it mean for OPC to 'be the lead' for this effort?
- OPC could have a subcommittee do this
- How would a process with OPC differ from Jerry's Comments?
- Commissioner Horn likes the idea of the task force; gets more community members involved. Sustainable South Sound may not be a good fit. Suggested that a Councilmember be involved, to keep things on track. Nine may be too many members.
- Committee was looking for an environmental perspective.
- If a Councilmember participated, that may help Council be on board with the recommendation.
- This committee should not get too big. Should be an odd number, with at least 5, but not more than 9.

Mr. Stahley said budget discussions have begun, and it looks like the City will need to cut \$1.6m out of the budget for 2014. Thus, the sooner we have an estimated budget for this work item to present to Council, the better. It will likely be in the range of \$200,000. Generally, the City does not go out with an RFQ before there is a budget. The Scope of Work and RFQ don't necessarily need to be complete before Council budgets the item.

Commissioner Brown, seconded by ?, moved to present to Land Use Committee next Monday Option 2 as further revised as follows: change membership to one Downtown Association member, add a Land Use & Environment member; Sound member to Utility Advisory member; under deliverable, change second; budget to be written with assistance; deliverable should be a statement of work to be covered by the consultant. Ask staff to begin a discussion with Council for an approximate \$200,000 budget allocation for an RFQ. All in favor.

Brown, Richmond amendment to change deliverable to Statement of Work. all in favor.

Horn amendment- revise this and present to LUEC next Monday night. All in favor. Mr. Stahley encouraged Chair Parker to report out on this during report-outs at LUEC.

Commissioner Richmond passed out copies a presentation by George Crandall made to the community in 2011.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[13-0559](#) Approval of June 17, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

[13-0553](#) Approval of July 15, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The minutes were postponed until September 9th.

8. REPORTS

Commissioner Horn reported that the CFP Subcommittee met with staff. Are there any issues from last year that OPC wants to carry over into this year's letter. The Subcommittee will draft the letter during the meetings on August 28 and September 11.

Commissioner Bardin asked for the Subcommittee meetings to be staggered, so they don't occur in same week as a regular Planning Commission meeting. The Subcommittee will discuss moving the September 11 meeting at their next meeting.

Chair Parker announced the Leadership Team discussed the Planning-to-Plan and the agenda for the retreat issue at their meeting on August 16. Things are still up in the air regarding the Downtown Master Plan scoping, since Council hasn't made a formal decision yet.

Commissioner Bardin attended the last Heritage Commission meeting 9:28pm

Commissioner Brown announced the CRA Committee met with the Mayor, but there is nothing to report yet. It is not clear where this is heading.

Commissioner Horn reported that he attended the Downtown Association meeting ... 9:30
They discussed the SMP, CRA, Comp Plan, Downtown Master Plan

9. ADJOURNMENT

Accommodations