

Item A5, Views & Heights

OPC Sponsor: Commissioner Bardin

1. Describe the scope of the topic. (Don't just state, "housing." What are the goal or policy issue(s) regarding housing to be discussed?)

In reviewing public comments on views and heights, I came across an email from Jeffrey Jaksich that very effectively addresses the scope of this topic. I have included a number of excerpts from his email, not his entire email.

"Scenic views were always an intrinsic part of this area, the quality of life, how locals live and enjoy the Olympia area, especially the views up Puget Sound to and from Olympia to the Black Hills from east to west, from west to east to Mt. Rainier, from Olympia, especially from the State Capital Campus up Puget Sound to the Olympic Mountains. The tree lined hill tops and ridges planned by generations of Olympia Planning Commissions and elected officials surrounds south Budd Inlet with fabulous panoramic views. These views and view sheds have become part of Olympia and South Sounds formalized in values, vision, goals, and supporting policies. These are largely reflected in numerous Olympia Comp Plans going back from many decades. A good example of these values and vision are reflected Wilder and White graphic visions and conceptual designs. The strategic vision in Wilder and White Washington State Capital Campus of 1911 Capital Campus design reflect a long held value to not only appreciate the local beauty, but to protect and preserve such views such as Olympia Capital Dome Sight Plain in Olympia Zoning Ordinances, etc."

"The point is to recognize the importance of views to Olympia and the residents of this area of Olympia for hundreds of years and far into our future. We recently recognized in the Olympia Planning Commission in the 1980's and 1990's that views and panoramic views were important to our local Olympia quality of life. We wanted and still want a walkable community with beautiful views that can be enjoyed around the City. This is especially true along the saltwater and other shorelines. This value was formalized in the Wilder and Whites vision and designs in 1911 for the Capital Campus. Olympia was and still is a special place in the mind of most current residents largely because of it special views, like those over the Isthmus".

"People" " have often remarked and continue to make the point about the special view of coming into Olympia from the waters of Puget Sound. This is especially true looking up to the Capital Dome as you come into Olympia by boat from the water."

2. Why does this issue demand attention? (i.e., why the treatment in the July draft is, to the sponsor, inadequate.)

The language in the plan is not specific enough to protect scenic views/vistas/view sheds.

A high profile public process needs to be set-up to make sure all important views are identified and maintained.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft? If so, where? (staff can help)

Substantive change policies

PL6.9: Preserve and enhance water vistas by retaining public rights-of-way that abut or are within one block of water bodies and by not siting public buildings within associated view corridors.

PU6.10: Identify and designate significant public- viewpoints and – with consideration of trees and other enhancing landscaping—protect, preserve and enhance particular views of the Capitol Campus, Budd Inlet, Downtown skyline, Mount Rainier, the Black Hills, Capitol Lake and surrounding treed slopes, and the Olympic Mountains, such as:

- Capitol Group views of the Olympic Mountains
- West Bay Park views of Capitol Group
- Existing West Bay Park views of Olympic Mountains
- Olympic Way sidewalk and Fourth Avenue bridge viewpoint views of the Capitol Group
- Existing Fourth Avenue bridge views of the Olympic Mountains
- Upper Sunrise Park views of Mount Rainier
- Pacific Avenue sidewalk views of Mount Rainier from Boulevard Road to Steele Street
- Priest Point Park views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains
- East Bay Waterfront Park views of Olympic Mountains
- Existing Brawne and Foote intersection view of Budd Inlet
- Upper Madison Scenic Park views of Capitol Campus and downtown
- Capitol Boulevard west sidewalk views of Capitol Lake
- Percival Landing views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains

[Other] policy language in the July Draft:

PR3.3: Preserve and enhance scenic views and significant historic sites within Olympia's park system.

PU 3.3: Protect historic vistas from the Capitol Campus to Budd Inlet and the Olympic Mountains and from Budd Inlet to the Capitol Group.

PU 10.2: Establish maximum building heights that are proportional to streets, retain scenic views and are compatible with adjoining development.

PU 12.5: In the West Bay Drive area provide for a mix of recreation and urban uses that enhance wildlife habitat and cultural resources; limit industrial uses to existing sites; minimize blockage of upland views of Budd Inlet; and connect the area to the south with an urban trail.

PU 14.1: Adopt a Downtown Master Plan addressing – at minimum – housing, public spaces, parking management, rehabilitation and redevelopment, architecture and cultural resources, building skyline and views, and relationships to the Port peninsula and Capitol Campus.

PU 15.5: Designate 'pedestrian streets' where most of the frontage will have 'people-oriented' activities, and street-level buildings will have a high proportion of glass. Prohibit parking lots along these streets, except when preserving scenic views and instead provide for surface parking along other streets.

PU 15.8: Limit building heights to accentuate, and retain selected public views of, the Capitol dome.

- 4. Provide the specific goal or policy language that you propose (or a motion if goal/policy language is not applicable.)**

Heights and View Protection

Goal 7: Establish building height limits to protect, preserve, and enhance treasured public and private views in the capital city of Washington state.

Policies:

PL7.1: Implement public processes to identify important landmark views and observation points. Involve 2013 digital simulation software to verify protection of landmark views.

PL7.2: Utilizes 2013 digital simulation software to identify and maximize view planes and sightline heights which provide the maximum development capacity for downtown between the landmark view and observation point.

PL7.3: Establish the maximum height for state office buildings north of the Legislative Buildings which are below the base of the World War I Memorial.

PL7.4: Provide public landmark views from all west capitol campus's War and Law Enforcement Memorials to Puget Sound and Olympic Mountains.

PL7.5: Prevent buildings or structures 35 feet or more in height above the average grade level above the west and east Olympia valley ridge lines in all directions distracting attention from landmark views.

PL7.6: Delete all height bonuses and incentives in state capital city policies, and all development codes, and require that "height means height". Delete maximum allowable heights from discretion of city staff or private individuals.

P L7.7: Delete "Visual Impact Assessment" analysis and requirements from all development permits.

PL7.8: Prevent interference from night light sources, utility poles, and light standards, radio communication towers, and street signage (public and private) that obstruct or distraction from landmark views.

PL7.9: Develop matrix between scenic Landmark Views and Observation Points.

Landmark Views: (Landmark views involve state Capitol campus, mountains, waterways, and hills.)

Olympic Mountains
Puget Sound
Mt. Rainier
State Capitol Campus Promontory
Olympia Valley's Treed Hill Slopes
Capitol Lake Estuary
Black Hills

Observation Points: (Observations points are either static or dynamic from: Puget Sound, state capitol campus, public parks, public right of ways, "W", downtown Olympia, and the surrounding community.)

Puget Sound's Navigational Channel

State Capitol Campus Promontory

Parks: West Bay Park, Priest Point Park, North Point, Sunrise Park, and Madison Scenic Park, and Percival Landing.

Streets: State, 4th Ave, Harrison, Deschutes, West Bay, East Bay Drive, 4th Ave Bridge, Olympic Ave, Boulevard Road, Pacific Ave, Martin Ave, Brawne, Foote, Capitol Way, (portions)

Washington "W" walkway and bikeway system (portions)

Downtown: Hands-on Museum, and old/new City Hall,

Height and view protection shall provide greater opportunities for the general public to enjoy the scenic qualities of the capital city of Washington state. Protection and enhancement of public and private views of Olympia is an important objective of the Comprehensive Plan.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

In the Land Use and Urban Design chapter

Item A3, Non-Consent Item #11, Substantive Change #30

Carried over from 2/11 HDC Topic, but not part of the Subcommittee's work

Revised Future Land Use Map Amendments (FEIS p. 88 of 145)

OPC Sponsor: Commissioner Horn

1. High-Rise Multifamily category with Heritage Park deleted.

Comment: Change is acceptable. Heritage Park (excluding fountain block) would be included in the Planned Developments designation, along with the Capitol Campus.

2. South Bay Road area proposed to change from Light Industrial to Auto Services.

Comment: We have very limited Light Industrial in the city. With recommended change #8, the only remaining areas currently designated as light industrial in the city would be in the Fones Road area (reduced from size in prior map), the Olympia portion of Mottman Industrial Park, and a small piece along the south side of 101. With recommendation #6, the Port would be the only remaining areas currently designated Industrial. The area on South Bay proposed to change to Auto Services is not large (less than 10 acres). The rationale for the change is that the area is bordered by residential on all sides. Given the limited amount of Light Industrial in the city, I recommend we keep the designation as light industry and have separate designations on the future land use map for Light Industry and Industry rather than lumping them together. If we do make a change, Auto Services may be too limiting. Also, the Auto Services designation (18.06.020(B)(3)) is written specifically to support the regional Auto Mall and doesn't fit the South Bay parcels. If Light Industry does not seem appropriate, General Commerce may be a better choice.

3. Capitol Campus proposed to change from Capitol Campus/Commercial Services High Density (CC/CSHD) to Planned Development.

Comment: Planned Development seems like a reasonable designation for Capitol Campus. Other Planned Development areas include the Courthouse Hill area, Briggs Village, the development on the west edge of the city on Mud Bay/Harrison, Bentrige, an area in the far NE corner of the city, and Trillium. (Note: Since Trillium is now zoned Residential 4 to 8, it may no longer be appropriate for the Planned Development category. Staff will be discussing the issue with Council.)

4. Henderson Park to change from CC/CSHD to General Commerce.

Comment: This is a small area (four lots, seven acres) south of the traffic circle as you exit I-5 coming north at Exit 105. It is just beneath the Wildwood neighborhood. Currently there is an approved binding site plan for a hotel and other uses; there is no application pending at moment. The next step would be for owner to seek building permits consistent with the binding site plan. There is no other development in that area east of I-5.

The proposed map eliminates CC/CSHD as a designation. Given the binding site plan, the designation as General Commerce is probably the best choice. However, note that the site is on former wetlands and, I believe, opposed by the Wildwood neighborhood.

5. Two Professional Office blocks in vicinity of City Justice Center changing to Central Business District.

Comment: These blocks are west of Eastside Street and, therefore, are in the area we define as City Center/Downtown. I recommend we accept the proposed change of designation to Central Business District.

6. LOTT treatment plant changing from Industry to Urban Waterfront.

Comment: This proposal would designate the LOTT plant parcel to Urban Waterfront. I recommend we accept this designation. If LOTT moves, it would be inappropriate to limit the use in that location to industrial.

7. Description of Auto Services added to text.

Comment: I have no objection to the new description (LU chapter, page 42 of 44). However, see discussion in #2 above. The designation would still apply to the Auto Mall even if we don't use it for the South Bay properties.

8. Light Industry designation for area southwest of the intersection at Kaiser Road and Highway 101 changed to General Commercial.

Comment: From the FEIS: "Each area (#1 and #8) is bordered by relatively low density residential uses (with resulting potential for land use conflicts), lacks quality freight access (both are about one mile from the nearest freeway interchange and border streets lacking sidewalks and other improvements, and have relatively high potential for contaminating ground or surface water if accidental spills occur." My concern, again, is reducing further our limited light industrial areas. We have controls to limit spills in areas near wellheads and not all light industry needs close-by freeway access. Currently a small industrial park is located on the site and there is very little residential nearby. I recommend the Commission retain the area as Light Industry unless the environmental concerns expressed by Public Works make LI untenable.

1. Urban Corridor designation: The proposed Future Land Use map defines the Urban Corridor area as one-quarter mile on either side of 4th, State, Harrison, Martin, Pacific, and Capitol Way south of I-5 (Carlyon/Wildwood/Governor Stevens neighborhoods), and the entire Capital Mall area. The prior map did not include the Carlyon, etc. area, the areas north and south of 4th and State, or the areas north and south of Harrison as High Density Corridor (now Urban Corridor). The new map also designates as UC formerly General Commercial areas between Pacific and Martin.

Comment: Increasing the density for this amount of land in Olympia seems excessive. It would change the character of the most historic neighborhoods in the city with the exception of the South Capitol neighborhood. The recommendation on these changes will be provided by the Urban Corridor sub-group.

LIST B PROPOSALS

Topic: #B1, Urban Green Space

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B2, Cluster Subdivision

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B3, Sea Level Rise - Revision to Proposed PN6.5

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 2/11 – Other Natural Disaster topics tabled

Topic: #B4, Downtown Planning

OPC Sponsor: Rob Richards

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B5, Protect and Preserve Olympia's Single-Family Neighborhoods

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B6, Public Participation

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

Proposed new goal and policies to address Peter Guttchen's letter and testimony of 10/29/12: I am recommending this goal go between current goals GP2 and GP3.

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.

Policy: Select strategies from the full spectrum of public participation tools and techniques.

Rationale:

From Peter’s letter: “In Pete’s (Pete Peterson, Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership) experience, public officials only turn to more effective strategies to build trust and engage their communities when all else has failed. When they are simply exhausted and have no other place to turn. I think we’ve reached that point on many issues in our community and we still continue to repeat our mistakes. Yes—effective public engagement requires time and resources. The only thing that requires more is bad public process that ends up polarizing the community and that forces citizens to turn to the courts and the ballot box to get their voices heard.”

The proposed policy above is meant to address Peter’s concern by encouraging the city to utilize more effective processes for engaging with the public. In my view, the budget and SMP roundtables held by Council, testimony by panels followed by Q&A at the Planning Commission’s July public hearings, and the community café discussions held during Imagine Olympia were all superior to the typical public hearing three-minute testimony often used for public input. While I understand that time is a legitimate constraint in many cases, where possible meaningful alternatives should be used.

Non-Consent Item #4 – Public Participation - RECOMMENDATION COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B7, Port of Olympia

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding a chapter on Port of Olympia into the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Port is located inside the city limits, and the relationship of the Port and City has to be described. Tax payers have to benefit from the Port’s activity – as requested during public hearing.

Additionally, please clarify the following City statement: “**Converting the Port Peninsula** (partially into city park - A.K.) **would be inconsistent with the established purpose of a legally established unit of government that is unlikely to be eliminated in the next 20 years.**” Clarify the “established purpose of the Port”. I demand that its purpose is to serve population, for example by providing water taxi, airline connection etc., instead of conducting “the economic development” using tax money for profit.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Lack of clarification contradicts the statement on page 5 of the Comprehensive Plan: “Development (...) does not mean to protect economic development of few.” Currently, our tax dollars support harmful activities of the Port (export of raw material abroad, trucks polluting kindergarten backyard on Plum Street, damage to the roads). It is also alarming that, according to City Council Karen Rogers, the Port is going to take the City to court if Olympia does not cooperate with Port.

It is critical to describe the relationship between the Olympia City/Port in great details to legally protect the City and to be able to take care of this prime piece of real estate inside the city limits.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft? It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide a new chapter on the Port of Olympia in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan? CPU.

Topic: #B8, Affordable Housing

Services for the Public Chapter

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

Adequate and affordable housing is critical to a healthy community. The Growth Management Act directs that planning for housing:

- Encourage affordable housing for all economic segments of the population
- Promote a variety of residential densities and housing types
- Encourage preservation of existing housing stock
- Identify sufficient land for housing, including government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities

The strategies of this chapter depend on well-formulated design standards to promote flexibility and stimulate innovation while preserving and enhancing the character of neighborhoods. We seek to establish and encourage diversity in housing opportunity and link diverse neighborhoods. With a strong foundation in preserving our heritage, our community can incorporate new housing and other developments in a manner that continues our legacy of

well-planned neighborhoods. The housing goals and policies below provide a framework for residential land uses in Olympia's area. The City's related programs for supporting affordable housing are found in the Public Services chapter. An apartment building being added to the City's housing stock.

Many factors contribute to the need for more housing of various types:

- Olympia's growing residential population
- Household incomes vary
- The capitol's legislative session creates a demand for short-term housing
- College students seek affordable housing near transportation corridors and services
- Household sizes are declining
- The proportion of senior citizens is increasing
- **The City should provide annually information to the citizens on affordable housing, family incomes, and market rate housing.**

Olympia is a part of a larger housing market extending throughout Thurston County and beyond. Thus planning for housing is done based on anticipated shares of this larger area. The 2010 Census indicated that Olympia and its urban growth area included almost 26,000 housing units. Of these, as estimated in the TRPC Profile, 57% were single-family homes, 39% were multi-family (shared wall) units, and 4% were manufactured housing. As amended in 2008, the Buildable Lands Report for Thurston County estimates that over 11,000 new housing units will be needed by 2030 to accommodate population growth in the Olympia urban growth area. Of these, about 60% are expected to be single-family homes.

Based on existing zoning and development patterns, that report indicates the area can accommodate almost 15,000 units. In addition to large areas zoned for single-family development, almost 400 acres of vacant multi-family and duplex zoned land is available, and an additional 500 acres of vacant, partially-used, and redevelopable commercial land is also available for new housing. Because Olympia generally allows small group homes and manufactured housing wherever single-family homes are permitted, allows larger group homes by special approval, and does not discriminate with regard to government-assisted housing, foster-care, or low-income housing, the area is expected to be adequate to accommodate all types of housing.

Similarly, the Thurston County Consolidate Plan of 2008 for affordable housing indicates that there is no shortage of land for affordable housing. However, there is a "mismatch" between the availability of affordable housing and the need for such housing, both at the lowest end of the income scale and the upper end of the moderate income bracket. That Plan and the Public Services Chapter describe efforts to close these gaps and make adequate provisions for all economic segments of the community.

To meet this need, the community will use compact growth to preserve space for future residents and reduce costs of providing public services. To ensure a variety of options, the

community will need to allocate sufficient land for a variety of housing including detached homes, duplexes, group homes, small cottages, apartments, special needs housing, manufactured housing, and accessory dwellings. This approach can provide both variety and affordable options. For example, factory-built manufactured housing governed by federal standards and modular housing built to state standards are often less expensive than site-built housing. This Plan provides for these types of units and more luxurious and higher-priced shared-wall housing, including condominiums and townhouses. Housing types and sizes can be blended.

Housing costs in the Olympia area rose rapidly from 1990 until the economic recession of 2008. In general the cost of owner-occupied housing rose more rapidly than income, while rents roughly corresponded to income changes. Those changing costs and availability of land for development, combined with public preferences, resulted in gradual changes in the area's ownership. While county-wide owner-occupancy rose from 65% to 68% between 1990 and 2010, the City of Olympia trended in the opposite direction with owner-occupancy declining from 52% to 50% of all housing units. The type of housing structures being added to the housing stock has varied as a result of similar factors. As a result, multi-family housing county-wide increased gradually from about 16% in 1970 to about 22% by 2010. In the Olympia city limits multi-family structures provided 28% of the housing in 1970, and gradually increased to about 42% by 2010 as most new apartments were being built inside the urban areas.

The following is the proposal from the July Draft. Sponsor's proposes new policy PL13.4 in red.

GL13: The range of housing types and densities are consistent with the community's changing population needs and preferences.

PL13.1 Support increasing housing densities through well-designed, efficient and cost-effective use of buildable land, consistent with environmental constraints and affordability. Use both incentives and regulations such as minimum and maximum density limits to achieve such efficient use.

PL13.2 Adopt zoning that allows a wide variety of compatible housing types and densities.

PL13.3 Encourage 'clustering' of housing to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.

PL13.4 Disperse low and moderate-income and special needs housing throughout the urban area.

PL13.5 Support affordable housing throughout the community by minimizing regulatory review risks, time and costs and removing unnecessary barriers to housing, by permitting small dwelling units accessory to single-family housing, and by allowing a mix of housing types.

PL13.6 Promote home ownership, including by allowing manufactured homes on individual lots, promoting preservation of manufactured home parks and allowing such parks in multi-family and commercial areas, all subject to design standards ensuring compatibility with surrounding housing and land uses.

PL13.7 Allow single-family housing on small lots, but prohibit reduced setbacks abutting conventional lots.

PL13.8 Encourage and provide incentives for residences above businesses.

PL13.9 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.

PL13.10 Require effective, but not unduly costly, building designs and landscaping to blend multi-family housing into neighborhoods.

PL13.11 Require that multi-family structures be located near a collector street with transit, or near an arterial street, or near a neighborhood center, and that they be designed for compatibility with adjacent lower density housing; and be ‘stepped’ to conform with topography.

PL13.12 Require a mix of single-family and multi-family structures in villages, mixed residential density districts, and apartment projects exceeding five acres; and utilize a variety of housing types and setbacks to transition to adjacent single-family areas.

PL13.13 Encourage adapting non-residential buildings for housing

PL13.14 Provide information about what is affordable housing regarding home owning and apartment renting yearly in the City of Olympia. This should include information regarding the a percentage of annual income limit for affordable housing, what the average family average family wages are yearly in the City of Olympia, and what is the annual market rate housing is yearly in the City of Olympia. The implementation (action) should report yearly on how the city is doing regarding there being affordable housing in Olympia.

Staff Note: *Additional goal and policies regarding affordable housing are in the Services for the Public Chapter. See GS3 and related policies (page 3 of the chapter.)*

Topic: #B9, Earthquake Preparedness & Liquefaction

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B10, Index

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding an index to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Definition of index: *“in a nonfiction book, alphabetical listing of places, topics and names along with the numbers of the pages on which they are mentioned or discussed, included in or constituting the back matter.”*

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Clarity of the document is critical. According to the lawyer conducting training for City Planning 2012, it is illegal for jurisdiction to produce documents that are unclear.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide Index and if subjects are scattered thru the whole document - reorganize the content of the main document.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

At the end of the CPU.

Topic: #B11, How many and where will Olympia people live?

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B12, Graphics, Visual Images

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B13, Edits to Transportation Chapter

OPC Sponsors: Roger Horn/Larry Leveen

COMPLETED ON 2/25/13 – WITH SOME PROPOSALS TABLED FOR HDC DISCUSSION

Topic: #B14, Neighborhood Plans

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympia Planning Commission
FROM: Amy L. Tousley, Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Olympia Comprehensive Plan – Neighborhood / Sub-Area Planning

It was my intent to set aside the topic of Neighborhood/Sub-Area Plans so that the Commission could have an opportunity to assess if the proposed Olympia Comprehensive Plan has established the initial structure for the future development, adoption and implementation of such ancillary documents. This would also incorporate the City's future Implementation Strategy/Action Plan.

First and foremost, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework for Sub-Area Plans such as the goals and policies in the following chapters:

- Vision and Values
- Public Participation
- Natural Environment
- Land Use and Design
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Park, Arts and Recreation
- Economy
- Public Services
- Capital Facility Plan

Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

In July 2012, the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (CNA) and the Olympia City Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a city-neighborhood association partnership for conducting forums and other activities affecting neighborhoods. This includes the structure for sub-area planning.

The first steps in this forthcoming process will be presented to the Council's Land Use and Environment Committee on May 23rd. The presentation between the staff and members of the CNA will consist of considering the first steps in developing a process for sub-area plans. Status reports of this work will be presented to the Committee on July 25th and September 26th. I presume the Committee will then provide a recommendation to the Council with formal action taking place afterwards.

Below is an excerpt from the CNA's 2013 Action Plan (see attached). The Action Plan was presented to Land Use and Environmental Committee on January 30th. The excerpt outlines the CNA's proposal for developing the Implementation Strategy and Sub-Area Plans.

B. Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy

The Comprehensive Plan's Vision Section provides that "Neighborhood groups [should] take an intimate role in the planning and decision-making affecting their neighborhoods. The vehicle for this will be an Action Plan or Implementation Strategy. When the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy is prepared by the city, neighborhoods will focus on the following key areas:

- *Ensuring that development regulations are made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan*
- *Making city programs more neighborhood centric*
- *Incorporating neighborhoods in the land use decisions of government organizations*

C. Sub-Area Plans

1. A new Organizational Structure for Neighborhoods

CNA has been working to increase the number of areas in the city which are covered by a neighborhood association. In some areas of the city, consolidations of neighborhoods are already occurring. The City's proposed Comprehensive Plan includes neighborhood involvement in land use in the context of 10 sub-areas. CNA will propose a new framework for neighborhoods based on the City of Olympia's sub-area model so that all areas of the city have a neighborhood association point of contact.

2. Working Group for Sub-Area Planning

One sub-area of the city will be selected as a pilot for the sub-area planning process involving neighborhoods and the City Department of Community Planning and Development. CNA will provide assistance to that neighborhood as needed and support the allocation of neighborhood matching grant funds to assist the neighborhood in the planning process. Developing a final sub-area could take 1-2 years.

If deemed appropriate, the Planning Commission as well as other City Citizen Advisory Boards should provide feedback to the Council and CNA regarding the 2013 Action Plan. To avoid any missteps, it is important that continuity and coordination with the City's master plans and subsequent development regulations and the efforts of the CNA occur.

I believe that there will be a great deal of work accomplished in the 2013 Action Plan and in subsequent years, including answers about how to address certain specifics in Sub-Area Plans, such as:

- Do the Sub-Area Plans contain any regulatory authority?
- What will be the public involvement process in developing Sub-Area Plans?
- How will the City's regulatory framework be integrated toward the implementation of Sub-Area Plans?
- How will it be determined if Sub-Area Plans are consistent with and further the overall Comprehensive Plan for the City?
- What is the overall timeframe for addressing the 12 Sub-Area Plans (A through K, and Downtown)? The CNA indicates that a template will be created for the first plan.
- What are the obligations for implementation of Sub-Area Plans by the City Council? What is the process for the development and adoption (1 to 2 years per plan)?
- In addition to the Neighborhood Match Grants, what other funds for Sub-Area Plans will be used?
- Will there be a Sub-Area Plans for the Urban Growth Area – Thurston County?

Olympia Sub-Area Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Sub-Areas Map. It is my understanding that the CNA has developed its own map. Although this was not submitted to the Commission during the open record, it will most likely be presented to the Council during its Comprehensive Plan process. The Commission may opt to defer any recommendation on the proposed map due to the proposal by the CNA. However, absent any change, the July Draft proposal will then be forwarded to the Council.

Future Land Use Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether or not to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Future Land Use Map. This includes any indication on the designation of land use areas as well as neighborhood centers or nodes versus villages. It is important that Commission review the designations and defined terms for the following land use classifications since these classifications will then be used as a basis for the underlying zoning categories.

- Low-Density Housing
- Medium-Density Housing
- Mixed Residential
- Neighborhood Center

- Residential Mixed Use
- Planned Developments
- Professional Offices & Multi-family
- Urban Corridors
- Urban Waterfront
- Central Business District
- General commercial
- Auto Services
- Medical Services
- Industry

Continued on next page ...

As stated earlier, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework, however the goals and policies listed below should be considered essential in ensuring consistency between Sub-Area Plans established in the City.

Neighborhoods, Villages and Planning Sub-Areas	
GL 17	“Development maintains and improves neighborhood character and livability.”
PL 17.1	“Require development in established neighborhoods to be of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.”
PL 17.2	“Unless necessary for historic preservation, prohibit conversion of housing residential areas to commercial use; instead, support redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods to bolster stability and allow home occupations (except convalescent care) that do not degrade neighborhood appearance or livability, create traffic, noise or pollution problems.”
PL 17.3	“Allow elder care homes and senior-only housing and encourage child care services everywhere except industrial areas; but limit hospice care to multi-family and commercial districts.”
PL 17.4	“Support local food production including urban agriculture, and provide for a food store with a transit stop within one-half mile of all residents.”
PL 17.5 “new”	“Encourage development and public improvements consistent with healthy and active lifestyles.”
PL 17.6 “new”	“Discourage ‘fortress-style’ and unnecessarily secure designs that isolate developments and separate neighborhoods.”
GL 18	“Neighborhood centers are the focal point of neighborhoods and villages.”
PL 18.1	“Establish a neighborhood center at each village site, encourage development of designated neighborhood centers as shown on Future Land Use Map and allow designation of additional centers where compatible with existing land uses and where they are more than one-half mile from other commercial areas.”
PL 18.2	“Locate neighborhood centers along collector arterial streets and within

	about 600 feet of a transit stop.”
PL 18.3	“Include housing, a food store, and a neighborhood park or civic green at all neighborhood centers. Allow churches, schools, and convenience businesses and services that cater primarily to neighborhood residents. Prohibit auto-oriented uses. Vary the specific size and composition of such centers for balance with surrounding uses; focus commercial uses on the civic green or park, and limit the size of commercial uses. (Note: a larger urban center is permitted in the Briggs Urban Village.)”
PL 18.4	“Allow neighborhood center designs that are innovative and provide variety, but that ensure compatibility with adjoining uses. Consider appropriate phasing, scale, design and exterior materials, as well as glare, noise and traffic impacts when evaluating compatibility. Require buildings with primary access directly from street sidewalks, orientation to any adjacent park or green and to any adjacent housing, and signage consistent with neighborhood character.”
PL 18.5	“Locate streets and trails for non-arterial access to the neighborhood center.”
GL 19	“Trees help maintain strong and healthy neighborhoods.”
PL 19.1	“Use trees to foster a sense of neighborhood identity.”
PL 19.2	“Identify, protect and maintain trees with historic significance or other value to the community or specific neighborhoods.”
Sub-Area Planning	
GL 20 “new”	“Each of the community’s major neighborhoods has its own priorities.”
PL 20.1 “new”	“In cooperation with residents, landowners, businesses, and other interested parties, establish priorities for the sub-area shown on the Planning Areas Map. The specific area, content and process for each sub-area is to be adapted to the needs and interests of each area. (See public involvement regarding public involvement goals.)
PL 20.2 “new”	“Create sub-area strategies that address provisions and priorities for community health, neighborhood centers and places assembly, streets and paths, cultural resources, forestry, utilities and open space and parks.”

PL 20.3	“Develop neighborhood and business community approaches to beautification that include activities in residential and commercial areas.”
‘Villages’ and other Planning Developments	
GL 21	“Mixed use developments, also known as “villages,” are a planned with a pedestrian orientation and a coordinated and balanced mix of land uses.”
PL 21.1	“Require planned development sites shown on the Future Land Use Map to develop as coordinated, mixed-use projects.”
PL 21.2	“Provide for any redevelopment or redesign of planned developments including the Evergreen Park Planned Unit Development to be consistent with the ‘village vision’ of this Plan.”
PL 21.3	“Require ‘master plans’ for villages that encompass the entire site and specific the project phasing, street layout and design, lot arrangement, land uses, parks and open space, building orientation, environmental protection and neighborhood compatibility measures.”
PL 21.4	“Proved for a compatible mix of housing in each village with pleasant living, shopping and working environment, pedestrian-oriented character, well-located and sized open spaces, attractive well-connected streets and a balance of retail stores, offices, housing, and public uses.”
PL 21.5	“Require a neighborhood center, a variety of housing, connected trails, prominent open spaces, wildlife habitat, and recreation areas in each village.”
PL 21.6	“Require that villages retain the natural topography and major environmental features of the site and incorporate water bodies and stormwater ponds into the design to minimize environmental degradation.”
PL 21.7	“Locate parking lots at the rear or side of building, to avoid pedestrian interference and to minimize street frontage. Landscape any parking adjacent to streets and minimize parking within villages by reducing requirements and providing incentives for shared parking.”
PL 21.8	“Require village integrity but provide flexibility for developers to respond to market conditions.”

PL 21.9	“Limit each village to about 40 to 200 acres; require that at least 60% but allow no more than 75% of housing to be single-family units; and require at least 5% of the site be open space with at least one large usable open space for the public at the neighborhood center.”
PL 21.10	“Require that 90% of village housing be within a quarter mile of the neighborhood center and a transit stop.”
PL 21.11	“Provide for a single ‘urban village’ at the intersection of Henderson Boulevard and Yelm Highway; allowing up to 175,000 square feet of commercial floor area plus an additional 50,000 square feet if a larger grocery is included; and requiring that on 505 of the housing be single-family.”
Public Participation and Partners	
GP 4	“Sub-area planning conducted through a collaborative effort by community members and the City and is used to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop.”
PP 4.1	“Work with neighborhoods to identify the priorities, assets and changes of the designated sub-area(s), as well as provide information to increase understanding of land-use decision-making processes and the existing plans and regulations affecting sub-areas.”
PP 4.2	“Encourage wide participation in the development and implementation of sub-area plans.”
PP 4.3	“Define the role that sub-area plans play in City decision-making and resource allocation.”
PP 4.4	“Allow initiation of sub-area planning by either neighborhoods or the City.”
PP 4.5	“Encourage collaboration between neighborhoods and City representatives.”

Topic: #B15, Shoreline Master Program, Restoration Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B16, Environmental Protection – Restoration, Daylighting Creeks, Corridors

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

Day-light creeks in Olympia - as an environmental demonstration project. Restoration of creek in Elma, Washington, is a good example to follow. This project would:

- Bring attention to salmon protection (food protection) and environment in general;
- Generate landmarks in Olympia; and
- Generate public works.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Recent events related to the climate change force us to reconsider our impact on environment. Forcing fish to swim inside the dark pipes is an example of negative impact that we have on environment and is has to be reversed.

Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

Provide the specific goal /motion:

Start with reopening of the Creek along Cherry Street, creating a bike route along the creek/along the City Hall and connecting it with the Port area.

Where should this be located in the Plan?

Two chapters: Environmental and Park/Recreation.

Topic: #B17, Capital Facilities Element

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B18, Action Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B19, Gateways to the City, Civic Boulevards

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B20, Historic Preservation

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B21, Revisions to the Economy Chapter

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B22, Artist Live/Work Space

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B23, Measurable Goals

Entire Plan

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I am asking to introduce the set of Measurable Goals to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

To be useful, a goal has to be specific and measurable. For example, new development along busy streets has to meet requirements of green buffer. Large development has to have access to the parkland area - goal: 3 acres per 1000 people, maximum distance – half mile.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

OPC Final Deliberations
Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: February 11, 2013

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

When possible, provide measurable goals.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

Next to goals.

Topic: #B24, Reduction of Cars and Trucks Downtown

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4