

City Council SMP Questions for Staff October 9, 2012

Buxbaum

1. Where are there areas of inconsistency or potential conflict between the SMP goals to promote recreational uses and the establishment of vegetative buffers?
2. Could any proposed SMP policies or regulations adversely impact or affect City facilities or interests?
3. What are the rules regarding utilities easements within required setbacks?

Hankins

1. The Port has indicated they are not authorized to do housing projects on Port property. Please clarify.
2. What standards/regulations are required to be in the SMP as compared to other development regulations?

Jones

1. What is the role of Ecology when a Conditional Use Permit is required?
2. If Ecology has a role with CUPs, does their role differ depending on the SED?
3. Concerning the Port – does the “special recognition” of the Port apply to all uses or activities a Port might propose, or just particular kinds of uses?
4. How have other jurisdictions dealt with the issue of covered moorage?
5. Can Olympia use the SMP to establish general standards/requirements for “soft” approaches to shoreline bank stabilization?
6. Can the SMP play a role in regulating stormwater detention, treatment, or outfalls?
7. Regarding Shoreline Environmental I Designations (SED): The City can develop new, alternative designations if it determines they are appropriate for a given shoreline reach. Can staff provide comments on this option, or perhaps sketch out some conceptual approaches to adding new SEDs?

Roe

1. Is it possible or legal that some non-conforming uses be grandfathered and others enforced?
2. If zoning regulations prohibit industrial uses throughout Budd-1 through Budd-3 what would be the impact to Dunlap Towing or other existing industrial users, and what recourse would impacted property owners have?
3. There are 3 reaches in particular on Budd Inlet that seem most problematic: The UC reaches on W.Bay , the reach where Bayview is, and the reach on the west side of East Bay along the Port Peninsula.
4. Can the City develop new SEDs for these and other reaches?
5. Can staff attempt to address the Port’s 10 questions presented at the October 2nd workshop?
6. Can staff please provide a clear definition of nonconforming use, impacts and different

approaches?

Cooper

1. How do we rework this document so we achieve more than the minimum of no net loss and get
2. to a net gain? How can we do this and yet also achieve social, environmental, and economic
3. needs (balance Michael Cade referred to at the September 25th Council workshop?
4. Can we get language from other jurisdictions that has been developed for inclusion in SMPs that
5. would lay out incentives to develop waterfront trails, access, etc?
6. Can we create a “trust fund” of some kind to help fund large restoration objectives?
7. Can we find in the record why the work “marine” was dropped from the Port’s SED during the
8. Planning Commission deliberations?

Roe:

How long-term is the long-term vision we are trying to achieve with this SMP? Is it, for example, 50 years, or is it just until the next update in 8 years? When we are considering the shoreline designations, are we supposed to focus on how they are characterized by existing uses, or should we focus on desired future uses? What’s the relationship between the SMP and the Comp Plan?

Hankins:

Please explain Ecology’s reference to the need for a “transition period” as we move toward desired future conditions for the shorelines.

Buxbaum: Please have staff look into LOTT’s concerns about utilities and pipelines along Capitol Lake and whether currently proposed SEDs would make them prohibited or nonconforming.

Port Questions

1. What is the objective to be achieved in classifying the eastern portion of the Port Peninsula Urban Conservancy?
2. Will the Port be able to develop any structure within 200 feet of the shoreline at North Point and at the Swantown Marina if Urban Conservancy remains the designation?
3. Will Boatworks and Olympia Area Rowing be considered nonconforming?
4. Is the objective of identifying a structure or property as nonconforming to insure that it eventually goes away and doesn't come back at that location?
5. How much of the Olympia shoreline will be considered nonconforming if the plan is passed as recommended by the Planning Commission?
6. What are the impacts of identifying a property as nonconforming? Please ask lending, finance, insurance and real estate professionals this question?
7. What is the purpose of a setback and what is the objective in increasing setbacks in the this SMP update?
8. Does removing the ability to commercially develop a piece of property or making the property nonconforming have an impact on the value of the property? If so is it possible to quantify the property value impact of the proposed changes?
9. What was the rationale behind altering the SMP that was recommended by the Thurston Regional Planning Council? Did the science, characterization of the shoreline conditions or interpretation of the data change?
10. Is there any connection between the proposed SMP and the future decisions regarding Capitol Lake?