GLENN WELLS, AIA

January 21, 2026
City of Olympia Council members
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia WA 98501

RE Briggs Village OMC amendments

Dear Council Members:

I opened my architectural practice in 1982 and the most important thing that I've learned about business over the past 44 years is that flexibility is key. The business environment has changed and shifted dramatically over these past decades and having the ability to reimagine, adjust or pivot is essential. Who would believe that the State of Washington would choose not to come back to work after COVID and they would instead start vacating hundreds of thousands of SF of large-scale commercial office space designed specifically for government. Real estate that was appraised at $300 per SF just five years ago are now half that amount. Since there isn't a strong demand for these large footprints in the private sector, creative repurpose solutions are needed.

Obviously, this trend isn't unique to Olympia. I'm sure you've read about the state of office space in Seattle.

Back in 2001, the Briggs Village was born, and many exciting aspects were incorporated into this brand-new Urban Village. A 50,000 SF grocery store was one of the elements and idea of it attracted many people to move to the Briggs Development. Unfortunately, a fatal design flaw occurred that would severely limit this possibility. Instead of siting the grocery store along Yelm Highway, where traffic exceeded 40,000 trips even back then, the YMCA took that coveted spot. This forced the grocery store into the middle of the mixed-use district which limited visibility to Henderson Dr, which is a fraction of that traffic flow. From a practical standpoint, this limited the grocery store's market to Briggs Village and an adjacent neighborhood or two. I think it's safe to say that if one is in their car, there are too many other, cheaper options. This grocery store would be primarily served by walk-ins.

The previous developer made a deal with the Stormans to operate a 30,000 SF grocery store at the Briggs Village. I met with Kevin Stormans, and he explained to me that his role was only to manage the operation of the store, and he had no exposure for the real estate he occupied. In other words,

the developer would construct a 30,000 SF grocery store without a tenant lease that would ensure rent payments. Obviously, this isn't financeable and once the developer reneged on this deal, the Stormans wisely backed out.

The current owner has contacted numerous grocery store representatives and there has been zero interest in owning any size grocery business above 5,000 SF. He did find interest in a 5,000 SF grocery tenant two years ago, but that opportunity vanished when the son took over the business.

25 years have passed since the Briggs Village inception and the mixed-use district has remained vacant, primarily because of the grocery store requirement. It is my humble opinion that we need to incorporate more flexibility in the language. I asked the city staff if there were other instances where the city required a specific use and an exact size as part of a land use application. They said that this was unique to the Urban Village and that they didn't ever expect to see another urban village proposed, presumably because of the lack of flexibility.

There is another challenge that a grocer would face with Briggs Village. Food items cost significantly more at small grocery store. These types of stores can't begin to compete with the Costco's and Safeway's of the world. Even a 9,200 SF grocery store would generally cost 25-33% more than a Safeway or Costco. It is very likely that many residents of Briggs would do their heavy grocery shopping at one of the larger grocery stores and walk to the local grocery store for something they missed, or to hold them over until their primary shopping trip. Since the grocery tenant's only market would be these local people, they might find that business model would not be sustainable.

I am not proposing that we give up on the idea of a grocery store, I am suggesting that we manage the code language so that we can be successful. I propose the following:

1. We keep the area of the grocery store at 9,200 SF; however, it does not have to be in one spot. For example, if we attract a pastry shop tenant, that area counts towards the grocery tenant minimum. If we attract a wine bar, that sells bottles of wine, that area counts also. If we attract a deli that also sells meat to customers, that area counts. All tenants that sell items usually found in grocery stores would apply to this minimum 9,200 SF size.
2. The developer will agree to build as an amenity to Briggs Village, a 2,500 SF grocery store that will emulate the Whistler Upper Village Market. This store has 1,000 SF of store space and 1,500 SF of storage and cooler space. The developer will lease it to a grocery operator at no cost with the specifications that they interact with their customers and get recommendations on what they would like to see made available. There is one thing that can overcome the higher prices and that is uniqueness. The grocery store will need to cater to their market.

The Whistler Upper Village Market is in the Hilton Grand Vacations Club and attracts customers throughout the north village. Since there is no parking at the store, virtually all the customers walk-

in. I can provide on request nine photos of the store's interior and the items they carry, which includes fresh fruit and vegetables, and meat.

There is one more point I would like to make. The city seems amendable to the idea of having four-story mixed-use buildings adjacent to the Town Square. Since the commercial space requires a higher ceiling, this would require a higher maximum height limit than the listed 45 feet. The minimum design heights are as follows:

- 14-foot floor-to-floor height for the commercial space (the existing Briggs Design Guidelines call for an 18-foot ceiling which equals a 20 to 21 floor to floor height for commercial space).
- Two 10-foot floor-floor residential floors
- One 9-foot ceiling fourth floor
- .5 to 1.5 base grade. The OMC requires the base grade to be the average as measured 6' from the building around the perimeter of the building.
- 5.75-to-7.19-foot roof height. The OMC requires the height of the building to be at the midpoint of the roof.

This totals between 49.5 and 51.69-feet height.

I respectively request these changes be incorporated into the staff report so that the Briggs Village Mixed-Use District development can finally move forward. We have an owner willing to develop the property, which is not a small thing. This is not the most advantageous period to take on a major construction project with the civil unrest in the country, conflicting interest rate reports, tariff threats and high construction costs. Please add some additional flexibility to the code language so that we can reimagine, adjust, and pivot as the times demand.

If you have any questions for me, please do not hesitate to contact me

Sincerely,

Glenn Wells, AIA
Principal

324 WEST BAY DRIVE NW, STE 214 C, OLYMPIA, WA 98502
360-239-5971 glennwellsarchitect@gmail.com

From: karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2025 12:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Application and Planning Commission Briefing; Urban Village text code amendments OMC 18.05

Jackson -
Thank you for your response, I had read the proposed changes but didn't read the staff report carefully enough. I agree that the proposal needs to keep to the original concept of the Urban Village. There have already been some compromises in earlier changes to this Master Plan relating to drive through businesses, for example. I am concerned with incremental changes that, in the end, result in something that is not a true Urban Village.
In creating a different formula for the commercial space, does it essentially keep the amount of commercial intact? I understand that with more housing, the previous formulas wouldn't make sense.

Here are two parts of the staff report that I think need to be clearer. The equity one seems to leave out how living near services can actually reduce household transportation costs. The climate analysis needs to be more plain language pointing directly to the reduction in GHG emissions. : (See my comments in bold inside these two areas.)

Climate Analysis:
The proposed amendments would allow for increased housing opportunities in an area already served by city services. Increased urban density in an area that currently requires additional commercial and office space would allow for a more efficient land use pattern. The village is currently served by city water and sewer, and has existing private and public streets, as well as by public transportation (bus routes and bike lanes). New residents would have the option to utilize public transportation. The existing village contains sidewalk connections and bike lanes that provide pedestrian and bike access to the large city. New residents would have ample opportunity to bike or walk to nearby services including those offered within existing villages. **[[This land us pattern, dense development, sidewalks, and transit, reduces trips and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.]]]** [This is consistent with the cities climate goals of promoting infill development.

Equity Analysis:
The proposed text code amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan goals for increased housing within the city limits. This will allow for the potential for increased housing stock. Housing has been identified as a major equity issue by Washington State and the City of Olympia and emergency declarations have been made. Increased multifamily housing in urban villages would help alleviate this problem and allow for increased density within the core of urban villages. Based on analysis provided by the applicant, these changes would allow up to 260 additional multifamily units to be built in Briggs Village the only “urban village” in the city. **[[Having services and shopping nearby, as in an Urban Village, can help by reducing a household's costs for transportation. This makes the housing more affordable.]]]**

Karen Messmer

On 1/22/2025 11:38 AM, Jackson Ewing wrote:

> Good morning, Karen,
>
> City staff has come to a position after reviewing the proposal against the existing comprehensive plan. The city will provide the planning commission a briefing on the proposed changes next Monday evening.
>
> The proposal is not to remove requirements for commercial within urban villages, but to increase multifamily allowances in order to support the intended commercial development.
>
> Please review the issued staff report and let me know if you have any questions.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
> (360) 570-3776
> jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
>
> **All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*
>
> **From:** karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
> **Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2025 2:32 PM
> **To:** Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Subject:** Re: Notice of Application and Planning Commission Briefing; Urban Village text code amendments OMC 18.05
>
> Jackson - A few questions -
> How can the City have a 'position' on this proposal before there has been a public hearing? I see that the staff will present the 'city position' at the Planning Commission briefing. How does the 'city' come to this position and will the planning commission or public have influence on that position?
> Also, how is this being referred to as a 'text amendment' when indeed it would be big policy change in terms of the function of an urban village. If there is not commercial development, how can it even be an urban village?
>
> Thanks
> Karen Messmer

On 1/16/2025 1:40 PM, Jackson Ewing wrote:

> Good afternoon,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects. The attached Notice of Application is for a text code amendment to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.
>
> A planning commission briefing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission briefing with able time to review the city and applicant proposals and provide public comment.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
> (360) 570-3776
> jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
>
> **All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Kathy McCormick <kathy.mccormick@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 10:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: CityCouncil
Subject: Re: 12/18/ 2025; Land Use and Environment Committee Meeting; Briggs Development Agreement briefing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Jackson - Please see that the Land Use and Environmental Committee gets a copy of my comments below re: Briggs Development Agreement. Unfortunately I am not able to comment in person.

To: Land Use and Environment Committee - Chair Dani Madrone, Council member Jim Cooper, Council member Robert Vanderpool

As a lead Planner when the Urban Village Zone was included in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan Rewrite and when the initial development regulations were approved I submit the following.

When the Urban Village zone was included in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan there was a LOT of fear about what this new zoning designation would be. Ironically a major fear was that most of the property would develop as commercial. Consequently the development regulations ended up being overly prescriptive - not allowing any commercial until certain types and amounts of housing were developed. The expectation when the zone was created was that as Briggs housing developed, there would be at least another 900 housing units built in the surrounding adjacent neighborhoods on undeveloped land. Market analysis at the time showed that the additional demand from these added units outside of Briggs would create the demand needed to make the Briggs town center commercial viable.

Over the last 20 years decisions were made to add acreage to the existing LBA park and more recently parks planned adjacent to the Yelm highway. Consequently, under the current development agreement housing unit limitations in Briggs simply cannot produce the necessary housing needed to support the originally envisioned commercial town center. The City and our region has a severe housing shortage. The changes as proposed need to be adopted in order to make full use of the remaining Briggs property for enough housing to finally - after 30 years - make some additional commercial viable and allow a town center to finally emerge.

Sincerely,
Kathy McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA 98501

From: Eika Petermann <eikapetermann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 7:34 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Project Meeting

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to host the Briggs Village Project meeting on 1/27. It was a lot to cover after presumably a regular work day for all you planners.

I have been a resident of Briggs Village for 11 years now and "bought in" with the assurance that is was planned to be a walkable neighborhood with a grocery store. 2008 and the pandemic are long over and business is booming everywhere.

That is has taken so long is inconceivable. Those of us living in and around here know this walkable community is full of potential.

Glenn Wells mentioned he knew one family here that wants a grocery store. In reality, everyone here and around here wants a grocery store. You mentioned “staff” input quite a bit. Does any staff live in Briggs Village?

I worked at Briggs Taphouse for a year and a half even though I already have a full-time job. Why? Because it’s a 3-minute walk from my house. That is the ideal scenario: walk to work, walk to eat, get coffee, get a haircut, work out, go shopping, get groceries. I’m flabbergasted this is such an abstract concept. Every neighborhood should be walkable.

From the meeting and the continued search for data to support this “futuristic” walkable concept, it seems like people continue to overthink this project. Build the grocery store and they will come.

Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow are successful beyond what they even imagined. They have both become destinations, in addition to people who can walk there. A grocery store will only sweeten the deal for everyone and bring other retailers and service providers in.

It may not be the size of grocery originally planned but we will accept anything other than a convenience store. No 7/11 or anything like that.

If Spud’s is truly interested, I’d like to see proof of that and do something soon to bring that offer into reality.

Thank you for your time. I’d like to live to see this walkable concept become a reality.

Eika Petermann
EdenSpa Wellness

eikapetermann@gmail.com
360.790.5032
FarmHouse Fresh Affiliate
Le Mieux Cosmetics Affiliate



From: Craig Tedder <craigsshs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 12:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Brian Faller & Kris Norelius
Subject: Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05) COMMENTS

Leam planner,

I have lived in the community for 24 years and for most of this time we have been waiting for a commercial district and a grocery store.

I think if any change in zoning is planned it should be to facilitate a commercial walking district and possible grocery store. I understand the need for housing, but housing has improved over the 24 years, and a commercial district has not seen any progress.

I am NOT in favor of a change in amendments that would result in more housing.

I WOULD be in favor of amendments that would promote a commercial district and grocery store option.

Craig Tedder, DHSc, DPT, MBA, BSc.(Physio), MTC, FAAOMPT

(360) 951-2902

Mr. Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner,

City of Olympia Land Use Commission
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA 98501

Subject: Urgent Request to Deny Approval of Revised Briggs Village Development Plans Omitting Promised Retail Elements

Dear Mr. Ewing:

As a resident and stakeholder in the Briggs Village community, I am writing to strongly urge the City of Olympia Land Use Commission to reject any proposed amendments to the Briggs Village Development Plan that fail to include the promised retail elements, specifically the envisioned retail village and grocery store. Approval of such plans would be a direct affront to the principles of responsible urban planning and a violation of the commitments made to current and future residents.

Alignment with the Briggs Village Master Plan

The Briggs Village Master Plan, amended in 2014, was expressly designed to create a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly community where residents could access essential services without dependence on vehicular transportation. The Master Plan's Town Square concept, as described on page 4, was to serve as the vibrant centerpiece of this vision, hosting retail spaces that include a grocery store, professional services, and other commercial amenities.

This vision aligns with the goals of the City of Olympia Comprehensive Plan, which emphasizes sustainable growth, walkability, and community-oriented development. Specifically, the Comprehensive Plan prioritizes:

- **Goal LU 1.1:** Encouraging mixed-use developments that integrate residential, commercial, and recreational opportunities.
- **Goal TR 1.4:** Reducing vehicle dependency by ensuring access to daily services within neighborhoods.

The proposed deviation from these commitments—replacing retail with additional high-density housing—directly contravenes these goals and undermines the integrity of the City's planning framework.

Legal and Community Implications

1. **Violation of Representations:** The initial marketing and sale of Briggs Village properties were predicated on the assurances outlined in the Master Plan. Removing the retail components constitutes a material misrepresentation to residents who purchased homes based on these promises. This bait-and-switch approach risks not only legal challenges but also significant reputational harm to both the developer and the City.
2. **Community Impact:** Eliminating retail spaces, particularly the grocery store, places an undue burden on residents by forcing them to rely on vehicles to meet basic needs. This change contradicts the core principle of creating a walkable, self-sufficient community and will exacerbate traffic congestion, harming both safety and quality of life.
3. **Precedent for Accountability:** Allowing developers to abandon key elements of their commitments without consequences sets a dangerous precedent. Such an outcome would undermine public trust in both developers and the City's planning process.

Call to Action

I implore the Land Use Commission to uphold the commitments enshrined in the Briggs Village Master Plan and Olympia's Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, I request the following:

1. **Rejection of Any Plan That Excludes Retail Elements:** The Commission should deny approval for any proposal that omits the retail village and grocery store components.
2. **Enforcement of Developer Obligations:** Require Briggs Village Development Corporation to adhere to the original Master Plan commitments.
3. **Community-Centered Decision-Making:** Ensure that any amendments to the plan prioritize the needs and welfare of the community, as envisioned in both the Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion

The City of Olympia has a responsibility to its residents to uphold the principles of fairness, accountability, and sustainable urban development. By denying approval of any deviation from the Briggs Village Master Plan's original vision, the Land Use Commission can reinforce these values and protect the long-term interests of the community.

I appreciate your immediate attention to this critical issue and look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further discussion or clarification.

Sincerely,

Franklin A. Wilson,

1526 Brighton Way SE, Olympia, Washington 98501

Phone Number (cell, 608-512-3425)
January 25, 2025

Jackson Ewing

From: Kirsten Rue <kirsten.rue3@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 2, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Andrew Peterson
Subject: Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Mr. Ewing,

I have lived in the Brigg's Village for 11 years now. I live at 4306 Magnolia Drive SE. It's my understanding that there is a proposal being considered to essentially reduce the designated commercial space for our village from 28,000 to 2,800 square feet and to allow additional apartment complexes to replace the commercial space. When I bought into Brigg's Village, part of what sold me on the location was the concept of a village where I could walk to get groceries, dine at restaurants, and have recreational space. I understand that you are the lead planner for Brigg's Village. As you move forward with the planning, I insist that those of us who purchased homes in the village deserve to have the urban village plan that we were promised at the time of purchase.

I can be contacted at 360-790-6490 if you have additional questions for me regarding my thoughts for the future of my Brigg's Village neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Kirsten Rue

Mr. Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner,

City of Olympia Land Use Commission
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA 98501

Subject: Urgent Request to Deny Approval of Revised Briggs Village Development Plans Omitting Promised Retail Elements

Dear Mr. Ewing:

As a resident and stakeholder in the Briggs Village community, I am writing to strongly urge the City of Olympia Land Use Commission to reject any proposed amendments to the Briggs Village Development Plan that fail to include the promised retail elements, specifically the envisioned retail village and grocery store. Approval of such plans would be a direct affront to the principles of responsible urban planning and a violation of the commitments made to current and future residents.

Alignment with the Briggs Village Master Plan

The Briggs Village Master Plan, amended in 2014, was expressly designed to create a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly community where residents could access essential services without dependence on vehicular transportation. The Master Plan's Town Square concept, as described on page 4, was to serve as the vibrant centerpiece of this vision, hosting retail spaces that include a grocery store, professional services, and other commercial amenities.

This vision aligns with the goals of the City of Olympia Comprehensive Plan, which emphasizes sustainable growth, walkability, and community-oriented development. Specifically, the Comprehensive Plan prioritizes:

- **Goal LU 1.1:** Encouraging mixed-use developments that integrate residential, commercial, and recreational opportunities.
- **Goal TR 1.4:** Reducing vehicle dependency by ensuring access to daily services within neighborhoods.

The proposed deviation from these commitments—replacing retail with additional high-density housing—directly contravenes these goals and undermines the integrity of the City's planning framework.

Legal and Community Implications

1. **Violation of Representations:** The initial marketing and sale of Briggs Village properties were predicated on the assurances outlined in the Master Plan. Removing the retail components constitutes a material misrepresentation to residents who purchased homes based on these promises. This bait-and-switch approach risks not only legal challenges but also significant reputational harm to both the developer and the City.
2. **Community Impact:** Eliminating retail spaces, particularly the grocery store, places an undue burden on residents by forcing them to rely on vehicles to meet basic needs. This change contradicts the core principle of creating a walkable, self-sufficient community and will exacerbate traffic congestion, harming both safety and quality of life.
3. **Precedent for Accountability:** Allowing developers to abandon key elements of their commitments without consequences sets a dangerous precedent. Such an outcome would undermine public trust in both developers and the City's planning process.

Call to Action

I implore the Land Use Commission to uphold the commitments enshrined in the Briggs Village Master Plan and Olympia's Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, I request the following:

1. **Rejection of Any Plan That Excludes Retail Elements:** The Commission should deny approval for any proposal that omits the retail village and grocery store components.
2. **Enforcement of Developer Obligations:** Require Briggs Village Development Corporation to adhere to the original Master Plan commitments.
3. **Community-Centered Decision-Making:** Ensure that any amendments to the plan prioritize the needs and welfare of the community, as envisioned in both the Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion

The City of Olympia has a responsibility to its residents to uphold the principles of fairness, accountability, and sustainable urban development. By denying approval of any deviation from the Briggs Village Master Plan's original vision, the Land Use Commission can reinforce these values and protect the long-term interests of the community.

I appreciate your immediate attention to this critical issue and look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further discussion or clarification.

Sincerely,

Franklin A. Wilson,

1526 Brighton Way SE, Olympia, Washington 98501

Phone Number (cell, 608-512-3425)
January 25, 2025

From: karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2025 12:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Application and Planning Commission Briefing; Urban Village text code amendments OMC 18.05

Jackson -
Thank you for your response, I had read the proposed changes but didn't read the staff report carefully enough. I agree that the proposal needs to keep to the original concept of the Urban Village. There have already been some compromises in earlier changes to this Master Plan relating to drive through businesses, for example. I am concerned with incremental changes that, in the end, result in something that is not a true Urban Village.
In creating a different formula for the commercial space, does it essentially keep the amount of commercial intact? I understand that with more housing, the previous formulas wouldn't make sense.

Here are two parts of the staff report that I think need to be clearer. The equity one seems to leave out how living near services can actually reduce household transportation costs. The climate analysis needs to be more plain language pointing directly to the reduction in GHG emissions. : (See my comments in bold inside these two areas.)

Climate Analysis:
The proposed amendments would allow for increased housing opportunities in an area already served by city services. Increased urban density in an area that currently requires additional commercial and office space would allow for a more efficient land use pattern. The village is currently served by city water and sewer, and has existing private and public streets, as well as by public transportation (bus routes and bike lanes). New residents would have the option to utilize public transportation. The existing village contains sidewalk connections and bike lanes that provide pedestrian and bike access to the large city. New residents would have ample opportunity to bike or walk to nearby services including those offered within existing villages. **[[This land us pattern, dense development, sidewalks, and transit, reduces trips and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.]]]** [This is consistent with the cities climate goals of promoting infill development.

Equity Analysis:
The proposed text code amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan goals for increased housing within the city limits. This will allow for the potential for increased housing stock. Housing has been identified as a major equity issue by Washington State and the City of Olympia and emergency declarations have been made. Increased multifamily housing in urban villages would help alleviate this problem and allow for increased density within the core of urban villages. Based on analysis provided by the applicant, these changes would allow up to 260 additional multifamily units to be built in Briggs Village the only “urban village” in the city. **[[Having services and shopping nearby, as in an Urban Village, can help by reducing a household's costs for transportation. This makes the housing more affordable.]]]**

Karen Messmer

On 1/22/2025 11:38 AM, Jackson Ewing wrote:

> Good morning, Karen,
>
> City staff has come to a position after reviewing the proposal against the existing comprehensive plan. The city will provide the planning commission a briefing on the proposed changes next Monday evening.
>
> The proposal is not to remove requirements for commercial within urban villages, but to increase multifamily allowances in order to support the intended commercial development.
>
> Please review the issued staff report and let me know if you have any questions.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
> (360) 570-3776
> jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
>
> **All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*
>
> **From:** karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
> **Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2025 2:32 PM
> **To:** Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Subject:** Re: Notice of Application and Planning Commission Briefing; Urban Village text code amendments OMC 18.05
>
> Jackson - A few questions -
> How can the City have a 'position' on this proposal before there has been a public hearing? I see that the staff will present the 'city position' at the Planning Commission briefing. How does the 'city' come to this position and will the planning commission or public have influence on that position?
> Also, how is this being referred to as a 'text amendment' when indeed it would be big policy change in terms of the function of an urban village. If there is not commercial development, how can it even be an urban village?
>
> Thanks
> Karen Messmer

On 1/16/2025 1:40 PM, Jackson Ewing wrote:

> Good afternoon,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects. The attached Notice of Application is for a text code amendment to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.
>
> A planning commission briefing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission briefing with able time to review the city and applicant proposals and provide public comment.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
> (360) 570-3776
> jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
>
> **All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Craig Tedder <craigsshs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 12:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Brian Faller & Kris Norelius
Subject: Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05) COMMENTS

Leam planner,

I have lived in the community for 24 years and for most of this time we have been waiting for a commercial district and a grocery store.

I think if any change in zoning is planned it should be to facilitate a commercial walking district and possible grocery store. I understand the need for housing, but housing has improved over the 24 years, and a commercial district has not seen any progress.

I am NOT in favor of a change in amendments that would result in more housing.

I WOULD be in favor of amendments that would promote a commercial district and grocery store option.

Craig Tedder, DHSc, DPT, MBA, BSc.(Physio), MTC, FAAOMPT

(360) 951-2902

From: Eika Petermann <eikapetermann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 7:34 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Project Meeting

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to host the Briggs Village Project meeting on 1/27. It was a lot to cover after presumably a regular work day for all you planners.

I have been a resident of Briggs Village for 11 years now and "bought in" with the assurance that is was planned to be a walkable neighborhood with a grocery store. 2008 and the pandemic are long over and business is booming everywhere.

That is has taken so long is inconceivable. Those of us living in and around here know this walkable community is full of potential.

Glenn Wells mentioned he knew one family here that wants a grocery store. In reality, everyone here and around here wants a grocery store. You mentioned “staff” input quite a bit. Does any staff live in Briggs Village?

I worked at Briggs Taphouse for a year and a half even though I already have a full-time job. Why? Because it’s a 3-minute walk from my house. That is the ideal scenario: walk to work, walk to eat, get coffee, get a haircut, work out, go shopping, get groceries. I’m flabbergasted this is such an abstract concept. Every neighborhood should be walkable.

From the meeting and the continued search for data to support this “futuristic” walkable concept, it seems like people continue to overthink this project. Build the grocery store and they will come.

Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow are successful beyond what they even imagined. They have both become destinations, in addition to people who can walk there. A grocery store will only sweeten the deal for everyone and bring other retailers and service providers in.

It may not be the size of grocery originally planned but we will accept anything other than a convenience store. No 7/11 or anything like that.

If Spud’s is truly interested, I’d like to see proof of that and do something soon to bring that offer into reality.

Thank you for your time. I’d like to live to see this walkable concept become a reality.

Eika Petermann
EdenSpa Wellness

eikapetermann@gmail.com
360.790.5032
FarmHouse Fresh Affiliate
Le Mieux Cosmetics Affiliate



From: Craig Tedder <craigsshs@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025 8:29 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05) COMMENTS

Jackson,

To clarify, we have seen the "increase in housing density" already, but limited commercial development. As a member of the community who has wanted patiently for 20 years for some more commercial development, I want to see the commercial development FIRST, before more housing density.

I am skeptical further increased housing density leading to more commercial development, in our experience more housing density results in more housing and still no commercial development.

Craig Tedder, DHSc, DPT, MBA, BSc.(Physio), MTC, FAAOMPT

(360) 951-2902

On Fri, Feb 7, 2025 at 2:00 PM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Craig,
>
> Thank you for taking the time to provide comment on this proposal. I have received you comment letter and have added it to the project record. These comments will be provided to the Planning Commission for review prior to the upcoming public hearing which is scheduled for February 24th, 2025.

You will also be added to the party of record list and will receive all public notices regarding these amendments and Briggs Village.

The goal of the amendments is to increase housing density allowances and height limits in the core, to spur the intended commercial development. Requirements for a commercial core fronting the village square will not be removed from the code requirement. Additionally, the requirements for a grocery store in “urban villages” will not be removed. City staff is recommending a more flexible range to allow the vacant land to develop with market demands.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Craig Tedder <craigsshs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2025 12:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Brian Faller & Kris Norelius <krisnorelius@comcast.net>
Subject: Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05) COMMENTS

Leam planner,

I have lived in the community for 24 years and for most of this time we have been waiting for a commercial district and a grocery store.

I think if any change in zoning is planned it should be to facilitate a commercial walking district and possible grocery store. I understand the need for housing, but housing has improved over the 24 years, and a commercial district has not seen any progress.

I am NOT in favor of a change in amendments that would result in more housing.

I WOULD be in favor of amendments that would promote a commercial district and grocery store option.

Craig Tedder, DHSc, DPT, MBA, BSc.(Physio), MTC, FAAOMPT

(360) 951-2902

From: PETER PLUMLEY <peterplumley@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing,
Thank you for taking the time to read my input on proposed changes to the Briggs Village plan from the property owners.
From what I understood in 2012 when I moved here and bought a home is that Briggs Village would be a community with mixed housing (homes, townhomes and apartments) and walkable commercial businesses including a Ralph's Thriftway type grocery store. What I have heard is that the property owners cannot find a grocery store interested. I tend not to believe them, and they have never come up with any documentation to prove that they cannot find anyone interested, and I believe they are only interested in maximizing profit and will go to any lengths to try to change the original plan.
In the meantime, they have not given the HOA any control over our neighborhood, submitted a current budget, they will not provide even the minimum landscaping upkeep of our neighborhood, and they have created an eyesore of an empty lot full of trash and weeds.
The property owners should be told to stick with the plan or sell it to find someone who will fulfill the promise that is Briggs Village. Any changes should only be the form of affordable and/or subsidized housing and apartments. More unaffordable big apartments and taking away open space are certainly not the answer.
Sincerely,
Peter Plumley
1539 Bellerive Way SE
Olympia, WA 98501

From: SUSAN SMITH <olysue@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 7:58 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Development - NO MINI MART

Planning Commission:

My family and I have lived in Sten Village for 28+ years - arriving shortly after the Urban Village plan for the Briggs property was approved. I understand the property has changed hands since the original developer.

I learned today that the current developer wants to change the plan and omit a grocery store & more restaurants from the Briggs Urban Village. We do NOT want a mini-mart!! We want a grocery store and more retail. We have seen the area of Henderson/Yelm Highway grow dramatically in density and traffic. People are walking and would love a walkable commercial area to get groceries or a meal and socialize with neighbors. We have been waiting years for this.

Why have we not been notified about these potential changes? In the past the Planning Commission sent out postcards about informational meetings or community comment opportunities. We had heard nothing until earlier today when a neighbor shared some information.

Please notify the neighborhoods bordering the Village of an informational meeting and please collect public comments prior to making any changes. Those of us living in the neighborhood need to have a voice.

Thank you,
Susan L Smith
4614 Village Ct SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Kirsten Rue <kirsten.rue3@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 2, 2025 4:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Andrew Peterson
Subject: Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Mr. Ewing,

I have lived in the Brigg's Village for 11 years now. I live at 4306 Magnolia Drive SE. It's my understanding that there is a proposal being considered to essentially reduce the designated commercial space for our village from 28,000 to 2,800 square feet and to allow additional apartment complexes to replace the commercial space. When I bought into Brigg's Village, part of what sold me on the location was the concept of a village where I could walk to get groceries, dine at restaurants, and have recreational space. I understand that you are the lead planner for Brigg's Village. As you move forward with the planning, I insist that those of us who purchased homes in the village deserve to have the urban village plan that we were promised at the time of purchase.

I can be contacted at 360-790-6490 if you have additional questions for me regarding my thoughts for the future of my Brigg's Village neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Kirsten Rue

Jackson Ewing

From: Stacey Plumley <staceyaplumley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:10 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed changes to Urban Village

Hi Jackson,

I live at 1539 Bellerive Way SE in Briggs Village. I have concerns about the Briggs Village developer's request to modify the definition for Urban Village in the zoning code.

I'm opposed to reducing the minimum amount of commercial space from 175,00 sf to 52,000 sf. The developer claims that commercial isn't viable right now but existing commercial businesses in Briggs appear to be doing very well. Other nearby commercial businesses, like the Safeway in Tumwater and the Vics/Spuds shopping center, are always busy. Even if commercial isn't viable currently, the market could change. An urban village should be a true mixed use development with restaurants, shopes, offices, multifamily and single family homes, not just a bunch of apartments.

I'm also opposed to increasing residential density for urban villages:

- Don't change the current ratio of single family and multifamily homes from 50% min single family/50% max multifamily to 15%/85%.
- Don't increase residential density by allowing buildings facing the town square to be four stories instead of the maximum of three stories.
- Don't eliminate the maximum housing density requirements (currently, 24/acre).
- Don't let rooftop courtyards count for the required min. of open space for multifamily sites. Open space should be accessible for everyone to use.

I don't see changes proposed that would benefit communities for the increased density such as, requiring a percentage of subsidized housing units, or smaller, more affordable units. What will developers be required to give back to the community for making a higher profit on increased density?

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Best,
Stacey Plumley

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2025 9:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: krisnorelius@comcast.net
Subject: Village SMC amendments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Jackson,

I appreciated the informative presentations.

Please email me a copy of your slide show and all of the materials that Glen and Gordy presented.

A few questions:
It wasn't clear based on the proposed SMC amendments what areas of the currently undeveloped center could have housing built on them without any first story commercial now and after the proposed amendment if it is approved. Could you please identify that percent now and under the proposed amendment and provide a map or maps showing what those areas now and under the amendment if such exists.

One of your slides seems to indicate that all 3 story buildings could under the proposed amendment be 4 story. Is that true? If so, does that mean all new buildings in the undeveloped area could be 4 stories if the amendment is adopted as proposed? If not, can you identify the sf of 4 areas that could be 4 story and provide a map showing the 4 story areas if one exists.

Based on the presentations it appears that the size of the grocery story has gone from 50,000sf, then to 28,000 sf (due a 2014 amendment), and now according to Gordy could be as low as 5-6,000 sf under the proposed amendment. Is that correct?

What actual data and records has the developer given the city to show it has requested grocery stores to located here? Specifically has it provided the city any records showing it has made a significant attempt to get any grocery stores (e.g., Trader Joe's (relatively small), Whole Foods, other Thriftways) to locate here by doing regional and national advertising and indicating they would negotiate the price based on commercial land use? If they reject deals based on residential land pricing would the city find that in bad faith? Specifically has the developer provided the city copies of market adds that inform grocery developers of the property's availability and the willingness to negotiate the price based on commercial land values? Have you seen such adds? If not, what proof do you have that the developer has made a real effort to find a grocery tenant of some size?

Clearly if the developer can make more money by doing residential it has no real incentive to find an anchor grocery tenant and will ask the city for more residential. That's what it appears to be doing. But in order to consider the developer's propose amendment, **why shouldn't the city first insist that the developer show the city substantial evidence (not just an email or two) of having sought out grocery developers across the nation, and to have worked with them based on commercial (not residential) land values?** Please share your response to these thoughts?

Also, will you will please share this comments with the members of the planning commission and also put them in the record.

Thank you, Brian Faller
Text 360 515 8617 (feel free to call me)

February 14, 2025

Dear Olympia Planning Commission

Response to Amendments to the OMC 18.05 Related to Briggs Master Planned Villages ffrom Kathy McCormick

I support changes to the code that would result in adding as many new multi-family housing units as possible since this will bolster the desire to build out the Briggs Center. I strongly support changing the code to be as flexible as possible to make up for the loss of expected housing in SE Olympia over the last 15 years. Over 900 addditional units of housing were expected when Briggs UV was planned. The loss of these "rooftops" in the Briggs shopping shed area has made it difficult to build the UV center as envisioned. Commercial/retail viability in dependent on the amount of housing within each given shopping shed area. Changes in land use in SE Olympia from housing zones to parks/open space zones decreased the viability for such uses as even a moderate sized grocery store. The loss of that SE Olympia housing zones utterly changed the equation for commercial built into the 1994/95 UV and UV Master Plan. The proposed changes are absolutely necessary.

Background:
I served as a City Planner for many years both during and after the rewrite of the Olympia Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 1994) to comply with the 1990/91 WA State Growth Management Act. I was the lead on the Urban Village zone designation that was incorporated into the plan. The UV zone and code was contentious from the beginning. It was considered a new concept and some in the surrounding neighborhoods were fearful of how it would develop. Some in the surrounding neighborhods mounted a disinformation/misinformation campaign about the Briggs 100 year old nursery and the family intentions. With direction of the Olympia City Council the planning department expanded on the public information planned. Briggs hired NBBJ architects to illustrate a draft Master plan concept that was incorporated into the plan and additional public information and discussion took place. The result of this effort was the adoption of the image very similar to the Master Plan image adopted and still in use today.

Because of the fear and skepticism - the zoning code adoped in 1994/95 ended up being extremely prescriptive. This was counter to one of the known advantages of an Urban Village master plan – i.e. the evolution of the development as the demand for residential and commercial evolved over time.

The UV code revision process is an opportunity to change some key elements that would allow the 30 year old vision to adjust to today's realities.

Reality 1) Over the last 30 years at least 900 units of possible new housing expected to support the UV commercial center was lost when large portions of SE Olympia was rezoned from housing to parks/openspace and added to the existing LBA Park. With that change and other subsequent changes in the SE area expecations for even a moderate size UV grocery store was lost. The market study done as part of research for the UV code changes indicated a small grocery store (like a SPUDS) looks viable if additional housing units are able to be built.

Reality 2) Since the1990's a housing crisis has emerged. State GMA law has changed to allow a mix of housing types in all zones including single family zones. Olympia's Comprehensive Plan and code

has changed to comply with GMA law as well City and Thurston region goals for sustainable transportation, land use and environmental. Briggs UV is a prime opportunity to add additional apartment housing units so badly needed AND that will support the limited amount of commercial identified in the market study.

Reality 3) The additional height recommendations should be supported to maximize the number of units that could emerge. The combination of these additional units may help to making some small scale commercial viable. The result will be the animated UV center originally envisioned.

Reality 4) Mixed use housing/commercial is always more difficult to build. Staff has recommended maintaining the requirement for ground floor commercial/retail space on the 3 street edges directly facing the actual center area (where it is hoped a small grocery and possibly other commercial could prove to be viable).

I ask that you consider relaxing the ground floor uses in the remainder of the expected multifamily area. As noted in the draft this should at the very least be allowed to be live/work space, or common areas related to the housing development. In my opinion these UV undeveloped outer center blocks around the actual center could be successfully developed without ground floor activity. Consider the Briggs Town Center Apartments (I believe the most recently added Briggs UVmultifamily). Additional multifamily housing using this design would be a fine addition the village and achieve the walkability desired.

I send this to you as I felt it was important for you to understand why this Briggs UV code is so very prescriptive. Some were so fearful that just commercial would be developed that no commercial/retail was allowed untill specific amounts of single family and then multifamily were developed. Given the current circumstances it is well past time to make it possible for the remainder of Briggs UV to build out. I am hopeful that the proposed changes will encouarage this to happen without incurring more time and money process cost. I would rather any additional cost by any developer go into well designed buildings.

Thank you for your consideration and for your dedicated service.

Sincerely

Kathy McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA

Mr Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner, City of Olympia 15 February 2025

Subject: Proposed Breach of Briggs Village Development Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

We write as deeply concerned residents of Briggs Village to demand accountability for the recent proposal to replace planned retail developments, including a promised grocery store, with additional apartment complexes. This change is blatantly inconsistent with the original Master Plan and constitutes a direct violation of the commitments made to the community. The proposal raises serious legal and community concerns that require address and resolution.

Breach of Offering Plan

The 2014 Briggs Village Master Plan clearly mandates the creation of a mixed-use district centered around a vibrant Town Square designed to serve as a community hub. This district was intended to balance residential living with accessible retail amenities, including essential services such as a grocery store. The plan's design intent, as described on page 4, emphasized a "lively and varied retail experience" and included "visibility and accessibility for retail tenants" to ensure residents could conveniently access daily necessities without relying on vehicular transportation.

The unilateral intent to replace retail spaces with high-density housing is an egregious breach of these commitments and undermines the principles on which the development was marketed to prospective buyers and tenants. Such a material deviation constitutes a violation of the offering plan and may expose your organization to significant legal liability under Washington State consumer protection laws for misrepresentation and potential "bait-and-switch" tactics.

Impact on Community

1. **Access to Essential Services:** A grocery store and other retail establishments were presented as integral features of Briggs Village, promoting walkability and reducing dependence on cars. Without these amenities, residents are forced to bear increased burdens of time and cost associated with traveling outside the community for basic needs. This failure contradicts the pedestrian-friendly vision outlined in the Master Plan and erodes the quality of life for all residents.
2. **Traffic and Safety Concerns:** The replacement of retail spaces with additional apartment units will significantly exacerbate traffic within the community. The Town Square, as envisioned, was to be a safe, family-oriented gathering place. The addition of high-density housing, combined with the absence of promised retail, creates vehicular congestion that threatens the safety of children and pedestrians, particularly in areas designated for recreation and socialization.

Demands for Action

This current developer's intention demands rejection. We insist that you take the following actions without delay:

1. Provide a detailed and transparent explanation for the abandonment of retail components, including the grocery store, as originally planned.
2. Commit to reinstating the promised retail amenities in alignment with the original design intent and provide a timeline for implementation.
3. Develop and share a comprehensive mitigation plan to address traffic and safety concerns arising from the proposed increase in residential density.

Conclusion

Residents of Briggs Village relied on the representations made in the Master Plan when making significant financial and personal commitments to this community. Current proposed changes represent a flagrant betrayal of these assurances and threaten to irreparably damage trust within the community. We demand that you fulfill your obligations and honor the commitments that formed this development's original foundation.

Failure to address these concerns will leave residents with no choice but to pursue all available legal and regulatory remedies to hold you accountable and protect our community's interests.

We request a written response addressing these concerns within 14 calendar days of this letter's date. The residents of Briggs Village will not tolerate further disregard for our rights and expectations.

Sincerely,

Marcia K. and Franklin A. Wilson

1526 Brighton Way SE,

Olympia, Washington 98501

From: Jon Swanson <jon.swanson@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2025 6:57 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Grocery store and future small shops at Briggs Village

Hello!

I hear that the developer of Briggs Village is filing to cancel the proposed development of small business and grocery store properties along Henderson, near the YMCA.

This would be a poor long term decision for the area, and I am opposed.

(PS: if there's something else I should do here, please let me know. I got a flyer asking me to email the Planning Commission asking it to not allow this)

Thank you,
Jon Swanson
1405 Brighton Way SE, Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Ellen Cavanaugh <emcavanaugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2025 7:35 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Hi Jack,

I have some serious concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Briggs Development. In order to maintain the original vision of the village (and the reason we bought a home here), we cannot increase the height of the buildings in the town square nor reduce it the commercial space as Gordie has proposed.

Gordie has failed to genuinely try to fulfill the original plan; rather, he's trying to make more money with his proposal. I suggest that someone obtain proof about the "recent" interest that Gordie said Spuds has in putting in a store. The date of that interest is prior to their build on Old Hwy 99 in Tumwater. He complains about limited interest but it's his greed that has gotten in the way of completing his commitment to the City of Olympia.

Over and over again, Gordie has violated his own HOA (not holding annual meetings, failing to maintain the community property, wasting water because of unmanaged irrigation lines). He is not genuinely concerned about Olympia or our little village.

Please hold firm and don't accept this proposal. It will degrade the vision, decrease property values, and increase the population density overwhelming schools and streets.

Sincerely,
Ellen Cavanaugh
1608 Bellerive Wy SE
Olympia, WA
360.951.6020

Jackson Ewing

From: Matt Murray, Realtor <matt@pnw-realty.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Support

Hi Jackson,

I am writing in support of the proposed code changes for Briggs Village because they're a practical solution to Olympia's growing need for housing. More homes, including those with ADUs, mean more options for people looking for a place to live, whether it's a home buyer, renters, or families needing more flexibility.

These updates make sense. They help address affordability and increase housing supply, all while making better use of the space we have. Olympia needs more housing, and this is a step in the right direction.

Best,Matt Murray, Realor

Matt Murray, Realtor
Van Dorm Realty

Call or Text 360.259.6315

Website linktr.ee/mattm.realtor

Whats my Home worth bit.ly/3xCT1qQ

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Schaufler
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:36 AM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: FW: Briggs Village Amendments

Please do not reply to this email.

Good morning, Commissioners –
Please see the comments below. The public hearing for this topic is coming up on Monday. Thank you.

Kind regards,
Casey Schaufler (he/him)
Associate Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.753.8254 | cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Jim Lazar <jim@jimlazar.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 8:30 PM
To: Casey Schaufler <cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Briggs Village Amendments

Please enter these comments into the record of the Planning Commission on the Briggs Village proposed amendments.

I am writing in general opposition to the amendments proposed for Briggs Village. It may be possible to craft an acceptable compromise that preserves the current level of retail development, and allows affordable-housing apartments above some of that retail.

I live within a half-mile of Briggs Village, and have since the development was proposed. I carpooled to some of the meetings with Gary Briggs. The pledges that were made by Gary Briggs, in obtaining approval for this Urban Village are not being realized. This leads to a declining confidence in the role of land use planning, resentment by the neighborhood, and possibly some unfortunate changes..

I have served as the Democratic Precinct Officer for Olympia Precinct 235, which includes Briggs Village for more than a decade. I have probably walked door-to-door there more than almost any other person. I've watched it grow, and I've talked with residents. It's a good place, and I hope it will continue to develop in the way that was promised.

I like the idea of having an urban village within easy walking and cycling distance. We occasionally eat at the brewpub, and we ride our trikes through Briggs frequently. But I want what was promised, not what maximizes the profits of the developer. I worked my neighbors to reduce their level of dogmatic opposition, pointing out the benefits of having a pub, a grocery store, a bakery, and some restaurants nearby.

Among the expectations for this development were:

a) A grocery store, restaurants, and other retail establishments;

b) Professional offices over the retail, enabling people to work in our immediate neighborhood, reducing commuting traffic;


c) A mix of roughly equal numbers of apartments, single-family attached, and single-family detached homes;

Yes, the demand for office space is lower, as more people telecommute. Substituting some apartments for some of the professional office may be appropriate. But reducing the retail square footage is NOT appropriate.

Several years ago, the developer asked for a change to eliminate the obligation for professional office over retail; now they want apartments over retail. That was a compromise of the original expectation. Now the developer wants to put three stories of apartments above a much more limited amount of retail. That would be a compromise of the original expectation.

I do not have an objection to allowing additional apartments. But I would listen carefully to the people who live in Briggs Village today on that question. They bought expensive homes on an understanding of the ultimate character of the neighborhood. The are entitled to receive what was promised to them.

While Olympia has a shortage of affordable housing, it does not have a shortage of market-rate apartments, such as those in Briggs Village. In fact, if you walk around Briggs Village, you will see For Lease signs on every one of the apartment complexes, but almost no For Sale or For Rent signs on the single-family or townhouse properties. That is a hint that the market rate apartment market is glutted at the moment. In fact, we have the highest rate of vacancy in a dozen years. At the end of this comment are photos of the for lease signs in Briggs Village.



We do have a shortage of affordable housing in Olympia. And if the Planning Commission supported an increase, above 50%, in the ratio of apartments to other dwellings, it would be responsible to require that any additional apartments allowed be affordable housing: a rate that people can pay with 30% of their income, if their income is 80% of the area median income. Those would be **300 - 500 square-foot apartments, including mostly studio units,** not the current mix of mostly 800 - 1300 square-foot one to three bedroom apartments.

I do have a strong objection to a reduction of the retail square footage. I would love to see a bakery, a Thai restaurant, a Mexican restaurant, and a sandwich shop. These would go well with the pub/pizza place and ice cream shop there now. These are exactly the kind of businesses we anticipated when Briggs was approved. Holding firm on the retail footprint will help to make these kinds of businesses possible.

During the original consideration of the Briggs Master Plan, we were enticed to believe that the Stormans family (Ken Stormans lives just a few blocks from Briggs Village) would be bringing a Thriftway to Briggs Village, and the size limit of 50,000 square feet was designed to accommodate that, but not a Safeway/Haggens size store of 60,000 - 120,000 square feet. The idea was a market that would appeal to those of us who can walk or cycle there, but not so much those who would drive from other areas.

There are other grocery companies that operate smaller stores -- Aldi is one that comes to mind. Their stores are typically under 20,000 square feet, but carry a very wide range of fresh, frozen, produce, and shelf products. Trader Joe's is another smaller-store operator, as is Tacoma Boys. All of these offer a wide enough range of products to serve the local "run to the store" market, and each would also serve some other demand.

This development involved compromise by the community and by the applicant (Gary Briggs). Briggs did not get everything he wanted, and the community came with very diverse interests. The requirement for a minimum level of retail, a minimum and

maximum level of apartments, and a mix of single-family, apartment, townhouse, and senior housing was carefully crafted to make the development work for the developer, the neighborhood, and the future residents.

Today approximately a thousand people reside at Briggs Village. My precinct is one of the largest populations of any in the County. These folks are entitled to the retail services that was promised as a part of their decision to move there. Please do NOT reduce the minimum grocery store size or the total retail square footage. The current developer needs to engage a realtor with expertise in retail and restaurant tenancy. I believe that grocery, retail, and restaurant tenants would be successful in this location.

Finally, I'll note that the Briggs Village management is inattentive to maintenance, and should not be granted approval of changes until they address these maintenance issues. There are more than twenty places where sidewalk heaves create tripping hazards. Despite multiple formal complaints, filed on the City's OlympiaConnect app, these have not been fixed. The trail network has not been maintained. Vegetation in the future retail area (mostly blackberries and Scot's Broom) encroaches onto the sidewalk. The irrigation system floods the sidewalk along Henderson Boulevard. Cars regularly park blocking the sidewalks and bike lanes. The City will not enforce the parking that blocks sidealks, because the "retail streets" remain private, not public streets. We've asked the Briggs Village management to sign these areas to reduce parking blocking the sidewalks, with no response. I've inserted some photos below.

To summarize, I recommend no reduction to the required retail in Briggs Village. Substituting affordable housing apartments above the retail (replacing the originally planned professional office) is probably fine. The allowance of that apartment construction should be concurrent or following the retail development. One way to do that is to hold the square footage ratio of apartments to retail constant, so that each group of apartments can only be built as the retail is built.

I understand that the Friends of Briggs Village has developed an alternative set of amendments. I urge the Planning Commission to give these **equal consideration** to the amendments developed by the applicant and the City Manager's staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lazar

1907 Lakehurst Dr. SE

Olympia, WA 98501

Examples of For Lease signs at Briggs Village, January, 2025


BRIGGS
Apartments
EST 2019
VILLAGE
MOVE IN TODAY!
360.485.5161
BRIGGSVILLAGEAPARTMENTS.COM


NOW LEASING
Copper Leaf
2 & 3 BEDROOM
Luxury Apartment Homes
360.515.5025 · CopperLeafOly@gmail.com



Examples of Unrepaired Sidewalk Tripping Hazards at Briggs Village





--
Jim Lazar
1907 Lakehurst Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98501
360-786-1822

Jackson Ewing

From: Annette Wells <12annettewells@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Fwd: Briggs
Attachments: Outlook-e5pmycqs.png; Outlook-wkxmhf4l.png; Outlook-0ehtcgm0.png

Dear Planning Commission,

We are asking you to honor the original Briggs Village commitment to build a grocery store in our community.

We bought a home 15 years ago in Briggs Village because we wanted to be part of a village, with a grocery store, farmer's market, gathering space, and walkable opportunities to gather, shop, and connect with neighbors.

I cannot even count how many times we talk about a grocery store in our own home, not to mention with neighbors. It's almost daily. We are still holding out hope. It is a significant priority for many of us and one of the main reasons we all bought homes in this community.

We want to walk over and buy groceries for dinners, or grab a coffee, or meet friends on a bench outside the store after a bike ride in our neighborhood.

15 years after purchasing a home in Briggs Village, we now own our home. (Yay!!!) We are nearing retirement and the appeal of a walkable grocery store is on the top of our list of needs/wants.

Please honor the initial city code to build a grocery store in Briggs Village. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Annette Wells & Casey Ward
1432 Harvest Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Briggs Village

Annette Wells (she/her)

Teacher-Librarian

Salish Middle School

Extension 38202 (Please wait 6 rings and if it goes to voicemail, call back or email me)

Currently reading:

[cid:ecf4fe5b-3301-4f5e-a054-eabb2ed986b9]

Just finished:

[cid:cda51954-d965-43a9-89c2-f846988072f3][cid:da7aa492-9ca3-40b0-a9d3-65b563d7c61c]

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

Public records are available upon request under the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW. Unless exempt from disclosure, email communication is a public record that may be disclosed to a third party under the Act.

Jackson Ewing

From: Haley Coughlin <haleyjoy.coughlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:07 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Planned zoning changes

I am a Thurston County resident and I am not interested in the proposed amendments. Briggs village does not need more residential housing. It was meant to be walkable and have businesses with the residences. Thank you

February 19, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

On half of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the Briggs Community), I am attaching a letter signed by 263 community members over the last two weeks.


This letter reflects the great concern of the Briggs Community about the proposed code amendments that would reduce the commercial space in the Briggs Village. The developer has made clear he intends to use these code amendments to allow him to drastically reduce the size of the required Briggs Village grocery store to the size of a mini-mart.

To date the public has **not** had an opportunity to ask the staff and the developer questions about these complex proposed code amendments and what they would mean for Briggs Village and the promised real grocery store. The Planning Commission has not held any meetings/forums/workshops that would allow for such questions and interchange.

These letters request the Planning Commission to reset the comment deadline and hold at least two meetings where the public can ask the city staff *and* the developer questions about the amendments and the intended outcomes. Those meetings may result in the development of solutions that are a win-win for all interests.

Sincerely,

Betty Bailey
The Village Cooperative
1520 Palomino Dr. SE #305
Olympia, WA 98501



February 5, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati
Olympia Planning Commission

Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Commission Members and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the "community") regarding the proposed amendments to the Urban Village ordinance, OMC 18.05. These amendments were developed between the developer Gordie Gill and the staff of Community Development and Planning **without** any outreach to the community.

The proposed amendments would reduce the requirements for commercial space and apparently pave the way for the developer to reduce the planned grocery store (promised over 20 years ago) to a mini mart and substitute more apartments (which are not affordable) in place of a real grocery store.

It is essential that the Planning Commission give the community a fair and reasonable opportunity to ask City staff and the developer questions about these proposed amendments and the reasons for them and to understand the implications for the community. To date no such opportunity has been provided, and the community is being asked to comment on the amendments by February 20, 2025, without having had a chance to get its questions answered and under standard this complex and highly significant changes.

The Planning Commission and City should extend the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public forums or workshops

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
1, 2	Cathy and Rick Williams	4632 Village Ct SE Olympia 98501
3	[illegible]	4629 Village Ct SE Olympia 98501
4	[illegible]	4627 Village Ct SE 98501
5	Jan Black	4623 Village Ct SE
6	[illegible]	4618 Village Ct SE
7	[illegible]	4624 Village Ct. SE
8	Kimberly Couture	4620 Village Ct SE

	Name	Address
9	Susan L. Smith	4614 Village Ct. SE
10	George Smith	4614 Village Ct SE
11	Jon Peterson	4612 Village Drive SE
12	Lisa Peterson	4612 Village Drive SE
13	Miki Conrad	4525 Village Dr SE
14	Robert Conrad	4525 Village Dr SE
15	Will Flora	4470 village Dr SE
16	Darrell Hagney	1505 Yelm Hwy SE DarrellHagney@Gmail.com
17	Bob Dent	1804 Yelm Hwy SE
18	Hannah Kim	1804 Yelm Hwy SE

	Name	Address
19	Pete + Kirsten Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
20	Kirsten Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
21	Maria Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
22	Sharon Krieger	4910 Orvas Ct SE
23	David Krieger	4910 Orvas Ct SE
24	Dera Wallace	5025 Orvas Ct SE
	chordabord@gmail.com	
25	Tim Flotlin	5012 Orvas Ct. SE
26	Kim Flotlin	5012 Orvas Ct SE
27	Diane Williams	5020 Orvas Ct. SE

	Name	Address
28	Scott Reese	5028 Orcas Ct SE Olympia WA 98501
29	Elizabeth Enfield	5036 Orcas CT SE Olympia WA 98501
30	Ben Enfield	5036 Orcas CT SE Olympia WA 98501
31	Dustin Games	5092 Orcas Ct. SE 98501
32	Sara Games	5092 Orcas Ct. SE 98501
33	Heidi Durkee	5045 Orcas Ct SE. 98501 360-292-3658
34	Elyette Weinstein	5000 ORCAS Ct 98501
35	Phil Jones	5000 ORCAS Ct. 98501

	Name	Address
36	Sara Larsen	4935 Orvas Ct. SE
37	Steve Larsen	4935 Orvas Ct. SE
38	Genera Hawkins	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
39	Steve Hawkins	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
40	Arie Dragt	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
41	Cameron Parkerim	1707 Yelm Hwy
42	Christine Ha	4636 Village Dr Se
43	Marsha Lorentsen	4606 Village Dr. SE.
44	Laura Schleyer	303 Wilson St NE

	Name	Address
45	Kristi Ayn Lorentson	4606 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
46	Renee Tedder	4605 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
47	Craig Tedder	4605 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
48	Meegan Cronk	4528 Maple Lane SE Olympia WA 98501
49	Rashaan Ganga	4530 Briggs Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501 rashaan.ganga@gmail.com
50	Katherine Ramirez	4530 Briggs Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
51	Lana Smith	4530 Briggs Dr SE OLY WA 98501
52	Cassandra Lew	4530 Briggs Dr SE 204 Olympia, WA 98501
53	Yana INGRAHAM	4530 Briggs Dr. SE

	Name	Address
54	Stephen INGRAHAM	4530 Briggs Dr. SE
55	Josh Arnett	4580 Briggs Dr. SE. jsharnettmd@gmail.com
56	Martha Perez-Gutie	4526 Briggs Dr SE Apt 102
57	Corey Baum	4421 Briggs Dr SE
58	Samuel Lowe	4401 Briggs Dr. SE
59	SMW	4327 Briggs Dr. SE
60	Richard Ramos	4520 Hayesson Blvd SE
61	Anne Mahrodi	1798 Yelm Hwy
62	Shane Jorgeson-Ramirez	21606 Krupton St

	Name	Address
63	Stephen Lyles	4520 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
64	Pamela Lyles	4520 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
65	Claudia Smith	4515 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
66	Tracy Mahler	4515 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
67	Shannon Sue	4410 VILLAGE DR SE OLY WA 98501
68	MIKE McGAULEY	4410 VILLAGE DR SE OLY 98501
69	MAC ACARADO	4247 MAGNOLIA DR SE
70	Lahela Peterson	1408 Harvest Ave SE Oly, WA
71	Andrew Peterson	1408 Harvest Ave SE Oly, WA

	Name	Address
72	Sarah Skeuris	1748 Iden Hwy E, Olympia 98501
73	Hannah Harrison	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
74	Jefferson Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
75	Melinda Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
76	Dante Harrison	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
77	Melody Harrison Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
78	Casey Ward	1432 Harvest Ave SE Oly 98501
79	Annette Wells	1432 Harvest Ave SE Oly 9850
80	PREM ARORA	1418 HARVEST AVE SE, ~~LACEY~~ OLYMPIA 98501

	Name	Address
81	NATASHA ARORA	1438 Harvest Ave SE, Olympia WA 98501
82	Peter Gallagher	1414 Harvest Ave SE
83	Betty Gallagher	1414 Harvest Ave SE
84	[signature]	1522 Harvest Ave SE
85	Kelly Bowers	1522 Harvest Ave SE
86	Debra Bigelow	4110 Henderson Blvd SE
87	Lisa McLean	1519 Brighton Ave SE
88	Becky McLean	" "
89	Sam Shakespeare	4128 Mary St SE
90	Dario de la Fuente	4117 Mary St

	Name	Address
91	Cricket Construction	4117 Myrtle Ct.
92	Sean McIntosh	4225 Briggs
93	Dr. Avshalom Brock-Levi	4225 Briggs Dr. SE D201
94	Toni Brock-Levi	" "
95	Diamond Redd	" "
96	Matthew Redd	" " E-306
97	[signature]	" " E304
98	[signature]	" " C 301
99	[signature]	E 102

2025, without having had reasonable access to the information necessary to understand these complex and highly significant changes and their purported justification.

It is therefore incumbent on the Planning Commission and City to strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public forums or workshops with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop. Only after those workshops should the Planning Commission and City decide whether to proceed with an ordinance amendment, and if so, then schedule new comment period and potential public hearing.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
Silver Leaf 195	Marion M. Freels	4540 Henderson Blvd SE Apt 316 Olympia WA 98501
196	Trevor T. Sanders	4625 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
197	[illegible]	4625 Village Dr SE, Olympia 98501

	Name	Address
100	Jessica Brown	C301
101	Melissa Johnson	1603 Bellevue Way SE
102	Maureen Callender	1535 Bellevue Way SE
103	Andrew Callender	1535 Bellevue Way SE
104	[signature]	1539 Bellevue Way SE
105	Stacey Plumley	1539 Bellevue Way SE
106	Yasmin Rivera	1543 Bellevue Way SE
107	Shawna Purcell	1503 Vineyard Ave SE
108	Wade Ahnzo	1539 Brighton Way SE

	Name	Address
109	WADE ALONZO	1838 Brighton Way SE
110	PAUL MOORE	1532 Brighton Way SE
111	Tami Moore	1532 Brighton Way SE
112	Irene Rickard	4329 Braggs Dr SE
113	David B Merchant	1520 Brighton Way SE
114	Shelley Pilley	1520 Brighton Way SE

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
115	Krista L Brown / Krista Brown	Briggs Dr SE brown.kristalynn@gmail.com
116	[signature] / Chris D. Lovette II	Briggs Dr SE
117	MCross / Melissa Cross	Briggs Dr SE mfcswanson@gmail.com
118	[signature]	Briggs Dr SE poojitran@gmail.com
119	[signature]	Briggs Dr. Youstafa.i.ibrahim@outlook.com
120	Genevieve Baglio	4407 Briggs Dr
121	Woodie Logan	woodielogan@yahoo.com 4405 Briggs Dr SE
122	Maggie Logan	4405 Briggs Dr SE
123	Brenda Neely	4403 Brigg DR SE
124	Richard Humberg	4403 Briggs Dr SE.

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
125	Craig Adair Dale Craig Adair	deadair@comcast.net
126	Lynne Adair Lynne Adair	adairl@comcast.net
127	Wenjuan Zhao	wenjuan0715@gmail.com
128	Alex Ge	yuanlong79@gmail.com
129	Megan Kendall	meganKendall2000@gmail.com
130	Charles Kendall	charlesKendall2000@gmail.com
131	NICK LAWSON	nick_lawson93@yahoo.com
132	KRISTINA LAWSON	" "
133	Levi	Limahmhu@hotmail.com
134	Idan Beyer	1110 South St, SE Turnwater
135	Gary Dilbeck	"
		4160 Village Dr SE

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
136	Hugh Cotton / Hugh Cotton	1441 Harvest Ave SE
137	[illegible] Ernest Merritt	[illegible] Biggs Rd. SE
138	E'Heguse ELIZABETH LEGURE	4135 Maple St SE
139	Walter	1536 Bellerive way
140	Justin Elms	1540 Bellerive Way
141	Dianna Kaiser	1629 Bellerive Way SE
142	Adrienne Kuhn	1625 Bellerive Way SE
143	[illegible]	1605 Vineyard Ave SE
144	Zhan Zhao	1511 Vineyard Ave. SE.
145	Ben Solis	ben.solis@hotmail.com
146	Jeff James	JeffCJames.com
147	CARRIE JAMES	DAYLOC48C HOTMAIL.COM

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
148	Shidong Zhang	1513 Brighton Way SE
149	[signature]	elishia.ski@live.com
150	[signature] Francis Stefanowski	1507 Brighton Way SE
151	[signature] Sandra Albrecht	1423 Brighton Way SE
152	[signature] MATT ALBRECHT	1423 Brighton Way SE
153	[signature] Kelly Aumen	1422 Brighton Way SE.
154	Annika Sandvold	1428 Brighton Way SE
155	[signature] Scott Zylka	1434 Brighton Way SE
156	[signature] Elizabeth Zylka	1434 Brighton Way SE

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
157	[illegible]	4950 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 9850[illegible]
158	(Sharon) Weinberg	" " " " "
159	[illegible]	1007 Survey Trace SE Tum WA 98501
160	Erin Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Oly. WA 98501
161	Levi Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
162	Jonah Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
163	Huckleberry Smith	4510 Village Dr Se Oly WA 98501

	Name	Address
164	~~Dennis~~/ Susan McDonald	4619 Village Ct SE Oly 98501
165	Dennis McDonald	4619 Village Ct SE Oly 98501
166	Jeffahny Magadey	4410 Village Dr SE Oly 98501
167	Andrew J Krawczyk	4500 village Dr SE, olympia WA 98501
168	Casey Gathman	4500 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
169	Catherine Goering	4480 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
170	Galen Smith	4510 village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
171	K. Flynn Kyle Flynn	4510 Village Dr. SE Olympia, WA 985
172	Dorothy Gathman	4580 Village Dr SE WA 98501

	Name	Address
173	Tim Baker	4611 Pheasant Chase SE Olympia 98501
174	Sarah White	4620 Village Cir SE Olympia 98501
175	Norah White	4620 Village Cir SE Olympia
176	Chris Mathwig	4630 Village Circle olympia
177	Tess Clapp	4621 Village Circle Olympia
178	Melyay Clapp	4621 Village Circle Olympia
179	David Dunlap Jr.	4611 Village Circle SE Olympia, WA 98501
180	David Dunlap III	4611 Village circle SE olympia wa, 98501
181	Asher Zeitlin	4424 Village drive SE

	Name	Address
182	Frances Davis	4615 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
183	Thom Davis	4615 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
184	Paul Flock	4470 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
185	Sarah Jones	4302 Magnolia Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
186	TONYA KEHOE	4302 MAGNOLIA DR SE OLYMPIA WA 98501
187	Mall Farwell	4477 Harvard Ave SE Olympia WA 98501
188	Heather Coughlan	4250 Maple St SE Oly WA 98501
189	WYATT Palmer	4225 Briggs Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
190	Kristin Palmer	4225 Briggs Dr SE Olympia WA 98501

	Name	Address
191	Donald Stenhope	4225 Briggs Drive
192	Sara Hursley	4225 Briggs #163
193	Robert Seals	1519 Brighton Way
194	Emma Seals	1519 Brighton Way

understand these complex and highly significant changes and their purported justification.

It is therefore incumbent on the Planning Commission and City to strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public workshops with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop. Only after those workshops should the Planning Commission and City decide whether to proceed with an ordinance amendment, and if so, then schedule new comment period and potential public hearing.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

* **1520 Palomino Dr SE, Olympia – Village Cooperative of South Sound**

198 Betty Bailey — # 305
Name Betty L. Bailey — Address: 1520 Palomino Dr SE

199 Charles Chester — # 109
Name Charles Chester — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

200 Richard B Sloan — # 209
Name Richard B Sloan — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

201 Laurie Smith — # 219
Name ~~Karen Krause~~ Laurie Smith — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

202 Karen L Krause — # 117
Name Karen L Krause — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

203 Lynn M. Thorn — # 311
NAME — address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
204	Gloria Strait	#204
205	John Hoover (John Hoover)	#210
206	Barbara Hatfield (Barbara Hatfield)	1520 Palomino Dr SE #316 Olympia WA 98501
207	Ivri Messinger (Ivri Messinger)	#315 1520 Palomino Dr SE 98501
208	[illegible] (Peg Chapuseu)	#116
209	Aileen E Gardner (Aileen Gardner)	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #118 98501
210	Toni D. Weaver (Toni Weaver)	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #222 9850
211	Chuck & Barb Soule (Chuck Soule Barb Soule)	1520 Palomino Dr SE #203 98501
212	Mary Ann "Dave Webster (Mary Ann + Dave Webster)	1520 Palomino Dr. S.E. #313 98501

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
213	Mary Martin Blair Name Mary Martin-Blair	# 322
214	Meredith S. Blundell Name Meredith S. Blundell	# 115
215	Joan Neff Name Joan Neff	# 3016
216	David A. Beech Name David A. Beech	#308
217	Thomas E. Ciapusci Name	#116 Address
218	TERESA ANN CIAPUSCI Name	#116 Address
219	Dawn Foreman Name Dawn Foreman	# 104 Address
220	Sally Salzberg Name Sally Salzberg	#212 Address
221	Janice Ramsdell Name	#317 Address
222	Sandra McKinney Name	#301 Address

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

223 Becky Brewer — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #106
Name / Becky Brewer — Address

224 Dave Timbrook — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #118
Name Dave Timbrook — Address

225 Gail Wood — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #314
Name — Address

226 Richard E. Lince — 1520 PALOMINO DR SE #309
Name Richard E Lince — Address

227 Mark Rumple — 1520 Palomino Dr. SE, Olympia #315
Name Mark Rumple — Address

228 Martha Shinners — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #207
Name Martha Shinners — Address

229 Jerry Locke — 1520 PALOMINO DR. SE #202
Name — Address

230 Carol Perry — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #323
Name — Address

231 Ann Schwerchter — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #120
Name — Address

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
232	Joan Halverstadt #121	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501
233	HARMON EATON	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501 #103
234	Mary Ellen McKain	#221 1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia 98501
235	DALE WENZELBURGER	#220 1520 PALOMINO DR SE OLYMPIA 98501
236	John Allen	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501 #112
237	Jane VanDuathon	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #215 Olympia, WA 98501
238	Beverly Hutnik	1520 Palomino Dr SE #216 Olympia WA 98501
239	Lynn Kinzie	[redacted] 1520 Palomino Dr. SE #218 Olympia, WA 98501
240	Ruth Aetzel	" #319

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
241	Bill + Joan Quant Bill Quant Joan Quant	1520 Palomino SE #122 Olympia WA 98501
242	Gail O'Grady Gail O'Grady	#304 "
243	LaDonna West LaDonna West	#110 1520 Palomino Dr. S.E. Olympia, Wa. 98501
244	Teresa Dorian	1520 Palomino Drive SE #108 Olympia, WA
245	THOMAS DROZCI Thomas Drozci	1520 PALOMINO DR SE #219 OLYMPIA, WA 98501
246	Frances/John Scott	1520 Palomino Dr SE 201, Oly
247	Janice Welker Janice Welker	" " " #214
248 249	Mike + Jerrie Armstrong Name Armstrong	1520 Palomino DR SE #307 Address Oly.
250	Douglas Ringenbach	1520 Palomino Dr. SE Olympia, WA 98501 #310
251	Barb Dorn Barb Dorn Doug Ringenbach	Address

252 Carol Woodward — Name
774 Calvary Ct SE Tumwater 98501 — Address

253 [signature] — Name NELSON R GOETZE
1520 PALOMINO # 302 — Address

254 Nancy Cordell — Name Nancy Cordell
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 223 — Address

255 Joan Quant — Name Joan Quant
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 122 — Address

256 Cynthia K. Toft — Name Cynthia Toft
1520 Palomino Dr. SE Unit #111
Olympia, WA 98501 — Address

257 Penelope Locke — Name
1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly # 202
98501 — Address

258 Susan DuPon — Name Susan Dupron
1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501 Unit #312 — Address

259 Robert J Colella — Name Robert Colella
1520 Palomino DR SE #211
OLYMPIA, WA 98501 — Address

260 Kelly McLaughlin — Name Kelly McLaughlin
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 111
Olympia WA 98501 — Address

261 ~~285~~	Ben Fall	4460 Village Dr SE, Olym
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
262 ~~284~~	Larry Trout	4440 Orva Ct SE Olym
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
263 ~~285~~	Kris Norelius	4460 Village Dr SE, Olympia
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email

Jackson Ewing

From: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 3:35 PM
To: Aaron Sauerhoff; Daniel Garcia; Gregory Quetin; Raphael Garcia; Tammy Adams; William Hannah; Zainab Nejati; Jackson Ewing; CityCouncil
Subject: Transmission of pdf of the Letter to PCmember, the City Council, Ewing
Attachments: 2.19.25 letter & signatures for Planning Commission, City Council, Jackson Ewing.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

On behalf of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the Briggs Community), I am attaching a letter signed by 263 community members over the last two weeks.

This letter reflects the great concern of the Briggs Community about the proposed code amendments that would reduce the commercial space in the Briggs Village. The developer has made clear he intends to use these code amendments to allow him to drastically reduce the size of the required Briggs Village grocery store to the size of a mini-mart.

To date the public has **not** had an opportunity to ask the staff and the developer questions about these complex proposed code amendments and what they would mean for Briggs Village and the promised real grocery store. The Planning Commission has not held any meetings/forums/workshops that would allow for such questions and interchange.

These letters request the Planning Commission to reset the comment deadline and hold at least two meetings where the public can ask the city staff *and* the developer questions about the amendments and the intended outcomes. Those meetings may result in the development of solutions that are a win-win for all interests.

Sincerely,

Betty Bailey

The Village Cooperative of South Sound

1520 Palomino Dr. SE #305

Olympia, WA 98501

PS: A paper copy of the attachment has been hand delivered to the reception desk of Olympia City Hall. Also please note that signatures 195 to 197 are located out of order directly after 108.

Betty Bailey
360-915-7935

Jackson Ewing

From: Nick Faller <nfaller89@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking concerns

Currently with the existing parking infrastructure it can be quite difficult for elderly or disabled people to access the entry of the YMCA. YMCA serves a great deal of elderly clients. Typically there is no parking on the entry side of the building available leaving the side street or street behind the YMCA the only option.

It should be noted that the grade along the side of the building are not ADA compliant and are greater than 2% which is state and national code. This distance is a rather far walk for elderly.

Further parking reductions will have severe impacts to the usability and access to the YMCA. The YMCA is an important community collector and incubator. In anything parking should increase.

Currently there is not enough parking for a building that could hold hundreds of occupants at a time. There is less than 50 parking spots available and those spots are shared with other neighboring buildings.

An urban assessment, including parking and traffic study should be conducted to to justify number of required spaces with future planning.

Best,
Nick Faller

Jackson Ewing

From: laurenmhovey@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:13 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Keep the Urban Village zoning

Keep the Urban Village zoning and do not alter the Briggs Village Master Plan!

Lauren Hovey

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Kris Norelius <krisnorelius@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: COMMENTS RE: 18.05 MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING URBAN VILLAGES

Dear Mr. Ewing, Planning Council Members and City Council Members

I live in Sten Village, a neighborhood approximately 4 blocks from the Briggs Village, which my husband and I see as an extension of our own neighborhood. We utilize the Briggs YMCA on a nearly daily basis, frequent the Fika coffee shop, and enjoy the Humble Cow ice cream and Briggs Taphouse. We go on our nightly walks through Briggs Village, and often marvel at how these new businesses are thriving. When we walk by we often see people we know from our Sten Village or other nearby neighborhoods like The Farm, Orvis Court and The Village Cooperative, enjoying these establishments. And most of the people have walked to enjoy these amenities. The scene emits a true sense of community.

I am writing to for two reasons: First, to ask that the Planning Commission's schedule for reviewing the proposed amendments to the 18.05 Municipal Code related to urban villages be adjusted in order to extend the timeline and provide more opportunity for input. To date, we have had no opportunity to ask the developer and the city staff questions about this complex process. The community needs more time and opportunity to understand the details of these amendments, ask questions to city staff and the applicant, and offer input. It is particularly important that the planning commission hear the wishes of Briggs Village and surrounding areas, regarding downsizing the commercial to allow reducing the size of a grocery store.

Second, I write to tell you we want the grocery store that the city promised when the community went along with the Briggs development over 20 years ago. It is evident to us it will flourish like the existing businesses in Briggs Village. We need a store much bigger than the mini-mart the applicant wants to amend the zoning code to make possible. The proposed Urban Village code amendments are extremely concerning. Decreasing the current required commercial space for the purpose of reducing grocery store footage from 30,000 sf to 2,500 sf and thereby allow the grocery parking and grocery store footprint to be converted into residential units is shocking, given the city's prior commitment to having a grocery store in the village. A real grocery store will thrive like the YMCA, Starbucks, Humble Cow and Briggs Taphouse. Thousands of people live within easy walking distance, and another thousand will be living in the homes and apartments planned to be built in Briggs Village. A REAL grocery store that actually has the range of foods to make a meal will be the go-to shopping location for us and much of our community. And bringing in more retail and services will only increase the utilization of the grocery store with many of the customers arriving on foot or bicycle!

Years ago, when Olympia shared the plan for an Urban Village, I felt a true sense of pride that our city was creating a walkable community where neighbors and friends can eat, shop and recreate. I knew the research showed that an Urban Village is a recipe for physical and mental wellness, a sense of belonging and social connection. The Briggs Urban Village has made strides to be that community. Please provide an opportunity for more input and do NOT move forward on the amendments to 18.05 as is. Doing so will squander the progress that has been made.

Sincerely,

Kris Norelius

Jackson Ewing

From: Denise Garoutte <dgaroutte@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:20 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning

I am writing to request that the current zoning requirements for Briggs Village remain the same.

I am a senior citizen who uses the Briggs Y and it is difficult to find close parking as it is without this change.
If this change requires parking further away I will no longer be able to use the Y.
Thank you for your consideration,
Denise Garoutte
Tumwater, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: carol@reachone.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village - Do Not Amend the Original Briggs Village Master Plan

I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to the original Briggs Village Master Plan. Please do not decrease the required commercial space in Briggs Village, an urban village. I understand the goal is to increase residential density, which should not come at decreasing the urban village of Briggs. The balance for residential housing and all the amenities of the Briggs urban village were finalized, with input from various stakeholders. The amendments would take away the essence of what makes Briggs Village a pleasant, special space. My husband and I have looked to downsize and move to that area. If these changes occur, then we may not continue to see it as a preferred option.

Parking would be adversely affected by this amendment, which would make it even more difficult to get into the Y, which is an essential community resource. It is now quite nice as it is walker friendly, encouraging some of us elderly to get out there and move to stay healthy.

Please do not alter the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Welch, PhD
Felix D'Allesandro

Jackson Ewing

From: craig burley <craigburley1@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Public Comment on proposed Amendments to Urban Village and Briggs Village

Dear Olympia Planning Commissioners

We attended the January 27, 2025, Planning Commission meeting to listen to the proposed amendments to the city code for definitions of an urban village and changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. We understand that the Planning Commission is addressing the urban village requirements at this time and will focus our comments on those proposed changes.

After listening to the presentation from the developer and reviewing the documents we are concerned and opposed to the proposed changes as they would significantly alter the Briggs Village – the first and only urban village in Olympia. Specifically, We are opposed to the following:

Reducing the minimum amount of commercial space,

A change in the percentage of single-family homes withing the neighborhood from 50% to 15%,

To allow buildings facing the town square to be four stories instead of the maximum of three stories,

rooftop courtyards to count as open spaces, and

Elimination of the maximum housing density requirements.

These proposed changes seem to be designed to maximize profit for the developer and will have a negative and permanent impact on our neighborhood. Our family moved to the Briggs Village in 2010 based on the promises expressed in the Briggs Village Master Plan. To alter the intent of an urban village based on the request of a developer outside the country to maximize the density of housing and profit at the detriment of the families that live in the neighborhood is egregious.

Please don't pass these amendments. They will forever alter the intent of the Briggs Village and will fundamentally change the look and feel of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Craig and Margaret Burley

1544 Bellerive Way, SE

Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Alice H <ahara1618@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Regards to Parking Situation at Y Brigg Village

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to convey my concerns regarding the potential reduction in required parking spaces at Brigg Village.

In light of the significant residential development in the area, I firmly believe that the existing parking infrastructure is insufficient to meet the needs of residents and businesses. The scarcity of parking options has resulted in residents parking on both sides of the road, causing congestion and safety issues.

I strongly encourage the committee to reassess the proposed decrease and prioritize the creation of a safe and accessible community with adequate parking facilities. Thank you for considering my perspective.

Best regards,
Alice

Jackson Ewing

From: ejacob4 <ejacob4@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns about Briggs YMCA Parking

Hello,

I'm an instructor at both Plum and Briggs YMCA locations. I'm also a parent of a child who regularly utilizes the Y for kid zone, climbing wall, and swim lessons.

I'm regularly at the Y after school hours and on Saturdays. Parking is almost always full. As an employee I try and park over by the coffee shop or even by Briggs Taphouse anyway.

At times I have no other choice. Taking away current Y spots at Briggs will only clog up the residential streets and the small parking lot of the several businesses next to the Y. Please find a different way to support residential housing. Thank you.

Erin Jacobson

Jackson Ewing

From: Anna <ymcanna@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking issues

Please leave the plan intact, as originally planned.

I am opposed to the proposed change!

“Do today; what you want tomorrow to look like…”
Anna

Jackson Ewing

From: Kibbe <lindsey.kibbe@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:40 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns on YMCA parking

Hi,

I live in the neighborhood near Briggs neighborhood. In the summer I can walk to the YMCA but in thr winter it's not safe. Already there is not enough parking spots in the winter during busy YMCA times. Cutting more parking would make it difficult to access the community activities we do at the Y. I'm emailing you to keep in mind parking needs in the dark winter months.

Thank you,
Lindsey Kibbe

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen <bbhalcyon@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: YMCA, Briggs, Parking and potential changes

Parking is already at a premium at the YMCA! Do not do not do not allow changes to further impact the ability to find a parking place here by making changes to the existing agreement.

Karen Maurer 360-790-0566

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Crawford <nancrawf@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: proposed zoning amendments for Briggs Village Master Plan

Dear Jackson Ewing and Olympia Planning Commission,

I am concerned about the proposed zoning amendments in the Briggs Village Master Plan to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space. The original Urban Village zoning and Briggs Village Master Plan aimed to support a walkable community. The proposed zoning amendments will lead to fewer services in Briggs Village and definitely substantially increase the pressure on parking.
As a frequent, if not daily, user of the Briggs YMCA, I am already aware of the existing traffic and parking difficulties. The parking lot is often full, and it is difficult to find a nearby parking space.
I respectfully ask that you keep the current zoning requirements for the Briggs Village development in order to respect the balance between residential growth and community services.
Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
Nancy Crawford

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Holdgate <nholdgate@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning/parking

Please keep the current zoning in place. Parking is already a challenge.
Thank you,
Nancy Holdgate

Yahoo Mail - Email Simplified

Jackson Ewing

From: Marg We <marg.we52@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village development

I am a senior who uses the Briggs YMCA on a regular basis. Parking can be very challenging at the YMCA and in the surrounding area. I am an advocate for using public transportation, but the bus service to this area is not set up to be convenient for getting from where I live on the westside of Olympia to the Briggs YMCA. Any decrease in parking in the area will be detrimental to those who use the YMCA. Please consider this as you consider changes to the current zoning requirements.

Jackson Ewing

From: Mary Chapman <mmchap99@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:20 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs master plan

Good evening, Mr. Ewing,
My husband and I moved here from University Place last spring because we had heard that Olympia was developing smaller communities through the city. We live less than a mile from the Briggs area, and are members of the YMCA there. Parking is already difficult, and more building without more parking would not be helpful. I encourage you to fully develop the Briggs area with a grocer, as well as provide adequate parking for everyone.
Many thanks in advance—- Mary Miller Chapman

Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Kade Rucker <kader212@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs zoning changes

Hi,

I'm simply a concerned citizen writing to implore you to reconsider making changes to the original zoning plan for the Briggs Village development. My family actively attends the YMCA and a few of the local businesses on a regular basis. Parking is already difficult during afternoon/evening hours at the YMCA and if any changes are made that would further restrict parking availability it would become much less enjoyable for us to utilize the Briggs village community. Please take careful consideration with any plans to ensure that we all still have sufficient access to the amenities we enjoy (and pay for). Thank you.

Jackson Ewing

From: Carol Ridenhour <carolriden@centurylink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking

I am writing as concerned about availability of parking for Briggs YMCA. Currently at peak hours in evening, after work it is already difficult to find a spot. Taking my three grandkids to swim lessons and parking three blocks away one time at six pm unpleasant.

The YMCA is used by multiple people in community with the majority driving vehicles, not walking to facility. It would be a shame to change zoning resulting in less parking available. This would create problem of YMCA customers parking in apartment building lots which already have signage up regarding towing if not resident.

I am requesting zoning not be changed around YMCA as concerned this create inadequate parking. In fact it would be great if more parking slots were made available for the YMCA members.

Sincerely,
Carol Ridenhour

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Meradith Thayer <meradiththayer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Keep Briggs the Way It Is!

Hello,

I am a resident of the Briggs community and request that the proposed changes do not occur.

Briggs currently is a lovely community that would do so well with the promised grocery store and green spaces.

Adding more apartments to this area does not make sense, as all of the apartments are constantly leasing units and are not full. Stores & other restaurants are really what will bring more people to this area.

Thank you,

Meradith

Jackson Ewing

From: Tara Sarsfield <tara.sarsfield@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Parking

Hello,

I am very concerned to hear about the proposed changes to the zoning of Briggs Village. Our kids do activities at Briggs YMCA and parking is already extremely hard to find. Changes to zoning would have such a negative impact on the community and cause distress to adults and kids. Please keep current zoning requirements for the Briggs Village development.

Thank you,
Tara Sarsfield

Jackson Ewing

From: Jared Mason-Gere <jmasongere@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:37 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed Briggs village masterplan

Greetings- I'm writing with concerns about proposed changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. Olympia is already, in opinion, a very oddly laid out town with a lot of bifurcated and separated neighborhoods without good access to groceries, neighborhood bars, coffee shops, etc. It is largely very car dependent. It strikes me as very shortsighted to exacerbate that and reduce the opportunity to create more mixed use in locations that would support it. I also believe Olympia is a difficult place to navigate and a difficult place to park. It also has a shortage of community gathering spaces, fitness centers, etc, so I have a lot of concern about decisions that could reduce access to those thriving community and fitness centers that do exist. I hope you will work hard to support existing facilities and encourage expansion of more mixed use, walkable neighborhoods with more easily accessible "third places" and start over on the revisions to the Briggs Village plan.

Thank you

Jared Mason-Gere
1918 Mark St., Olympia

Jackson Ewing

From: gailcg@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Planning for the Briggs complex

I am a long time resident of Olympia and a member of the Briggs YMCA. I am not very familiar with the planning process or issues related to the Briggs community, but I do know that the YMCA is a tremendous community asset for community members throughout the region. Reducing parking near the Y will not only cause congestion and potential accidents, but also it will be a disincentive for people to stay healthy and active. I urge you to consider these issues before making changes to the plan.

Gail Gosney Wrede

"There can be no daily democracy without daily citizenship."

February 16, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Olympia Planning Commission
Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Mr. Quetin and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as officers of the Ward Lake Neighborhood Association (WLNA) regarding the amendments to the Briggs Urban Village Ordinance (OMC 18.05) proposed by the developer Gordie Gill.

It is our understanding that these amendments would reduce requirements for a grocery store and other commercial space, increase residential density, and reduce open space.

We believe that these changes are contrary to the initial vision of the "village" and would adversely affect current Briggs residents. We are also concerned that they would worsen congestion in the area. And, finally, we are concerned about potential adverse impacts on Ward Lake.

We ask that the Planning Commission and City strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule additional public forums with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes and their potential impacts.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Field, WLNA President,
2000 42nd Ave SE, Olympia 98501

Jane Field

Sandy Nelson Lane, WLNA Treasurer
4125 Ward Lake Court SE, Olympia 98501

Sandy Nelson

John Bauer, WLNA Secretary
4115 Ward Lake Court SE, Olympia 98501

John Bauer

Jackson Ewing

From: Charlene Cruz <charlenebcruz@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 9:00 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Charlene Cruz
Subject: Reconsider Briggs Village

Hello Mr. Ewing,

I am reaching out in OPPOSED to the newly proposed zoning amendments that will affect Briggs Village. When my family and I moved to our single family home almost eight years ago, we were under the impression that Briggs Village will be of mixed use, with both business and residential "shared space." We have seen the rapid growth in our area with several town homes, apartments, and the recently added Olympia Pediatric Dentistry building anchoring Briggs Tapp House and Humble Cow Creamer being built. It was a welcome change and a good balance. But, with the newly proposed zoning of adding "dense" housing ie more apartments in such a small confined space, we feel that it will create heavy traffic, parking issues, and over crowding. This new proposal is misaligned and disproportionate to the original plan of an "urban village." Briggs Village has fostered a community where neighbors treat each other as family and children can walk and play freely on the streets knowing it is safe. Briggs Village is OUR HOME and this is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Charlene and Raul Cruz

Jackson Ewing

From: Sara Baker <saratinabaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 9:14 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello!

My name is Sara, I am an active daily user of the Briggs YMCA location. I am writing to say I would that I feel strongly the Briggs Village zoning should not be changed. The Briggs YMCA was the first place I felt welcome as a new parent and new resident of Olympia after we moved here in 2024. It is one of the only gyms with its vast services that also has on site childcare. Due to how many classes, activities, and the strength of its weight and cardio rooms, the shared parking areas of the Y as well as the Briggs Taphouse area are usually full, especially at peak hours or hours I am able to go with my daughter.

As it is already difficult to park there due to the demand, I feel strongly that it should not be made to be more difficult by changing the zoning of the Briggs Village area. The Briggs Y is impactful in the community. It supports the physical and mental health of all those who frequent it and for me personally, it has created a huge sense of home and community. For there to be an additional barrier to being able to go there each day by making an already tenuous parking situation worse, would be detrimental. Please consider keeping the zoning as it stands and not making any changes that would negatively impact the community.

Thank you for your time. I hope you will consider my perspective!

Sara

Jackson Ewing

From: kelly Allsup <allsupkl22@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 10:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking near Briggs village

is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

As a regular visitor to the ymca, dentist, ice cream shop. If the number of available retail parking spots are reduced it will impact the ability to utilize and support the business in the area

Kelly

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Jill T <jilllynn1984ig@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 10:18 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed changes to the Briggs Village development

To whom it may concern,

I am writing today to voice my concerns about the proposed changes to the Briggs Village development. The proposed changes would greatly impact my mental and physical health. I attend the YMCA as a 40 year old disabled female. I heavily rely on the community programs for social engagement and mental and physical well-being. This YMCA is ten minutes away from me and such a blessing to have for the community.

The current parking lot for the YMCA is already small and can be tricky to find a place to park. Maple lane leading to the YMCA is already narrow and hard to navigate with parking on both sides of the street. There is also no stop sign at Orchard and Maple, and there is usually a car parked right at the corner. If the proposed changes of more residential communities and a grocery store happened I do not see how I would be able to access the YMCA as a driver. At the very least, widen the entirety of Maple lane and adding a stop sign at Orchard and Maple should be considered.

Please include these concerns in the upcoming hearing and notes for the proposed changes.

Thank you.

Jill Taylor

Jackson Ewing

From: Jill T <jilllynn1984ig@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 6:48 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village

I am requesting that the current zoning requirements stay in place for Briggs Village. If not, it will be detrimental for me to access the ymca, which play a vital role in my daily well being.

Jill Taylor

Jackson Ewing

From: PHIL SANDIFER <pmsandifer@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 8:12 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Hi Mr Ewing,
My name is Phil Sandifer and I recently bought Townhouse in Briggs Village November 2023. I wanted to voice my concern with some of the proposed changes for the future development. I invested in my property on the assumption there would be a bigger footprint of commercial and retail space being development and single family homes. I am against the proposal to add mostly 4 story apartment buildings. I certainly don't agree with counting rooftop spaces as the percentage of open public space. Im hoping further opportunities for all the Briggs Village residents to voice their concerns.

Phil Sandifer
1405 Harvest Dr Se
Olympia Wa 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Betty Bailey; Dave Merchant; Andrew Peterson; Kris Norelius; Aaron Sauerhoff; Daniel Garcia; Gregory Quetin; Raphael Garcia; Tammy Adams; William Hannah
Subject: Please reschedule the Feb 24 Hearing—notice confusion
Attachments: 23-0313 Notice of hearing 2-24-2025.pdf

Jackson, after I got an email last night from the YMCA informing us that the OMC amendments hearing is scheduled for this coming Monday, February 24, 2025 at 6:30, I went back and reread the email notice you broadcast on Friday, February 14 (which is below).

I confirmed that your email notice in fact states that the hearing is scheduled for January 27, 2025. At the time I got your email on February 14, I thought you had accidentally resent your old notice, so I ignored your email. But last night when I scrolled down past your email text, I noticed you had attached a formal Notice at the bottom of the email.

Your email of February 14 did not refer to an actual notice that is attached below to your email, so I had not scrolled down to find one.

Under the circumstances, due to this confusion, please reschedule the hearing from February 24 to the next Planning Commission meeting in early March. Please discuss this immediately with the Planning Commission members and let us know the decision so we can plan accordingly. Rescheduling will benefit the process by allowing the Commission Member more time to digest the comments.

If you do reschedule, please also provide notice that the comment period is extended to 5:00 pm on the day of the hearing, as you have done for hearing on Feb. 24.

Thank you, Brian

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Date:** February 14, 2025 at 10:24:05 AM PST
> **Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages**
>
> Good morning,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code

amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:29 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Jackson,
I misread your email below that mistakenly announced the upcoming hearing as January 27th, and marked it in my calendar for February 27th. Now I learn that the hearing is set for February 24th. Given the confusion of dates, what should be done?

Betty Bailey
360-915-7935

On Fri, Feb 14, 2025 at 10:24 AM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Good morning,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.
>
> A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
>
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
>
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

Jackson Ewing

From: John Montrose <jumontra@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning change

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I'm contacting you because I believe the existing zoning law should remain as is. Allowing for more apartments in Briggs Village will make an already tight parking situation worse. Thanks for your consideration.

John Montrose

Jackson Ewing

From: larry.r.cowan@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed amendments Briggs Village

I am opposed to the proposed amendments that aim to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, including Briggs Village. This change will strain our existing parking infrastructure, which is already under pressure, and impact your daily access to the Y and surrounding businesses.

Please vote no!

Thank you,

Larry Cowan

Jackson Ewing

From: Linda Malanchuk-Finnan <lryh@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:11 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking and changes in requirements

I am opposed to changing parking requirements to reduce those available to business and facilities of public need. I am elderly retired and have been using Briggs to avail myself of the Silver Sneakers and other insurance/healthcare options which cover the cost of gym use. I have fallen twice in the past and am using various exercises and balance training to avoid another. My husband and I drive to Briggs from Castlewood near McKinney school. All my health care providers tell us to exercise. Well we are trying to do that but sometimes the parling lot at Briggs is already very full. We have tried different times of the day. Briggs is very highly used a lot of the time. If there are even fewer parking spaces, we will find it even MORE difficult to get a spot and that will make it harder for us to exercise there with the machines. Don't make a new policy on parking because it sounds good to housing enthusiasts but hurts seniors in a real way.

Linda Malanchuk-Finnan
3122 2^{8t}hAve SE
Olympia, WA 98501
360-357-7272
lryh@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Diane Rosado <dianegetchman@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village - proposed amendments

I am responding to the notice of a proposed amendment to the city code that would reduce the requirements for commercial space.

It's my understanding that the developer of Briggs Village claims there isn't real demand for retail/grocery in Briggs. My experience has been the complete opposite of this claim. The current businesses that are in this space are overflowing with customers of which we are ourselves. The many people who frequent these local businesses are begging for additional local commercial business. We have heard there is high interest for another brew house and a store, to include Spuds Produce.

Using this valuable commercial space for more apartments will not enhance the area, only the developers pocketbook. As a 15 year resident, I would ask that the original agreement for this space is honored and respected. The demand is there.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Respectfully,
Diane Getchman Rosado

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Siminski <777skypilot@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: the YMACA and Brigg master plan

I am a retired CPA. At one point was Briggs accountant when planning the development, and participated in their intentions. And was a contributing founder of the Briggs YMCA. I go way back.

The Y was an early adopter of the Briggs hoped for walking community, with local stores, neighborhood grocery within walking distance, with exercise within walking distance. It was and is a hallmark of more density, affordable housing, and close to work, with bus service. It remains a very valid objective for the future. For the residents and the community at large. It should remain as zoned, remain as intended.

In fact you should allow for entrance from Henderson, (no exit?) to make less congestion within the development and less car traffic, as it was originally planned.

Jackson Ewing

From: Ryan Krapp <crappie77@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Greetings Mr. Ewing,
I know there are and have been many pressures and challenges in the development of Briggs Village. As a frequent (2x weekly) visitor to the YMCA, and at least 1x month to Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow (as well as the Olympia Pediatric Dentist) I implore you to not stray too far from the original vision. It is a great location for us residents within the 2-mi radius to go and enjoy. As things may need to change a bit, please extensively consider the challenges of traffic and parking. Shared spaces near the existing businesses are already needed.

Has there been consideration of something like the Rockwood Market Hall or
I understand this is probably not as profitable as housing would be to a developer, but would be a great addition to the City of Olympia!!

Thanks for your time and your service to Olympia!

Ryan Krapp
2847 45th Loop SE, Olympia, WA 98501
701-471-8788

Jackson Ewing

From: Malynda Murphy <malynda3m@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: P}l to} zoning

Good after noon, Mr. Ewing,

I am writing my express my concern with the parking ordeal at the Briggs YMCA. I have a 4 year old daughter, it is often a challenge to get her to and from the overly packed as it is parking lot with out fear of an accident happening.

I'd really miss out on the development of my daughter's physical activities as well as my own if parking was not available.

Thank you for your time and consideration up front.

Respectfully,

Malynda Murphy

Best,

Malynda Murphy

February 20, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati
Olympia Planning Commission

Dear Commission Members:

My name is Andrew Peterson and my address is 1408 Harvest Avenue SE, in Briggs Village, Olympia, Washington and have a PhD. in Criminology, Law & Society from the University of California, Irvine. I spent five years doing quantitative and qualitative research and data analysis for the federal courts in Washington D.C. I moved to Olympia in 2014 to work for the Washington State Center for Court Research and have been performing, planning, and supervising qualitative and quantitative research projects across the state for the past ten years. I have not conducted a market study, like the one provided to the Planning Commission by the developer, but I am well versed in qualitative and quantitative social science research methods. My research on effects of changes to criminal sentencing practices has been cited by the U.S. Congress and my research on victim compensation has been cited multiple times by the U.S. Supreme Court.
I have reviewed the market study provided to the City of Olympia to support Mr. Gill's request for a zoning change. The market study purports to indicate that a grocery store in Briggs Village would struggle to be viable, but I believe there are analytical and methodological errors that, when corrected, may support the establishment of, at least, a moderate-sized grocery story – as the community

already supports the commercial establishments already established. Moreover, this study has a large accountability issue that puts the entire findings into question.

For the sake of full transparency, I am comfortable with proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 that would increase the number of residential units in Briggs Village. I am ambivalent on the ratio of single-family to multi-family units, but, after reading Jim Lazar's letter to the Planning Commission, I believe that we need to encourage affordable, smaller units, as opposed to more market-rate apartments. I am ambivalent on the story limit of commercial/mixed use buildings in village cores. I am against allowing rooftop courtyards to be counted towards open space requirements, as these spaces do not appear to be open to all residents. I am also against the proposed reduction to commercial space requirements, although, for the remainder of this letter, I am focusing on an objective, professional analysis of the market study provided by the developer.

Analytical and Methodological Errors

Decisions made in the study that I will not address.

As I mentioned above, I have substantial experience in complex social science studies using a mix of quantitative and qualitative data, as this study does. However, I have never performed a market analysis to support the feasibility of a commercial/retail property. Therefore, I do not have the experiential basis to contradict the study author's decision-making around several of the choices made in this study. For example, I cannot tell you if the Briggs Village Trade Area (BTVA) is reasonably calculated. Nor can I tell you if the author should have used current BVTA data, instead of data based on the developer's proposed amendments to OMC 18.05. Likewise, I am also assuming the local market conditions, retail real estate, and grocers and food-related retail data cited in the study (pp. 3-17) are

accurate. Although, I would note that they appear to be using Euclidean distances when describing distances to other stores, rather than the actual road miles between the Briggs Village Community and other existing retail.

Retail gap analysis from Exhibit 12 (p. 20)

The Cleveland Avenue Safeway generates almost all of the grocery sales in the BVTA, and the gap analysis appears to consider all of Safeway's revenue to come from the BVTA.[1] The Tumwater Safeway, however, is on the very edge of the five-minute BVTA and a substantial amount of the Safeway revenue must come from residents in the adjacent South Capitol and Tumwater Hill neighborhoods, both of which are outside the trade area. Conversely, the very southern and eastern areas of the BVTA are much more proximate to non-BVTA grocery stores. One might be tempted to call the transference a "wash". However, this may be the single most important analysis in the study and due diligence should have been done to quantify any differences in affected population and expenditure estimates. Given the other quantity and quality of other data referenced in the study, it seems the author(s) would have been able to identify areas of the BVTA that had other grocery stores more proximate to their locations, look at grocery spending in those other stores and extrapolate the amounts, as well as spending at the Cleveland Safeway from non-BVTA residents.

Non-transference assumption

In addition to the population transference, the market study supposes that none of the money spent at current grocery stores in the BTVA would be transferred to a new grocery store built in Briggs Village. It also ignores the likelihood that

[1] No indication occurs in the Market Study that sales for the Safeway were adjusted downward to account for sales to persons in the South Capitol neighborhood.

individuals visiting the neighborhood for existing commercial (the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, Fit Life Studio, Jaymes Paige Hair Studio, iLash and Esthetics, Fika Café, or Olympia Pediatric Dentistry) or recreational purposes (i.e., Kettleview Park and the Briggs YMCA) would stay and grocery shop here, as well. That seems like an obviously false supposition, and I believe any author that can access the data they claim to have accessed for this study could also access economic activity multiplier data for the existing commercial and recreational options within the Briggs Village development. It seems obvious this could have a substantial impact on consumer expenditure in the BVTA.

Possible methodological error in the discussion of Exhibit 13 (p. 22)

In the second paragraph below Exhibit 13, the author notes that the Briggs Village trade area has a larger population than the Gig Harbor trade area – which supports a Harbor Greens store listed at approximately 11,000 square feet.[2]. The author then diminishes the finding by noting the relative trade areas' average household income.[3] However, this metric is largely irrelevant in comparison to the consumer expenditure figure, which goes unmentioned. I cannot understand how household income or per capita spending are relevant to the analysis, when total consumer expenditure is the most significant metric. If the BVTA has a greater consumer expenditure than a location with an 11,000 square foot grocery store that the author considers analogous, why would the author conclude that the BVTA could only, "…theoretically, support a 9,200 square foot specialty grocery store (p. 20)".

[2] Tacoma News Tribune (2017). Local Grocer Harbor Greens holding its own despite being surrounded by big names. https://www.thenewstribune.com/news/business/article177198906.html

[3] The author(s) also make a claim that the Gig Harbor location "enjoys seasonal incremental lifts in sales due to tourism and its convenient throughfare location (p. 22)". However, this statement is not substantiated by any data or other evidence.

The "Analog (sic) Trade Area Analysis" ignores higher numbers of competing grocery retail

As noted above, the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery store within the BTVA. However, each of the three analogue stores that the author uses have significantly more competing stores.

Harbor Greens, Bridgeport Way, University Place (10,300 sf). Google maps indicates 4 major stores around this store: Fred Meyer at 19th and Mildred (1.1 miles) Whole Foods on Bridgeport (0.7 miles), Trader Joe's (1.0 miles) Safeway on Bridgeport (1.2 miles). Although the population around this Harbor Greens is approximately 2.5 times the BVTA, there are 4 times as many competing grocery stores and the two areas have a similar per capita consumer expenditure for food at home.

Harbor Greens (11,000 sf), Gig Harbor. Google maps indicate the there are three competing grocery stores around this store: Fred Meyer (0.2 miles); Metropolitan Market (0.2 miles), and Safeway (0.5 miles). Further, as discussed above, the BVTA has approximately 20% consumer expenditure for food at home (20.8%).

Trade Joe's, Spokane (13,400 sf). Trader Joe's has two stores in Spokane, but the study fails to identify which one is evaluated in the market study. Based on Google Maps images, the Trader Joe's Lincoln Heights location appears to be more similar to the Briggs Village Master Plan (various types of housing and a centralized mix of commercial/retail). This store has three competitive grocery stores within a short distance: Rosauers (0.4 miles), Natural Grocers (0.5 miles), and Safeway (0.6 miles). The Spokane location does have 2.1 times the population of the BVTA, but has 3 times the number of competitive grocery retail and a smaller per capita consumer expenditure on food at home (83.3%).

Given the additional competition of the analogous stores, it seems that the BVTA, theoretically, could support a substantially larger store than the market study suggests.

The single, anonymous real estate broker

The market study states that a single, licensed real estate broker was contacted (p. 17), but does not identify the person, their qualifications, or their potential biases. Anonymity prevents readers from assessing the broker's knowledge of the market, credibility, or even contacting them to confirm information. Again, anonymity falls below any professional standard for reliable, non-journalistic information. I note that, contrary to the reference to "brokers" in the "Key Findings," the text indicates only one broker was consulted.

There is no expectation that one broker represents the consensus or even a majority of opinions for commercial brokers with knowledge of the area. In addition, the interviewee indicated that, "To the extent that the site could serve and support any food and beverage-related retail…a smaller but established restaurant may be feasible." This point is confusing as the market study claims to have been completed on November 27, 2023, but the Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow opened in early 2022 and have done brisk business since then. This leads me to believe that either the real estate broker was not familiar with the Briggs Village area, or they were interviewed prior to February 2022 – making this stale information.

The anonymous "stakeholders"

The study mentions a "discussion with stakeholders" (p. 18), but, once again, provides no information on their identity, knowledge, or relevance to this analysis.

There is one-sentence about this discussion and it only includes their subjective conclusions without supporting data. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the commenters. Again, the use of anonymous stakeholders falls below any professional standard for reliable information. Moreover, their unsubstantiated conclusion is clearly contradicted by the thriving businesses of Starbucks, the Briggs Taphouse, Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, Humble Cow, and Fit Life. Further, the comment ignores the considerable appeal that comes from Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for all of Thurston County.

Author Anonymity

The anonymous, market study author(s)

At no place in the study is the person or persons who authored the study identified or their qualifications stated.[4] Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the author(s) to answer questions, correct errors, and supply missing data. Anonymity of the author falls below any professional standard for reliable analysis. In my 16 years of public sector research, I have never seen an anonymous study used to support a proposal.

Conclusion

Given the unusual nature of this study, I see the planning commission as having two options. You assume that the basic data collection regarding the BVTA was

[4] The only clues to its authorship are two references on pages 17 and 18 to the acronym CAI, "CAI interviewed…" and "CAI aggregated…". A Google search of this acronym found that CAI may represent the Community Associations Institute, a Virginia-based, international think tank and lobbyist group, which does not advertise or publicize market studies on their website.

correct, and the author(s) erred on their gap and analogue trade area analyses in a way that contradicts their conclusions, or you discount the whole study.

I would respect either decision from the Planning Commission and would be glad to discuss the above points at greater length, if Commission members or staff have any questions.

Sincerely,
Andrew Peterson, PhD.

Jackson Ewing

From: NAOMI HYLTON <nhylton52@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village parking

Mr. Ewing,

Please do not alter the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan. Over the years, parking at the "Y" has become an increasing challenge and the thought of it becoming more congested is difficult to comprehend.

Again, please do not alter the existing plan.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Naomi Hylton

Jackson Ewing

From: tjburns7@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Jan Black
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Briggs Urban Village

To Whom it may Concern:

My name is Tom Burns and I have lived in Sten Village (several blocks from the Briggs Property) for the better half of fifty years. When the Briggs Urban Village was proposed over 25 years ago the planned development was to create mixed park space, residential and commercial services, including a Market where folks could go to get fresh food. The idea was to develop a sustainable community where folks could live and work within the Village and have access to a bus line to commute to work limiting car traffic and congestion. The idea was a "walkable community".

Having been a member of the Briggs YMCA since it opened close to twenty years ago, I have found an increase in traffic within the network of streets within the Village as well as limited parking for Folks at the YMCA and adjacent businesses. The proposed amendment to the Village will drastically alter the intent of the original plan by increasing vehicle traffic, increase pressure on current parking and decrease access to the current facilities that now exist. In summary, the proposed amendment will simply be an Urban Sprawl compromising the quality of life that we as residents envisioned in the original plan for the Briggs Village and our nearby community.

I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the commercial space within the Village.

Sincerely,

Tom Burns

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Ward, Psy.D. <drcaseyward@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: CORRECTION NOTICE; RE: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Dear Planning Commission c/o Jackson Ewing

I am requesting that the planning commission continue to honor the original Briggs Village commitment to build a grocery store in our community.

My wife and I bought a home 15 years ago in Briggs Village because we wanted to be part of a village, with a grocery store, farmer's market, gathering space, and walkable opportunities to gather, shop, and connect with neighbors.

I cannot even count how many times we talk about a grocery store in our own home, not to mention with neighbors. It's almost daily. We are still holding out hope. It is a significant priority for many of us and one of the main reasons we all bought homes in this community.

We want to walk over and buy groceries for dinners, or grab a coffee, or meet friends on a bench outside the store after a bike ride in our neighborhood.

15 years after purchasing a home in Briggs Village, we now own our home. (Yay!!!) We are nearing retirement and the appeal of a walkable grocery store is on the top of our list of needs/wants.

Please honor the initial city code to build a grocery store in Briggs Village. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Casey Ward, Psy.D. | Washington State Licensed Psychologist
Phone: 360-970-5027
Fax: 360-991-0304
telehealthservices@caseywardpsyd.com

This electronic message transmission, including any attachments, contains information from, Casey Ward, Psy.D., which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by a "reply to sender only" message and destroy all electronic and hard copies of the communication, including attachments.

On Thu, Feb 20, 2025 at 1:47 PM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Good afternoon,

A mistake was made when routing the public notice via email. The body of the email sent 2/14/2025 referenced a planning commission hearing on 1/27/2025 is **INCORRECT**.

The Planning Commission public hearing will be held on 2/24/2025 at 6:30pm

The attached notice provides details on how to register and review applicable staff reports and attachments.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Jackson Ewing
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:24 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Good morning,

You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Bobby Kendall <charleskendall2000@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:56 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

I oppose amending any codes or changes to the master the plan regarding Briggs village retail space. The master plan has been in place for many years and was available when the current owner purchased the land. Many other areas have been developed and are thriving over the course of the last decade. The current owner's inability to develop the land is not the community's issue. If he is unable to develop the land to requirements laid out by the city, then he should consider selling the land as these requirements were readily available at time of purchase.

The density of Briggs community has grown substantially and is capable of supporting a grocery store, businesses and restaurants. Current business occupants are doing well. To change the codes to appease a developer unwilling or incapable of meeting current requirements would be disingenuous to the current residents of the community who purchased homes based on the master plan.

Charles and Megan Kendall (Brigg Residents)
4109 Seneca St. Se
Olympia Wa 98501

From: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:23 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Good morning,

You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

Jackson Ewing

From: Dave Auvinen <daveauvinen@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning

Mr. Ewing:

We purchased our home in Briggs Village in 2007. One of the most significant factors in our decision to move there was the zoning that led to the creation of a master plan urban village type community. To date, this has not fully materialized to the extent of the original plan as we were told.

Despite falling short of that plan so far, we have been happy with our neighborhood. I believe that it would be a tremendous mistake to alter the original zoning requirements to allow a disproportionate amount of residential to commercial development and would not comply with the type of community that the residents of Briggs Village invested in.

I'm afraid that the proposed changes would result in the loss of the healthy, walkable community in which we desire to reside.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Auvinen

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Ellen Caywood <rmceoc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns with modification of Briggs Village Parking

I want to express my concern with the proposed modification of the Briggs Village Parking plan to reduce the amount of available parking.

I have attended the YMCA for 25 years and there has been an increasing amount of frustration over lack of parking. The lot is often full by early morning and people are parking along the streets.. The way the parking has been laid out currently is pretty limited. To have increased residential and commercial properties developed without adequate parking is only going to intensify the issue.

While having walkable neighborhoods is a noble goal, the reality is many Olympia Area residents do not work in the area near their homes and with limited access to good public transportation most families end up with 2 vehicles. Parking on the street near the apartments and condominiums is already full.

I have known several YMCA members who have given up finding a parking spot and end up just going home. That means they have lost out on their necessary exercise and socialization provided by theYMCA. Some members drive a great distance. Some come fromYelm, Tenino, Dupont and further out Thurston County locations. There is no bus service or walking options for many members.

I feel the Briggs Village Plan was too limited to start with and to think about changing and reducing parking options will be detrimental not only to the YMCA and future businesses.

Please reconsider any changes that would reduce parking options.

Ellen Caywood
3512 48th CT SE
Olympia WA 98501
rmceoc@gmail.com.

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Groenewal <tomgroenewal1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs

Please do not change the parking zoning for Briggs Village. it is already difficult to park for the YMCA. Plus, it would make it more difficult to park when going to Humble Cow ice cream.

Thank you, Tom Groenewal

Jackson Ewing

From: Jason Rolfe <jleerolfe@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Community zoning amendments

Dear Jackson Ewing,

I am writing to express my concern about proposed amendments that would affect the balance of residential and commercial space in urban villages, and specifically Briggs Village, which is important to my family as members of the YMCA there.

Given the strains to parking infrastructure already experienced there, I hope the Olympia planning commission will prioritize maintaining a walkable neighborhood and not alter the Briggs Village Master Plan.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Jason Rolfe
Briggs YMCA Member, along with my wife and 7 year old son.

Jackson Ewing

From: Charlene Didier-Colby <charlenedidiercolby@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: parking at Briggs Y

Hello - I am a member of the Briggs Y and have heard that there is rezoning being considered for Briggs Village that will impact the already lousy parking situation at the Y. I already often have had to walk a couple blocks after parking my car on the street. I am 75 years old and in good health but this really gets old especially on a rainy day. Please reconsider.
Thanks
Charlene Didier-Colby
360-789-4966
5037 Oakmont Place SE
Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Nova Hobbs <novahasemail@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Parking at Briggs Village

Hello,

I'm reaching out to advocate for the original Briggs Village Master Plan. I live less than 5 minutes from briggs village, and regularly use the South Sound YMCA location there. It is already difficult to park when going to the gym. Navigating the parking lot, going in and out, regularly adds 10 or so minutes to my otherwise 5 minute drive. As I drive past the Briggs Villages townhomes regularly, I can confidently say I've NEVER seen all of the street parking full. I regularly find the YMCA parking lot overflowing.

Please, leave the plan as is. We need more business parking, and to keep the neighborhood as walkable as possible.

Thank you for your time,

Nova Hobbs

Jackson Ewing

From: Stephen Gear <stevegear@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:33 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking concerns.

Hello
I am a long time member of the Briggs YMCA in Lacey. I play sports and exercise at this YMCA branch 3 to 4 times every week. I am in my late 60's and the exercise helps with my physical and mental well being. Parking is often congested and I often have to wait until someone departs before I can secure a parking spot. It has recently come to my attention that the adjacent Brigg's village is considering an amendment to increase the number of proposed residential units. The original master plan was designed to accommodate all of the community needs including the YMCA. My concern is related to the already strained parking situation where Y members either have to wait to park and often are forced to park outside of the Y allocated parking in the adjacent streets. I ask that you would record this concern and add it to any other communications you receive that voice similar concerns as mine. Please reject this proposed amendment and maintain the original Briggs village plan.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gear

5744 Red Alder Dr NE
Olympia, WA 98516

Tel 360 561 1089.

Jackson Ewing

From: Jordan Bell <bellja6@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 7:24 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village crowding

hey there.

I am a longtime member at the Briggs Y, and began teaching group classes there years ago. I am also a bicyclist.

I vote NO on additional residential development, as there are already TOO MANY PEOPLE in this area, and they drive WAY TOO FAST.

driving/biking to the Y, as well as parking there, is already complicated by overpopulation & congestion. let's not make it worse.

I request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

cheers,
Jordan

Sent from Samsung Galaxy smartphone.
Get Outlook for Android

Jackson Ewing

From: Carol Tomer <carol.tomer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: carol tomer
Subject: Great concern about impact on parking at the Y

I am writing to express my great concern about any changes in city plans that will impact the available parking at the Y in Briggs Village. Whereas I think the current vision for urban villages needs to be maintained, the most immediate potential impact I'm writing about is the impact on the Y: the available parking.

There have been repeated issues with insufficient parking at the Y. I have experienced this, and I have friends who have experienced this.
In addition, as lead pastor of The Lutheran Church of The Good Shepherd down the street from the Y, I am very aware of the importance of the Y in the community and for the healthy lives of many people.

I strongly encourage you and all of us to make choices to increase the livability of our community, in support of the wholeness of the lives of all citizens.

With gratitude,
Pastor Carol Tomer

Jackson Ewing

From: bruce mcdonald <mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; cronkk@ssymca.net
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan

Hello Jackson Ewing,

We are writing to you about our concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the proposed Briggs Village Master Plan.
It is our understanding that the proposed amendments will increase residential development and reduce planned commercial space and subsequent parking.

We would like to know if there has been data and community involvement that has driven proposed amendments. The background data to help make a decision based on the value and need of an amendment for additional residential development over commercial development would be information such as

1) the existing occupancy rate of the two high density developments at the intersection of Henderson and Yelm Hwy. We are a casual observer, yet it is very apparent that both of these complexes are not to full capacity.

2) an existing travel and parking study of the surrounding commercial businesses. Is there currently adequate parking during busy hours. I can assure that the YMCA currently does not have enough parking during many hours of the day, not just peak use hours.

3) The current existing need for a small commercial grocery store, again a study of the current area residents and how far they have to travel to find food. Will the amendment increase the people density without increasing the ability to live in the area. Are you building a larger food desert for the existing community.

4) Who will benefit from this amendment ?and how ?

5) It is understood that there is a nationwide residential shortage but a few more high-end homes replacing essential services like a grocery store, or pharmacy detracts rather than benefits the existing community.

6) Is this a proposed SEPA Amendment? If so, would it change the prior determination and require mitigation for the proposed amendment? Would the proposal be reviewed again and the public comment period be reopened?

Please share any information with us regarding our questions and add us to communication list on this issue.

We live within 2 miles of the Briggs YMCA and utilize the facility several times a week. We have enjoyed riding our bikes to the businesses of ice cream, and pizza.

Please deny this amendment as it is currently proposed and get more information about what the Briggs Village Area needs to be a thriving community.

Sincerely

Mary and Bruce McDonald
mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Tonya Kehoe <tonyakehoeart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 12:00 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello, I am writing today to leave a comment about something that is really important to me and my family and many of my fellow neighbors here in Briggs Village community.
When we bought our home here last summer, we were told and understood in our paperwork that the center area will be developed with a real, actual grocery store. In addition, some retail and/or places to eat as well. This was a huge factor in buying here in Briggs.
I was given your email to write from a neighbor to declare that as a homeowner, I am adamantly opposed to the developer gaining approval to change the Briggs plans from the full grocery store and retail in the center. I am asking the City of Olympia deciders to not approve this as it is fundamentally the opposite of what we bought into in good faith.
I do not want it full of apartments, or mini mart or whatever shortcuts are being proposed . No, we need the grocery store and other neighbood amenities that were in the original approved plans.

Thank you for recording my comment in the record.

Tonya Kehoe

4302 Magnolia Dr SE
319-400-3297

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Schofield <lschofiel@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 7:20 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Amendments to Briggs Village

Hello,
I cannot make the meeting to discuss plans to amend the current plan of more residential housing in Briggs Village. Originally there was supposed to be a grocery store along with an abundance of shared parking for businesses and residential.
I am against amendments that increase residential use while reducing or not holding to the promise of shared parking for businesses. I will use the Briggs YMCA as my example. I have been going to this business for over 20 years. The current parking has been a disaster for the past few years while making for a dangerous driving condition along the side road leading into the facility. This situation needs to be corrected and this amendment would do nothing but make the situation worse. If an amendment was developed that allowed additional off street parking for the general businesses in the area I could support an amendment. Without corrections to the existing situation, I cannot support amendments.

Larry Schofield
1330 68th Avenue SE, Tumwater
360.628.9592

Jackson Ewing

From: Marge Wieland <wielandmarge@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Development

I am against changing the zoning in Briggs Village. Parking at the Y is very difficult at times now. If the zoning is changed, it will be impossible.
Marge Wieland

Jackson Ewing

From: cathy gilmore <thycamoregil@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Jackson-
I am requesting that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.
The parking situation for the Y is already ridiculous and needs more parking now. We do not need more residential housing! Originally there was to be a Thriftway in this area- all that is there is basically residential housing for seniors. I don't know what happened but I was disappointed not getting the grocery store, and to lose parking, add traffic, lose green space and strain our utilities with more housing is not acceptable.
Thank you
Cathy Gilmore
thycamoregil@msn.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Russ & Mary Pitkin <russandmarypitkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Amendments

Please do not make any changes to the Briggs Village Zoning Plan. What may seem like a good idea to solve one problem ends up creating additional unforeseen problems. Making room for additional housing by increasing residential density will result in a decrease of currently planned commercial space which will increase demand for other infrastructure which then would not be accommodated from within the village area. The imbalance due to the zoning change will cause strain in the surrounding area.

I've seen these planning mistakes take place in other cities and once the damage is done it is irreversible and makes these areas less desirable to live in, not to mention the additional strain on all sorts of surrounding community infrastructure and the tremendous inconvenience to everyone when infrastructure capacity is exceeded and needs to be enlarged just because there was no planning consideration in advance.

Just a few examples: Has the impact of this change been reviewed with the school district for the potential increase to their school populations and do they currently have capacity? This is the responsibility of good community planning. What impact will the increase have on utilities? Is there adequate PSE infrastructure? Is there adequate sewer infrastructure? How will the increased number of personal vehicles impact the existing traffic circulation not to mention the overcrowding of parking that will occur. Is there adequate nearby open space for residents? We are after all animals and we do need outdoor space for ourselves and our pets.

The last place I lived, Portland, Oregon, the planners really messed up badly. They wanted to increase housing density to meet demand. They figured they would develop around existing neighborhoods taking up commercial space with five over one buildings (five stories of apartments over one level of commercial) which surrounded the neighborhoods. Developers talked them into building these 5 over 1 structures without parking so they could minimize costs and save time in construction. The city allowed this because their transit system was large enough to handle the additional load and people living in these structures would not need cars because transit was convenient. People still owned cars to get off for the weekend and on vacations so they totally maximize all curb side street parking in the neighborhoods causing some of the streets to be one directional at a times which really congested traffic at major intersections in the vicinity of these neighbors. This transition total change the character of the neighborhoods. These structures lined both sides of the major thoroughfares creating a canyon-like atmosphere keeping sunlight out at street level for a majority of the day and the old commercial enterprises either relocated or did not reopen destroying the small business community used by residents and the new commercial spaces are mainly vacant. Many of the old always crowded restaurants were on large plots with plenty of parking now under a 5 over one structure. They are gone and what is left is not anywhere as nice or convenient.

February 21, 2025

City of Olympia
ATTN: Jackson Ewing

RE: Comments about Zoning Code Amendments related to Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing:

I am a member of the YMCA and have been a frequent user of the Briggs Village location. My children have also participated in YMCA sporting events that take place at this location.

The Briggs Village YMCA is very popular, and quite busy, particularly at certain times of day and especially on weekends. It is very difficult to find parking near the building during sporting events, outside of just a regular day and I have to park in the overflow area.

My understanding of Briggs Village was that it was conceived as a walkable mixed commercial and residential community with a grocery store and other amenities and that there would be ample parking which could be utilized for all of these purposes.

My understanding is that the amendments you are considering would result in the grocery store being eliminated and instead there would be more units of housing and that the net result of that would be less parking spaces. That result would certainly negatively impact the YMCA and frankly in my opinion, all of Briggs Village.

Finally, before supporting any such amendments to OMC 18.05I'd want to know the following:

1. Clarification on how parking is calculated in the core areas of Briggs Village, inclusive of any shared parking formats;

2. Clarification on how modifications to zoning or the Master Site Plan will not make parking on other underdeveloped sites impossible; and,

3. Clarification on how overflow parking will be addressed in light of the proposed changes to zoning and the Master Site Plan.

Sincerely,

Rozanne Garman

February 21, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

This letter is to explain our reasons for submitting substitute amendments to OMC 18.05, that relate to urban villages. The substitute amendments are contained in both PDF and WORD files attached to the email that transmits this letter.

The substitute amendments were drafted by four of us, Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, and Dave Merchant, who respectively live in Sten Village (adjacent to Briggs Village), the Village Cooperative (kitty corner to the Briggs YMCA), and Briggs Village.

As you know, Briggs Village was created over 20 years ago as the only urban village in Olympia. The key feature of an urban village is that it has a concentration of housing within walkable distance of a village commercial center that offers the basic amenities people need in everyday life. The critical amenity is, of course, a sizable grocery store. Other amenities typically include restaurants, a bakery, first aid, health care, clothing, housewares, hardware, a small post office (some of which might be contained within the grocery store). The current 2014 Master Plan in fact requires the developer to provide an anchoring grocery store between 30,000 – 35,000 square feet (sf). A local grocery chain (Stormans Inc.) had initially agreed to operate an approximately 25,000 sf Thriftway, but its deal with the prior owner fell apart before 2015.

The current owner Gordie Gill, who acquired the property in 2015, says that there isn't sufficient market demand for a grocery bigger than a mini-mart to locate in Briggs Village. To support that idea he hired an anonymous consultant (really, the consultant's name is nowhere in the study) to produce a market demand study with a gap analysis and analogue study. We took a hard look at that gap analysis and found that it too has gaps.

For example, the demand study assumed that NONE of the sales at the Tumwater Safeway would transfer to a grocery store in Briggs Village. That assumption is clearly false. Several thousand people live within an easy walk from Briggs Village,

the YMCA draws more than 1,000 users every weekday, and the Starbucks business has been phenomenal especially from walkers. The few businesses the developer has allowed at Briggs Village (the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, Fit Life, and Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, etc.) are thriving no thanks to the developer who only begrudgingly sold that land at exorbitant prices.[1] The anonymous author never bothered to contact those business owners, and relied on unsubstantiated opinions of an anonymous broker and anonymous "stakeholders" whose stake in Briggs Village was never revealed.

We found that once you correct the errors in the demand study, the demand would comfortably support a grocery store over 10,000 sf in Briggs Village. In looking at all of the analogue stores that the demand study used for comparison, we found that all of them in fact had 2 to 4 competing sizable grocery stores within a short distance, whereas the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery within a five-minute drive of Briggs Village.

The question remains why there isn't a grocery store now, if this site is favorable. The truth is that from all appearances, the developer Gordie Gill has done nothing over the last 10 years to seek out and attract a sizable grocery store, despite the requirements in the Master Plan. We checked with a commercial realtor and found out no commercial parcels in Briggs Village have been listed for sale in the last 10 years. We spoke with Greg Stormans, of Stormans Inc., and found Gill has not contacted him to see if Stormans Inc. might be interested in pursuing a grocery store of any size. We asked the planner Jackson Ewing directly whether Gill has provided the city any evidence he has sought out a grocery store provider, and we filed a PRA request with the city for records of any effort by Gill to obtain a

[1] According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, property # 37030000020 contains the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, etc. It was purchased from Gill on March 1, 2018 for $1,000,000, but was then assessed for $412,000, and is now assessed at $331,600. Similarly, property # 37030000021 just to the north of the property above was purchased from Gill on February 10, 2022 for $1,445,000. The property was then assessed at $332,500, and is now assessed at $484,200.

grocer. In both cases, we found Gill has provided the city NO evidence of any efforts to attract a grocery store.

A quick internet search will show you that there are at least one or two dozen grocery store companies operating in Puget Sound with multiple locations. They can be quickly spotted on Google Maps. They and local stores should be approached with some incentive to open a store over 10,000 sf at Briggs Village.

A word about incentive. Greg Stormans informed Brian Faller that the prior Briggs Village owner had given Stormans a initial good incentive package to operate the Briggs grocery store. The owner agreed to front the entire costs of building and equipping a 25,000- 30,000 sf store, which Greg thought may be in the ballpark of $8 -10 million. Under the deal, the owner would pay Stormans for operating the store for the first two years. After two years, if things went well, Stormans would buy the store. That deal fell apart when the owner refused Stormans' request to sweeten the terms after the Walmart went in on Yelm Highway in Lacey.

Here Mr. Gill in fact is creating disincentives, not incentives, for retail and office development. As discussed above, he had to be badgered to sell the two lots he sold in Briggs Village and charged well over market value for the parcels.[2] This seems to us clear bad faith on Mr. Gill's part given that the Master Plan and the OMC zoning commits him to develop the grocery store and commercial business in the village.

This brings us back to our substitute amendments. They were written to give Gill a financial incentive (1) to actually deliver a grocery store and a couple of restaurants and/or a bakery to Briggs Village , and (2) to commit to build some smaller studio apartments, which are more affordable. With this incentive, Gill will have a financial reason to offer good terms to a prospective grocery store as well as restaurants and a bakery, and to commit to build more affordable housing.

Here's how our incentive would work: Gill believes he will maximize his profits by building more residential in place of retail and office, and has proposed code amendments to do that. Our substitute amendments, say yes, you can get most

[2] Proof of the overcharging is in footnote 1.

of the key changes you asked for, but *only if* you have first actually deliver the grocery store and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery, and commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less.

We really want a grocery store soon, so in our substitute amendments, we agreed that the grocery store could be a minimum of 10,000 sf rather than the 30,000 sf minimum in the current Master Plan. A 10,000 sf grocery store (not including the space for selling beer, wine and hard liquor) can still provide a relatively wide assortment of items and choices.[3] This lower minimum would allow stores such as Aldi, Trader Joe's, Harbor Greens, Tacoma Boys, a small Town and Country, an enlarged Co-op or Spuds, etc. to fill the niche. The smaller store would be much faster to permit and build, require less investment, and present less risk.

As to the affordable housing component of our incentive, the smallest apartments in Briggs Village are over 700 sf, few in number, and typically cost in excess of $1,700 a month. Studio apartments at 500 sf or smaller rent for less, providing a more affordable housing option.[4]

You might say, the city can still protect a larger grocery store in the Master Plan, but unfortunately that will not get one built. The grocery store requirement has been in the Master Plan for over 20 years, but none has materialized. If the city now gives Gill the flexibility he wants without any conditions to motivate him, it loses all leverage to get him to deliver. **Our substitute amendments aim to provide the incentive to finally get the anchor grocery store and other businesses at Briggs Village that we have waiting for over twenty years. If there is a better way to create an effective incentive, we would welcome that too, but clearly one is necessary.**

Respectfully,

Brian Faller Betty Bailey Andrew Peterson Dave Merchant

---

[3] We learned that under Washington law a grocery store that sell spirits has to be at least 10,000 sf. However, it appears that the store need stock $3,000 of grocery items. Thus, it appears possible to have a 10,000 sf grocery that really functions as a liquor store. To exclude that, our amendments does not all the space allocated to spirits, beer and wine, to count toward the 10,000 sf.

[4] Apartments.com reports that studio apartments in Olympia on average rent for $1,327 per month and are 471 square feet. Average Rent in Olympia, WA - Latest Rent Prices by Neighborhood

Substitute Amendments to OMC 18.02 and 18.05

Submitted by Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, Dave Merchant

Residents of Briggs Village and Adjacent Neighborhoods

Applicant's proposed changes are shown in track changes. City Staff responses and recommendations are shown in commentary / revisions. Brigg's Community proposed changes are shown in red and flagged by a comment.

Definitions: 18.02.180.M

Mixed Use Building: A building comprised of ground floor commercial uses with upper story residential units. The ground floor is primarily comprised of commercial use(s), such as retail, office, and personal services. Lobbies and private amenity space serving the upper story apartments (gyms, community space, etc.) can be located on the ground floor of a mixed use building, but such space would not constitute a commercial use as it would be an accessory to the residential use rather than an independent commercial use. The ground floor commercial space associated with a live/work unit would constitute commercial use.

Commented [NF1]: City Staff recommend this new definition to help define what a mixed use building includes/does not include.

18.05.040 TABLES: Permitted, Conditional and Required Uses

TABLE 5.01

PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL AND REQUIRED USES

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
District-Wide Regulations					18.05.050
1. RESIDENTIAL USES					
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(A)
Apartments	C	R	R	R	18.05A.150-.240, 18.05.050(E)
Boarding Homes	C	P	P	P	
Congregate Care Facilities		P	P	P	18.05.050(E)(1)(c)(i)
Cottage Housing		P	P	P	18.05A.330, 18.04.060(H)
Duplexes		P	P	P	18.05A.250-.290
Duplexes on Corner Lots	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(HH)
Group Homes with 6 or Fewer Clients (up to 8 if approved by DSHS)		P	P	P	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Group Homes with 7 or More Clients		C	C	C	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(O)
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		P	P	P	18.04.060(S)
Residences Above Commercial Uses	P	P	P	P	
Short-Term Rental – Vacation Rentals	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(JJ)
Single-Family Residences	P	R	R	R	18.05A.250-.290
Single Room Occupancy Units					
Townhouses	P	P	P	P	18.05A.150-.240 or 18.05A.250-.290, 18.64

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	
2. OFFICES					
Banks	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(A)
Offices – Business	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Government	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Medical	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary Offices and Clinics	C	C	C	C	
3. RETAIL SALES					
Apparel and Accessory Stores	P	P	P	P	
Building Materials, Garden Supplies, and Farm Supplies	P	P	P	P	
Food Stores	R	R	P	P	
Furniture, Home Furnishings, and Appliances					
General Merchandise Stores	P	P	P	P	
Grocery Stores	P	P	R	R	18.05.060(C)
Office Supplies and Equipment					
Pharmacies and Medical Supply Stores	P	P	P	P	
Restaurants			P		18.05.060(A) & 18.05A.095
Restaurants, Without Drive-In or Drive-Through Service	P	P	P	P	
Specialty Stores	P	P	P	P	
4. SERVICES					
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios	P	P	P	P	
Hotels/Motels					

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Laundry and Laundry Pick-up Agency	P	P	P	P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	
Printing, Commercial			P	P	
Radio/TV Studios					
Recycling Facility - Type I	P	P	P	P	
Servicing of Personal Apparel and Equipment	P	P	P	P	
5. ACCESSORY USES					
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(B)
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(GG)
Garage/Yard/Rummage or Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P	5.24
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P	18.44.100
Residences Rented for Social Event, 7 times or more per year	C	C	C	C	18.04.060.DD
6. RECREATIONAL USES					
Auditoriums and Places of Assembly					
Art Galleries					
Commercial Recreation					
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	
Community Parks & Playgrounds	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(T)
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios					
Libraries					
Museums					
Neighborhood Parks/Village Green/Plaza	R	R	R	R	18.04.060(T), 18.05.080(N)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Open Space – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
Theaters (no Drive-Ins)					
Trails – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
7. TEMPORARY USES					
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P	
Mobile Vendors			P	P	
Model Homes	P	P	P	P	
Parking Lot Sales			P	P	18.06.060(Z)
8. OTHER USES					
Agricultural Uses, Existing	P	P	P	P	
Animals/Pets	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(C)
Child Day Care Centers	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(B), 18.04.060(D)
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P	
Conference Centers					
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(I)
Home Occupations (including adult day care, bed and breakfast houses, short-term rental – homestays, elder care homes, and family child care homes)	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(L), 18.04.060(JJ)
Hospice Care	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(M)
Non-Profit Physical Education Facilities	C	C	C	C	
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(U)
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(V)
Radio, Television, and other Communication Towers & Antennas	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(W), 18.44.100

Commented [NF2]: City Staff support requested change to allow but not require a day care center.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Schools	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(CC)
Sheltered Transit Stops	R	R	R	R	18.05.050(C)(4)
Social Organizations					
Utility Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(X)
Wireless Communications Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.44

LEGEND

P = Permitted C = Conditional R = Required

18.05.050 General standards

A. Project Approval or Redesignation.

1. Approval. Developments in the Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood Village, Urban Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts shall be reviewed according to the requirements of Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments.

2. Rezoning. Land in a NC, NV, UV, COSC, or district may be rezoned to a residential district (see Chapter 18.58, Rezones and Text Amendments) upon demonstration that the site is not viable for the designated uses due to site conditions, infrastructure or street capacity or--in the case of multiple ownerships--land assembly problems.

3. Interim Uses. The following requirements shall apply prior to approval of a Master Planned Development pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments:

a. Subdivision shall not be allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

b. One single-family home is allowed per existing lot of record prior to approval of a Master Plan.

c. Construction of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure which is in conjunction with neighboring or abutting projects is allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

4. Pre-existing uses.

a. Any use which was legally constructed prior to August 21, 1995, but which is not a permitted or conditional use under this Chapter, is allowed to continue under the zoning requirements in effect for that use prior to August 21, 1995, (e.g., as a permitted use, conditional use, limited use, special use, non-conforming use, or any other such zoning status, as may be applicable).

b. Any such zoning requirements applicable to said use (e.g., conditions attached to a conditional use permit), which were in effect on August 21, 1995, shall remain in effect for said use until such time as it is discontinued.

B. Project Size.


1. Villages. Urban villages and neighborhood villages shall be no less than 40 acres and no more than 200 acres in size, provided that at least 90 percent of all residences shall be within one-fourth of a mile of the perimeter of the village center. The perimeter of the village center means the boundary of the center identified on an approved Master Plan, consistent with Section 18.05.050(D)(2), Commercial Building--Location.

2. Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood center developments shall be no less than two acres and no more than ten acres in size.

3. Community Oriented Shopping Centers. Community oriented shopping center developments shall be no less than seventeen (17) acres and no more than 40 acres in size.

C. Village Center.

1. Required Center. Each village and each neighborhood center shall contain a village center with a village green or park (see Section 18.05.080(N), Private and Common Open Space), a sheltered transit stop and, as market conditions permit, businesses, services, and civic uses listed in Table 5.01. (See also Section 18.05.050(D)(2) Commercial Building--Location, and Chapter 18.05A, Design Guidelines for Villages and Centers.)



Village Center

FIGURE 5-1

2. Mixed Use. At least ten percent of the gross floor area of village centers in villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be occupied by residential units contained in mixed residential/commercial buildings. Exceptions to this requirement shall be granted if the applicant demonstrates that compliance is not economically feasible (based upon an independent market study accepted by the City).

3. Buildings Fronting on a Village or Center Green. At least sixty (60) percent of the total ground floor street frontage of the non-residential buildings fronting on a village or center green, park, or plaza shall be occupied by retail uses or professional or personal services. (Also see Section 18.05.080(M)(1) Height--Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens.)

4. Transit Stop. The sheltered transit stop required in 18.05.050(C)(1), Required Center, shall be located and designed in accordance with specifications provided by the City and approved by Intercity Transit.

5. Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction.

6. Location.

a. Separation.

i. Neighborhood village centers and neighborhood centers shall be separated from one another and from urban villages and community oriented shopping centers by at least one half mile.

ii. Urban village centers and community oriented shopping centers shall be separated from one another by at least one mile.

iii. The Hearing Examiner may allow closer spacing if the applicant demonstrates that the trade areas for the centers are distinct (e.g., segregated by physical barriers) or contain sufficient population (based on existing or planned density) to enable the affected centers to be economically viable.

b. Relationship to major streets.

i. Centers in established neighborhoods and neighborhood villages shall be located along collector streets to make them readily accessible for mass transit and motorists and to enable them to be a neighborhood focal point.

ii. Urban villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be located on sites abutting an arterial street. Such sites must have potential for accommodating moderate density residential development (e.g., 7 to 13 or 14 units per acre for COSC or UV districts respectively) and commercial uses scaled to serve households within a one and one-half (11/2) mile radius with frequently needed consumer goods and services.

D. Commercial Building Size, Location, and Type.

1. Size. The total gross floor area of all commercial uses (i.e., those uses specified in Table 5.01 under the general categories "Offices," "Retail Sales," and "Services") in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, community oriented shopping centers shall not exceed the maximum amounts specified in Table 5.02.

TABLE 5.02

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Min.94,985 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store. ~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	Office and Services Min. 5,000 sq. ft. ~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ ~~Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

Commented [BC3]: We rejected most of the proposed changes to Table 5.02. However, in Alternative Table 5.02 we accept in substantial part those changes, provided in order for the Alternative Table to apply, the developer must first satisfy the conditions OMC 18.05.055 below. Those conditions are designed to incentivize the developer to provide the grocery store, some restaurants, or a restaurant and bakery, and some studio apartments, which will be more affordable.

Commented [BC4]: Per the City's proposal, we accepted deletion of the maximum 175,000 sf limit for commercial square feet. We added the minimum 94,985 sf since this is the existing commercial minimum contained in the 2014 Master Plan. The proposed 52,500 sf minimum for all commercial is likely too low to support a village that provides necessary goods to surrounding residents within a short distance, including a reasonable sized grocery, shops, and restaurants, as well as offices. However, the developer and the city's replacement minimum of 52,500 sf is set forth in Alternative Table 5.02, and can be made applicable under the terms of proposed OMC 18.05.055 (below).

Commented [NF5]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC6]: We restored the existing text of Table 5.02 to provide a minimum value for retail exclusive of grocery. Assuming 810 units, the minimum floor space for retail (excl. grocery) is 60,750 sf (810 x 75 = 60,750).

Commented [BC7]: No minimum was stated in the original table entry. We added the 5,000 sq. ft. minimum for office/services which is the figure in the 2014 Master Plan. The developer's proposed minimum of 52,500 sf for office/services would leave NO sf minimum for retail or grocery under the developer's proposed commercial including retail minimum of 52,500 sf. In keeping with the City's proposed deletion of a maximum limit, we did not restore the proposed deletion of a maximum based on 200 sq. ft. per the authorized units/dwellings (810 units x 200sf = 162,000 total sq. ft.)

Commented [NF8]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.02 if applicable per 18.05.055

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq..ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: ~~50,000 sq. ft.~~ 52,500 sq. ft.	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: Min. 52,500 sq. ft. ~~Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

2. Location.

a. Commercial uses in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, and community oriented shopping centers shall meet the following location requirements. Commercial uses in urban centers shall be exempt from these requirements. (Staff note: these requirements have to do with placing all commercial uses within a block or so of the village green in villages and neighborhood centers. In an urban center, this would be impractical.)

b. Commercial uses shall be contiguous with or across a street from the village or center green/park.

c. Commercial uses shall not extend more than one block or 350 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in neighborhood villages and neighborhood centers.

d. Commercial uses shall not extend more than three blocks or 1,100 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in urban villages and community oriented shopping centers.

e. In an urban village or community oriented shopping center, the Hearing Examiner may allow buildings comprising up to 20 percent of the authorized commercial floor area to extend up to four blocks or 1,500 feet from the perimeter of the village green under the following conditions:

Commented [BC9]: The alternative table is in substantial part what the developer and the city have proposed. We are willing to have most of these values apply provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in proposed OMC 18.05.055 below.

Commented [BC10]: 52,500 is a very low amount of minimum space to provide for commercial covering retail (including a grocery) and office/services in a viable village center that supports the surrounding residents. This is borne out by the 2014 Master Plan which provides a minimum 30,000 sf for a grocery store and 94,985 sf for commercial. We are willing to accept this minimum provided it does not include the grocery store space.

Commented [NF11]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC12]: We increased the minimum to 52,500 sf to be consistent with the Combined Office & Services row below.

Commented [BC13]: For this to make sense, the minimum must be stated as Retail/Office combined, otherwise, there would be no minimum amount of commercial retail space necessary to provide for a grocery and basic retail stores and restaurants. In keeping with the City's proposal, we deleted the maximum.

Commented [NF14]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

i. The site's configuration or physical constraints (e.g., critical areas or steep topography) necessitate the location of commercial uses beyond the three block limit; or

ii. The proposed location of commercial uses would improve the project design, for example, by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the development (e.g., allowing buildings to screen parking lots from public rights-of-way), by increasing pedestrian accessibility, by allowing shared use of parking lots, or by allowing better integration of uses.

E. Mix and Location of Residential Uses.

1. Mix of Dwelling Types--General. Developments in the Urban Village, Neighborhood Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts must attain a mix of residential uses consistent with Tables 5.03A and 5.03B. Table 5.03A addresses the relationship between single-family and multifamily dwellings in general. Table 5.03B addresses the requirement for a variety of multifamily housing types, based on overall size of the project.

a. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Single-family detached residences, including designated manufactured homes

ii. Group homes with six (6) or fewer clients

iii. Single family residences above commercial uses (e.g., a single residence above a convenience store)

iv. Townhouses

v. Cottage housing

b. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Apartments with five (5) or more units per structure

ii. Boarding homes

iii. Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes

iv. Group homes with seven (7) or more clients

v. Multifamily residences above commercial uses (e.g., multiple apartments above retail or office uses)

c. Other residences.

i. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, the following uses are classified as "other" (i.e., neither "single-family and similar", nor "multifamily and similar"):

(a) Accessory dwelling units

(b) Nursing/convalescent homes and congregate care facilities

(c) Multifamily units in an urban village on the blocks contiguous to the town square.

ii. Such "other" uses are not counted in determining the required proportions of single-family and multifamily dwellings in Table 5.03A. However, such uses shall be counted in the calculation of total dwellings for purposes of Sections 18.05.080(B) Maximum Housing Densities and 18.05.080(C) Minimum Housing Densities, in the manner provided in those sections.

TABLE 5.03A

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	50% ~~50%~~ ~~15%~~	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75% ~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	25%~~25%~~ ~~65%~~	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	50%~~50%~~ ~~85%~~	50%

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.03A if applicable per 18.05.055

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	~~50%~~ 15%	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75%~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	~~25%~~ 65%	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	~~50%~~ 85%	50%

2. Mix of Dwelling Types--Requirement for Variety.

a. Urban villages, neighborhood villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall achieve a variety of dwelling unit types as specified in Table 5.03B.

b. For purposes of meeting the requirements of Table 5.03B, dwellings shall include the following four types:

i. Single-family detached dwellings (including manufactured housing);

ii. Townhouses;

iii. Duplexes; and

iv. Triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five (5) or more units per structure.

Commented [BC15]: We restored the original percentages used in Table 5.03A. However, we are willing to accept the proposed percentages (with the City's change) under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [NF16]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

Commented [BC17]: We are willing to accept the proposed percentages under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [BC18]: Per the city's comment below, we have restored 75% for the maximum percentage of total housing units of single family and similar dwelling types.

Commented [NF19]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

TABLE 5.03B

REQUIRED VARIETY OF DWELLING UNIT TYPES IN NV, UV, AND COSC

Number of Dwellings in Project	Minimum Number of Dwelling Types	Minimum Percent of Any Dwelling Type used in the Project (See also Table 5.03A)
1-70	2	25%
71-299	3	10%
300+	4	5%

c. Once the requirements of Table 5.03B have been met, other housing types--whether or not specified in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above--may be developed in any proportions within the requirements of Table 5.03A.

Example: Assume a neighborhood village with 400 dwelling units. According to Table 5.03A, at least 240 units (60% of the 400 total), and not more than 300 units (75%) must be single-family and similar dwelling types. At least 100 units (25%), and not more than 160 units (40%) must be multifamily and similar dwelling types.

According to Table 5.03B, the project must include four of the specified dwelling types. The developer chooses to build 240 single-family detached dwellings, meeting the requirement of 60% set in Table 5.03A. The developer also chooses to build 40 townhouse units (10% of the 400 total), 20 duplex units (5%--i.e., the minimum), and 80 units (20%) in triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five or more units. For the final five percent, the developer chooses to build 20 units of cottage housing, an optional housing type not required in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above.

3. Intensity of Development. The density of residential uses shall be highest around the village/community center and lowest adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:

i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and

ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.

b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:

i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and

ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

18.05.055 Incentives applicable to an urban village for completion of a village grocery store and other food amenities and construction of studio apartments.

Commented [BC20]: This section is the incentive section we propose.

A. Alternative Table 5.02, Alternative Table 5.03A, and the items identified in Table 5.05 shall apply and replace the corresponding tables and table provisions with respect to urban villages upon joint satisfaction of the conditions contained in subsections 1 -3, as determined by the city in a public notice of approval issued under subsection 4.

1. A grocery store of at least 10,000 square feet floor space is operational in the mixed-use district that (i) has a proven history of successful operation elsewhere, (ii) states its intent (which need not be legally binding) to operate at the site for at least 10 years, and (iii) sells the common items, including fresh produce, needed for meal preparation that are commonly stocked in grocery stores of comparable size. Any floor space that the grocery store allocates to spirits, wine, and beer shall not count toward the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet minimum, and during it operation the grocery store

shall maintain at least 10,000 square feet devoted to groceries, not including spirits, wine, or beer.

2. **At least three restaurants are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district or alternatively, at least two restaurants and a bakery are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district.**

3. **The urban village has given the city notice that (i) it wishes to proceed under this code section, (ii) subsections 1 and 2 above have been are currently met, and (iii) the urban village agrees to the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

4. **Upon receipt of notice under subsection 3 from a urban village, the city shall issue a notice of approval if it independently finds that subsections 1 -3 have been and are currently met consistent with the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

5. **The minimum floor space requirements for a grocery store contained in Table 5.02 and/or the master plan for the urban village shall not apply to a grocery store to be constructed pursuant to this subsection A.1.**

B. Every four years after the city has issued the notice of approval provided for under subsection A above, at least 15 percent of the apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued shall be no larger than 500 square feet of floor space. If this requirement is not met at a four-year interval, the city shall not issue any building permits for apartment units and/or dwellings over 500 square feet in the mixed-use area until this requirement is met. Any apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy was issued prior to the notice of approval shall not be counted in determining compliance with the 15% requirement.

A. Drive-through facilities.

18.05.060 Use standards

A. Drive-through facilities.

1. Banks, restaurants, pharmacies, and other businesses that primarily cater to pedestrians or walk-in customers are permitted to have a single drive-through lane.

2. Driveway access for a permitted single drive-through lane shall be allowed only through a common parking lot area in a Village Center, shall not impede direct pedestrian access to the building entry, and shall not be allowed on streets abutting a village green or park in a village center.

C. Grocery Stores. Urban Village (UV) and Community Oriented Shopping Center (COSC) District requirements: The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Commented [NF21]: City Staff recommend this change provided the applicant is supported in their request to allow instead of require this use in the village.

18.05.080 TABLES: Commercial Development Standards

TABLE 5.04

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (including mixed commercial/residential buildings)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	None.	None.	
FRONT YARD SETBACK	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(I)(1) 4. 18.05.080(K) 5. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. 18.05.080(K) 3. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking streets; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(K) 4. 18.05.080(L)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	30 feet for commercial structures; or	30 feet for commercial structures; or	45 feet;	3 stories, up to 45 feet;	18.05.080(M)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
(Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures.	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures; EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories 3 stories	2 stories 3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district. 4 Stories for mixed-use buildings facing the town square. 3 Stories elsewhere in the mixed-use district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	18.05.080(M)(10)
MAXIMUM BUSINESS OCCUPANCY SIZE (GROSS FLOOR AREA)	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one grocery store may be up to 50,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one building may be 50,000 sq. ft.	Residential floor area in a mixed-use building shall not be counted in determining the maximum building size.
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	85%	85%	85%	85%	
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS			For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	

(Ord. 6517 §16, 2007).

18.05.080 Development standards

A. General. Table 5.04 identifies the basic standards for commercial development (i.e., offices, retail sales, and services uses identified in Table 5.01) in the NC, NV, UV, COSC and districts. Table 5.05 identifies the basic development standards for residential uses in these districts. The reference numbers listed in these tables refer to the list of additional development standards below.

B. Maximum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Maximum Density. The maximum densities and average maximum densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations:

a. The area within streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" shall not be counted.

b. The area of the required minimum open space for the village or center (see Table 5.05) shall not be counted.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The density of a village center (as delineated in a master plan approved pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) and the density of the remainder of the project shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. The village center and the remainder of the project shall each comply with the maximum average density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Maximum Densities. The maximum housing densities shown in the top row of Table 5.05 refer to the maximum density of individual project components. The housing density for the overall project, however (i.e., all of the property subject to an approved Master Plan), shall not exceed the maximum average density for the district specified in the second row of Table 5.05. For example, a neighborhood village may contain an apartment complex with 24 dwelling units per acre provided that the average density for the entire development does not exceed 13 units per acre.

3. Convalescent Homes. Convalescent homes and nursing homes containing dwelling units which rely on shared cooking/dining facilities shall count as one dwelling unit for purposes of the maximum density calculation. Independent dwelling units (i.e., containing a bed, bathroom and a kitchen with a sink, stove, and refrigerator) in such facilities, however, shall be counted as individual housing units in the density calculation. The site containing a nursing/convalescent home depending on shared kitchen facilities shall be deducted from the land available for residential development when calculating the maximum density for the village or center. (The excess density shall not be transferred to other portions of the site.)

4. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory dwelling units built subsequent to the initial sale of the primary residence on a lot are not subject to the maximum density limits specified in Table 5.05. In addition, accessory units built on a maximum of 20 percent of a development's lots are not subject to the maximum density requirements, provided they are built prior to the time the primary unit on the lot is initially sold or receives occupancy approval (if built by the owner).

5. Density Bonuses. The maximum housing densities identified in Table 5.05 may be increased as follows:

a. Bonus for restoring degraded sites.

i. At the request of the applicant, the Hearing Examiner may grant a density bonus of up to 20 percent for sites on which damaged or degraded wetlands or stream corridors (e.g., streams and stream banks within the outer limits of the buffer required by OMC 18.32.435) will be restored and maintained according to specifications approved by the City.

ii. Sites proposed for this density bonus shall be posted with a notice describing the proposal and opportunities to comment. Property owners within 300 feet of the site shall be given notice of the

proposal and 15 days to comment. Such notice may be done concurrently with any other notice required by this Code.

iii. Prior to taking action on a request for a density bonus, the Hearing Examiner shall consider:

(a) the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies,

(b) the public's comments,

(c) the expected public benefit that would be derived from such restoration,

(d) the net effect of the restoration and the increased density on the site,

(e) the relative cost of the restoration and the value of the increased density, and

(f) the potential impact of increased density on surrounding land uses, traffic, infrastructure, schools, and parks.

iv. The City may require the developer to provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed restoration and other information as necessary to make a decision on the request.

b. Bonus for low income housing.

i. A density bonus shall be granted for low income housing (see Section 18.02.180, Definitions) at the rate of one additional housing unit allowed for each unit of low income housing provided, up to a maximum of a 20 percent density bonus.

ii. The applicant shall submit to the Department a document approved by the City Attorney stating that the low income housing which is the basis for the density bonus shall remain as part of the development for at least 20 years. This time period shall begin on the date that final inspection of all of the low income housing has been performed. This document shall be recorded, at the applicant's expense, at the Thurston County Auditor's Office as part of the chain of title of the affected parcels.

C. Minimum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Minimum Density. The minimum average densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations: [Note: Table 5.05 in Section 18.05]

a. The entire site shall be included in the minimum density calculation except streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, floodplains, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" and their associated buffers; tracts accommodating stormwater facilities required in compliance with the Drainage Design Manual; existing, opened street rights-of-way; and land to be sold or dedicated to the public, other than street rights-of-way (e.g., school sites and parks, but not street rights-of-way to be dedicated as part of the proposed development).

b. All dwelling units in convalescent homes/nursing homes and accessory units count toward the minimum density required for the site by Table 5.05, in the same manner as provided above in Section 18.05.080(B)(3) Maximum Housing Densities -- Convalescent Homes and 18.05.080(B)(4) Maximum Housing Densities -- Accessory Dwelling Units.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The minimum residential density of a village center and that of the remainder of a village or center shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. There shall be no minimum density requirement for a village center other than the requirement for mixed use buildings specified in Section 18.05.050(C)(2) Village/Community Center--Mixed Use

above. The procedures for calculating the required number of units are as provided in Sections 18.05.080(3)(1)(a), (2), and (3) above.

iii. The remainder of a village shall comply with the minimum density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Average Density. A housing project may contain a variety of housing densities provided that the average density for the entire development (i.e., all of the property subject to a single Master Planned Development approval) is neither less than the minimum density nor more than the maximum density established for the district in Table 5.05. No part of the development, however, may exceed the maximum density established in row one of Table 5.05 (see Section 18.05.080(B)(2) Maximum Densities).

3. Density Allowance for Site Constraints. At the request of the applicant, the Director or Hearing Examiner may reduce the minimum density required in Table 5.05, to the extent the Director or Hearing Examiner deems warranted, in order to accommodate site constraints which make development at the required minimum density impractical or inconsistent with the purposes of this Article (e.g., poor soil drainage, the presence of springs, steep topography (e.g., over 20 percent), rock outcrops, or wellhead protection areas). As a condition of granting a density reduction, the applicant must demonstrate that the minimum density cannot be achieved by clustering the housing on the buildable portions of the site (see Section 18.05.080(F) Clustered Housing).

4. Density Allowance for Natural Features/Habitat Protection. At the request of the applicant, the Director may reduce the minimum densities to the extent necessary to accommodate trees to be retained consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement. (Also see Section 18.05.080(F)(1), Mandatory Clustering.) At the request of the applicant, the Director may also authorize a reduction in the minimum density requirements in order to enable retention of Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Nonresidential Uses. The minimum lot size for non-residential uses (e.g., churches and schools) may be larger than the minimum lot size identified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05. Refer to Table 4.01 Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Districts, and Section 18.04.060 Residential Districts Use Standards for regulations pertaining to non-residential uses in residential areas. Also see Section 18.04.060(K) Group Homes for the lot size requirements for group homes.

2. Clustered Lots. Lot sizes may be reduced by up to 20 percent consistent with Section 18.05.080(F), Clustered Housing.

E. Transitional Lots.

1. Lot Size. The square footage and width of those residential lots in developments located in the NC, NV, UV, COSC, and districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than 85 percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.

2. Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the NC, NV, UV, and COSC and districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be the same as the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.

F. Clustered Housing.

1. Mandatory Clustering.

a. Criteria for clustering. The Hearing Examiner may require that the housing units allowed for a site be clustered on a portion of the site to:

i. Protect groundwater used as a public water source (e.g., wellhead protection areas); or

ii. Enable retention of trees (based upon a recommendation by the City's Urban Forester, consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement, Olympia Municipal Code); or

iii. Preserve Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

iv. Accommodate urban trails identified on Map 7-1 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

v. Preserve scenic vistas pursuant to Sections 18.20.070 View Preservation and 18.50.100 Scenic Vistas; or

vi. Enable creation of buffers between incompatible uses (see Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

b. Degree of clustering.

i. The approval authority may allow up to a 20 percent reduction in lot dimensions, sizes and setback requirements, consistent with the Uniform Building Code, to facilitate the clustering of the permitted number of dwelling units on the site.

ii. The required clustering shall not result in fewer lots than would otherwise be permitted on the site (at the minimum density specified in Table 5.05), without the written authorization of the applicant.

2. Optional Clustering.

a. Applicants for housing projects may request up to 20 percent reduction in lot sizes, dimensions, and building setback requirements in order to cluster housing and retain land for the following purposes:

i. To meet the criteria listed in Section 18.05.080(F)(1) Mandatory Clustering above; or

ii. To avoid development on slopes steeper than 20 percent; or

iii. To preserve natural site features such as rock outcrops or topographical features; or

iv. To otherwise enable land to be made available for public or private open space.

b. The approval authority may grant such requests if the approval authority determines that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.

G. Lot Width.

1. Measurement. The minimum lot width required by Table 5.05 shall be measured between the side lot lines at the point of intersection with the minimum front setback line established in Table 5.05.

2. Varied Lot Widths. The width of residential lots in the NC, NV, UV and COSC districts shall be varied to avoid monotonous development patterns.

a. No more than three (3) consecutive lots, uninterrupted by a street, shall be of the same width. This requirement does not apply to townhouses.

b. Lot widths shall be varied by a minimum of six (6) foot increments.

c. The minimum lot widths specified in Table 5.05 may be reduced by six (6) feet for individual lots to provide variety, provided that the average lot width for the project is no less than the minimum lot width required by Table 5.05.

3. Minimum Street Frontage.

a. Each residential lot, other than for townhouse and cottage housing, shall have a minimum of thirty (30) feet of frontage on a public street.




FIGURE 5-2

b. EXCEPTION: the City may allow the street frontage to be reduced (creating a flag lot) to the minimum extent necessary to enable access to property where public street access is not feasible (e.g., due to physical site conditions or preexisting development) or to protect environmentally Critical Areas (see Chapter 18.32 OMC).

c. Subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, and lot line adjustments creating flag lots (with street frontages of less than thirty (30) feet) are subject to the following conditions:

i. The project shall be designed to minimize the creation of flag lots; and

ii. Adjoining flag lots shall share a common driveway wherever possible; and

iii. All driveways accessing flag lots shall be designed to allow fire truck access to within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the residence(s) on the lot(s), unless alternate forms of fire protection approved by the Fire Department are provided (e.g., sprinkler systems); and

iv. The area of a flag lot which is less than thirty (30) feet in width shall not be considered part of the minimum lot area required in Table 5.05.

H. Front Yard Setbacks.

1. In the NV, NC, UV, and COSC districts, front yard setbacks for residential uses may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet under the following conditions:

a. When the garage or parking lot access is from the rear of the lot; or

b. When the garage is located at least ten (10) feet behind the front facade of the primary structure on the lot; or

c. When the driveway will be aligned to provide at least a twenty (20) foot long parking space between the sidewalk edge (closest to lot) and the garage.

2. Such setback reductions shall not be allowed where they would result in a setback of fifty (50) percent or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an abutting lot fronting on the same street. (See Design Guidelines, 18.05A.280, Garage Design.)

I. Maximum Front Yard Setbacks.

1. Proportion of Structure to be Built Within Setback.

a. At least thirty (30) percent of the front facade of the primary residential structure on the lot must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Table 5.05.

b. At least seventy (70) percent of the front facade of buildings fronting on a village or center green, park or plaza must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

2. Exceptions to the Maximum Front Yard Setback Standard. The following are exempt from the maximum front yard setbacks specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

a. Parcels with physical site constraints. The approval authority may allow larger setbacks than required by Tables 5.04 and 5.05 to accommodate steep or difficult topography, views, rock out-crops, environmentally Critical Areas, or trees designated for preservation.

b. Sensitive and high impact uses. The approval authority may allow greater front yard setbacks for nonresidential uses such as schools, nursing homes, public facilities, or utilities which may be sensitive to traffic noise or emissions, or warrant greater separation from adjoining property due to their potential impacts on adjoining land uses.

c. Flag lots, (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

d. Wedge-shape lots. (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

e. Dwellings which front on an arterial street or arterial boulevard.


J. Side Yard Setbacks.

1. Reduced Side Yard Setbacks. A side yard building setback shall not be required for one (1) side of a residential lot provided that it meets the following conditions:

a. If the distance between the proposed dwelling and property line is less than three (3) feet, the applicant shall provide evidence of at least a three (3) foot wide maintenance easement recorded with the deed of the applicable adjoining lot. Such easements shall provide access for the owner of the applicable lot (with a side yard setback of less than three (3) feet) to maintain the exterior of the wall and roof within three (3) feet of the side property line.

b. Side yard setbacks shall not be less than five (5) feet along a property line adjoining a lot which is not approved for reduced setbacks (e.g., a conventional lot with two (2) five (5) foot wide side yard setbacks) or less than ten (10) feet along property lines which abut a public rights-of-way.

2. Setbacks from Trails and Bike Paths. The minimum side yard setback adjoining a public bike path or walkway shall be ten (10) feet.



Zero Lot Line Housing
FIGURE 5-3

K. Measurement of Setbacks. Setback width shall be measured from the outermost edge of the building foundation to the closest point of the applicable lot line.

L. Encroachment into Setbacks.

1. Required setback areas shall be kept free of any building or structure higher than thirty (30) inches.

2. EXCEPTIONS: The buildings and projections listed below shall be allowed in the portion of the setback not contained in a utility, access, or other easement:

a. Accessory structures, including accessory dwelling units, may be located in a required rear yard and/or in the rear thirty (30) feet of a required interior side yard; however, if a garage entrance faces the rear or side property line, it shall be setback at least ten (10) feet from that property line.

b. Cornices, window sills, bay windows, flues and chimneys, planters, and roof eaves may project two (2) feet into the required yard area.

c. Marquees and awnings for commercial uses.

d. Fences in compliance with the fence height requirements specified in OMC 18.40.060.D Fences.

e. Swimming pools, hot tubs and satellite dish antennas may be placed in the rear or interior side yard setback area.

f. Up to fifty percent (50%) of a rear yards width may be occupied by a dwelling (primary residence or ADU) provided that the structure (foundation) is located at least ten (10) feet from the rear property line. For purposes of this Section, the rear yards width shall be measured in a straight line between the side property lines at the point of intersection with the rear property line.

g. Signs in compliance with OMC 18.43.




FIGURE 5-4

M. Height.

1. Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens or Plazas. Buildings in villages and community oriented shopping centers which front onto the required park, green or plaza (see 18.05.080(N)(2) Private and Common Open Space--Villages, and Community Oriented Shopping Centers) shall be at least two (2) stories in height. This requirement does not apply to food or grocery stores.

2. Commercial/Residential Transitions. Commercial buildings abutting lots designated for single family residential use shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height, whichever is less.

3. Roof Projections. The following structures may exceed the height limits specified for the district in Table 5.05 by eighteen (18) feet, provided that such structures do not contain floor space:

a. roof structures housing elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building;

b. fire or parapet walls;

c. skylights;

d. clock towers;

e. flagpoles;

f. chimneys;

g. smoke stacks;

h. wireless masts;

i. T.V. antennas;

j. steeples; and

k. similar structures.

4. Tall Buildings. In the NC, NV, UV, and COCS districts, buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height must comply with the following requirements:

a. The proposed building shall not be located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center. Public rights-of-way adjoining the village or center property boundary shall count toward this separation requirement. Exceptions to this provision shall be granted where topography, stands of trees (designated for retention and approved by the City's Urban Forester), or other site features block the visibility of the section of the building above thirty-five (35) feet in height from existing or potential residential areas (zoned and available for residential use) adjoining the site; and

b. Existing evergreen trees, which the City's Urban Forester determines do not pose undue risks for proposed site improvements or public safety and are appropriate for their location at their mature size, are retained where possible to help screen the building from the view of residents of dwellings abutting the property.

5. Places of Worship. The height of churches and other places of worship may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05 provided that the side yard width equals at least fifty (50) percent of the proposed height of the place of worship (including spires and towers).

6. Free-Standing Ornamental Structures. Free-standing ornamental structures such as clock towers, sculptures, monuments or other similar features approved as part of a master plan (see Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) shall not exceed 60 feet in height. These structures shall be located in the village center (see Section 18.05.050(C), Village/Community Center) and shall not contain signage.

7. Radio and Television Transmitting and Receiving Towers. The height of radio and television transmitting and receiving towers may exceed the maximum building height allowed in the district, subject to approval of the Hearing Examiner consistent with Section 18.04.060(Z).

8. Water Towers. Water towers may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05.

9. Perimeter Buildings. Except as otherwise provided in Section 18.05.080(M), Height, buildings located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty five (35) feet, whichever is less. This requirement shall not apply to the UV mixed-use district.

10. A building height waiver may be granted at project entries and along arterial or major collector streets within a Master Planned Community (NV, UV, and COSC) where slopes exist that would cause less than desirable height of building to width of street ratio (a ratio less than 1:4 building height to street width) not to exceed the permitted building height as measured from the fronting street edge.

N. Private and Common Open Space.

1. Development of Open Space.

a. Open space required by Table 5.05 shall be devoted to undisturbed native vegetation, landscaping, and/or outdoor recreational facilities. Driveways, loading areas, maneuvering space and parking lots shall not be considered part of this required space.

b. Required open space shall not be covered with impervious surfaces, except for walkways, tennis and basketball courts, swimming pools, or similar recreational uses which require an impervious surface.

c. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase the impervious surface coverage limits specified in Table 5.05 by up to five (5) percent to accommodate the walkways and recreational uses listed above (see also Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

2. Villages and Community Oriented Shopping Centers.

a. Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas

and type of access will be determined during the Master Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers (see Chapter 18.32, OMC).

b. Neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers must contain a neighborhood park or "green" between one (1) and four (4) acres in size located in the village or community center. This park, green, or plaza shall have an average slope no greater than five (5) percent; adequate drainage to allow active use in summer; and a width and length of no less than one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

3. Cottage Housing Developments.

a. A minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of private, contiguous, usable, open space shall be provided adjacent to each dwelling unit. No dimension of this open space area shall be less than ten (10) feet.

b. A minimum of fifteen hundred (1500) square feet or two hundred (200) square feet per unit, whichever is more, shall be provided in common open space (e.g., available for the use of all residents of the cottage housing development). This open space shall be contained in a contiguous area with no dimension less than thirty (30) feet. Such open space shall be sufficiently level (e.g., less than five (5) percent slope) and well drained to enable active use in summer.

4. Multifamily Housing.

a. In neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers, parcels or sites accommodating multifamily housing (e.g., triplexes, fourplexes, and larger apartment buildings) shall contain at least thirty (30) percent open space. However, such multifamily housing within one hundred (100) feet of a neighborhood park, green, or public or common open space, which is at least ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, shall only be required to retain fifteen (15) percent of the site in open space. Impervious surface coverage requirements shall be adjusted accordingly~~. Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.~~

Commented [BC22]: Rooftop courtyards are not open or visible to the public so should not count as open space.

b. At least fifty (50) percent of the open space required in 18.05.080(N)(4)(a) above shall be available for the common use of all residents of the multifamily housing.

c. Common open space shall be contiguous with the housing site (e.g., not separated from the dwellings by streets or barriers that impede pedestrian access) and shall be sufficiently level (e.g., five (5) percent average slope) and well drained to allow active use in summer. No dimension shall be less than fifteen (15) feet.

18.05.080 TABLES: Residential Development Standards

TABLE 5.05

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	24	24 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	24	18.05.080(B)
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	13	14 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	13	18.05.080(B)

Commented [NF23]: City Staff support. No other commercial zone has a maximum density, and this incentivizes increased units, however it is inconsistent in context of the remainder of the chart.

Commented [BC24]: These changes should apply only if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	7	7	7	7	18.05.080(C)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	3,500 sq. ft. = zero lots Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard. 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 5,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	18.05.080(D) 18.05.080(E) 18.05.080(F) 18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 80’ = duplex	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	18.05.080(G)
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	18.05.080(H) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK	25’	25’	25’	25’	18.05.080(I) 18.05.080(K)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	20’	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	15’ EXCEPT: 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots; 20’ with alley access.	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots.	18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.05.080(E)(2)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	18.05.080(J) 18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35’ EXCEPT: 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	18.05.080(M)
MAXIMUM ABOVE GRADE STORIES	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	50%	50%	50%	50%	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%	70%	18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	1 acre	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	18.05.080(N)

Commented [NF25]: City Staff does not support these changes. Mixed use buildings would be treated as commercial. This amendment would incentivize apartment only (no mix) in the commercial core.

Commented [NF26]: City Staff supports the concept, but a mixed use building is treated as commercial and must comply with commercial height standards. This section only applies to residential only buildings which should be required to include ground floor retail for additional height.

Commented [NF27]: City Staff does not support this change because it does not incentivize mixed use. Mixed use buildings are allowed additional height/stories.

Commented [NF28]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use. A mixed use building would be allowed additional coverage.

Commented [NF29]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use buildings. A mixed use building would already be exempt from open space requirements.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

February 21, 2025

City of Olympia
ATTN: Jackson Ewing

RE: Comments about Zoning Code Amendments related to Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing:

I am a member of the YMCA and have been a frequent user of the Briggs Village location. My children have also participated in YMCA sporting events that take place at this location.

The Briggs Village YMCA is very popular, and quite busy, particularly at certain times of day and especially on weekends. It is very difficult to find parking near the building during sporting events, outside of just a regular day and I have to park in the overflow area.

My understanding of Briggs Village was that it was conceived as a walkable mixed commercial and residential community with a grocery store and other amenities and that there would be ample parking which could be utilized for all of these purposes.

My understanding is that the amendments you are considering would result in the grocery store being eliminated and instead there would be more units of housing and that the net result of that would be less parking spaces. That result would certainly negatively impact the YMCA and frankly in my opinion, all of Briggs Village.

Finally, before supporting any such amendments to OMC 18.05I'd want to know the following:

1. Clarification on how parking is calculated in the core areas of Briggs Village, inclusive of any shared parking formats;

2. Clarification on how modifications to zoning or the Master Site Plan will not make parking on other underdeveloped sites impossible; and,

3. Clarification on how overflow parking will be addressed in light of the proposed changes to zoning and the Master Site Plan.

Sincerely,

Rozanne Garman

February 21, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

This letter is to explain our reasons for submitting substitute amendments to OMC 18.05, that relate to urban villages. The substitute amendments are contained in both PDF and WORD files attached to the email that transmits this letter.

The substitute amendments were drafted by four of us, Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, and Dave Merchant, who respectively live in Sten Village (adjacent to Briggs Village), the Village Cooperative (kitty corner to the Briggs YMCA), and Briggs Village.

As you know, Briggs Village was created over 20 years ago as the only urban village in Olympia. The key feature of an urban village is that it has a concentration of housing within walkable distance of a village commercial center that offers the basic amenities people need in everyday life. The critical amenity is, of course, a sizable grocery store. Other amenities typically include restaurants, a bakery, first aid, health care, clothing, housewares, hardware, a small post office (some of which might be contained within the grocery store). The current 2014 Master Plan in fact requires the developer to provide an anchoring grocery store between 30,000 – 35,000 square feet (sf). A local grocery chain (Stormans Inc.) had initially agreed to operate an approximately 25,000 sf Thriftway, but its deal with the prior owner fell apart before 2015.

The current owner Gordie Gill, who acquired the property in 2015, says that there isn't sufficient market demand for a grocery bigger than a mini-mart to locate in Briggs Village. To support that idea he hired an anonymous consultant (really, the consultant's name is nowhere in the study) to produce a market demand study with a gap analysis and analogue study. We took a hard look at that gap analysis and found that it too has gaps.

For example, the demand study assumed that NONE of the sales at the Tumwater Safeway would transfer to a grocery store in Briggs Village. That assumption is clearly false. Several thousand people live within an easy walk from Briggs Village,

the YMCA draws more than 1,000 users every weekday, and the Starbucks business has been phenomenal especially from walkers. The few businesses the developer has allowed at Briggs Village (the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, Fit Life, and Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, etc.) are thriving no thanks to the developer who only begrudgingly sold that land at exorbitant prices.[1] The anonymous author never bothered to contact those business owners, and relied on unsubstantiated opinions of an anonymous broker and anonymous "stakeholders" whose stake in Briggs Village was never revealed.

We found that once you correct the errors in the demand study, the demand would comfortably support a grocery store over 10,000 sf in Briggs Village. In looking at all of the analogue stores that the demand study used for comparison, we found that all of them in fact had 2 to 4 competing sizable grocery stores within a short distance, whereas the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery within a five-minute drive of Briggs Village.

The question remains why there isn't a grocery store now, if this site is favorable. The truth is that from all appearances, the developer Gordie Gill has done nothing over the last 10 years to seek out and attract a sizable grocery store, despite the requirements in the Master Plan. We checked with a commercial realtor and found out no commercial parcels in Briggs Village have been listed for sale in the last 10 years. We spoke with Greg Stormans, of Stormans Inc., and found Gill has not contacted him to see if Stormans Inc. might be interested in pursuing a grocery store of any size. We asked the planner Jackson Ewing directly whether Gill has provided the city any evidence he has sought out a grocery store provider, and we filed a PRA request with the city for records of any effort by Gill to obtain a

[1] According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, property # 37030000020 contains the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, etc. It was purchased from Gill on March 1, 2018 for $1,000,000, but was then assessed for $412,000, and is now assessed at $331,600. Similarly, property # 37030000021 just to the north of the property above was purchased from Gill on February 10, 2022 for $1,445,000. The property was then assessed at $332,500, and is now assessed at $484,200.

grocer. In both cases, we found Gill has provided the city NO evidence of any efforts to attract a grocery store.

A quick internet search will show you that there are at least one or two dozen grocery store companies operating in Puget Sound with multiple locations. They can be quickly spotted on Google Maps. They and local stores should be approached with some incentive to open a store over 10,000 sf at Briggs Village.

A word about incentive. Greg Stormans informed Brian Faller that the prior Briggs Village owner had given Stormans a initial good incentive package to operate the Briggs grocery store. The owner agreed to front the entire costs of building and equipping a 25,000- 30,000 sf store, which Greg thought may be in the ballpark of $8 -10 million. Under the deal, the owner would pay Stormans for operating the store for the first two years. After two years, if things went well, Stormans would buy the store. That deal fell apart when the owner refused Stormans' request to sweeten the terms after the Walmart went in on Yelm Highway in Lacey.

Here Mr. Gill in fact is creating disincentives, not incentives, for retail and office development. As discussed above, he had to be badgered to sell the two lots he sold in Briggs Village and charged well over market value for the parcels.[2] This seems to us clear bad faith on Mr. Gill's part given that the Master Plan and the OMC zoning commits him to develop the grocery store and commercial business in the village.

This brings us back to our substitute amendments. They were written to give Gill a financial incentive (1) to actually deliver a grocery store and a couple of restaurants and/or a bakery to Briggs Village , and (2) to commit to build some smaller studio apartments, which are more affordable. With this incentive, Gill will have a financial reason to offer good terms to a prospective grocery store as well as restaurants and a bakery, and to commit to build more affordable housing.

Here's how our incentive would work: Gill believes he will maximize his profits by building more residential in place of retail and office, and has proposed code amendments to do that. Our substitute amendments, say yes, you can get most

[2] Proof of the overcharging is in footnote 1.

of the key changes you asked for, but *only if* you have first actually deliver the grocery store and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery, and commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less.

We really want a grocery store soon, so in our substitute amendments, we agreed that the grocery store could be a minimum of 10,000 sf rather than the 30,000 sf minimum in the current Master Plan. A 10,000 sf grocery store (not including the space for selling beer, wine and hard liquor) can still provide a relatively wide assortment of items and choices.[3] This lower minimum would allow stores such as Aldi, Trader Joe's, Harbor Greens, Tacoma Boys, a small Town and Country, an enlarged Co-op or Spuds, etc. to fill the niche. The smaller store would be much faster to permit and build, require less investment, and present less risk.

As to the affordable housing component of our incentive, the smallest apartments in Briggs Village are over 700 sf, few in number, and typically cost in excess of $1,700 a month. Studio apartments at 500 sf or smaller rent for less, providing a more affordable housing option.[4]

You might say, the city can still protect a larger grocery store in the Master Plan, but unfortunately that will not get one built. The grocery store requirement has been in the Master Plan for over 20 years, but none has materialized. If the city now gives Gill the flexibility he wants without any conditions to motivate him, it loses all leverage to get him to deliver. **Our substitute amendments aim to provide the incentive to finally get the anchor grocery store and other businesses at Briggs Village that we have waiting for over twenty years. If there is a better way to create an effective incentive, we would welcome that too, but clearly one is necessary.**

Respectfully,

Brian Faller Betty Bailey Andrew Peterson Dave Merchant

---

[3] We learned that under Washington law a grocery store that sell spirits has to be at least 10,000 sf. However, it appears that the store need stock $3,000 of grocery items. Thus, it appears possible to have a 10,000 sf grocery that really functions as a liquor store. To exclude that, our amendments does not all the space allocated to spirits, beer and wine, to count toward the 10,000 sf.

[4] Apartments.com reports that studio apartments in Olympia on average rent for $1,327 per month and are 471 square feet. Average Rent in Olympia, WA - Latest Rent Prices by Neighborhood

Substitute Amendments to OMC 18.02 and 18.05

Submitted by Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, Dave Merchant

Residents of Briggs Village and Adjacent Neighborhoods

Applicant's proposed changes are shown in track changes. City Staff responses and recommendations are shown in commentary / revisions. Brigg's Community proposed changes are shown in red and flagged by a comment.

Definitions: 18.02.180.M

Mixed Use Building: A building comprised of ground floor commercial uses with upper story residential units. The ground floor is primarily comprised of commercial use(s), such as retail, office, and personal services. Lobbies and private amenity space serving the upper story apartments (gyms, community space, etc.) can be located on the ground floor of a mixed use building, but such space would not constitute a commercial use as it would be an accessory to the residential use rather than an independent commercial use. The ground floor commercial space associated with a live/work unit would constitute commercial use.

Commented [NF1]: City Staff recommend this new definition to help define what a mixed use building includes/does not include.

18.05.040 TABLES: Permitted, Conditional and Required Uses

TABLE 5.01

PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL AND REQUIRED USES

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
District-Wide Regulations					18.05.050
1. RESIDENTIAL USES					
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(A)
Apartments	C	R	R	R	18.05A.150-.240, 18.05.050(E)
Boarding Homes	C	P	P	P	
Congregate Care Facilities		P	P	P	18.05.050(E)(1)(c)(i)
Cottage Housing		P	P	P	18.05A.330, 18.04.060(H)
Duplexes		P	P	P	18.05A.250-.290
Duplexes on Corner Lots	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(HH)
Group Homes with 6 or Fewer Clients (up to 8 if approved by DSHS)		P	P	P	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Group Homes with 7 or More Clients		C	C	C	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(O)
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		P	P	P	18.04.060(S)
Residences Above Commercial Uses	P	P	P	P	
Short-Term Rental – Vacation Rentals	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(JJ)
Single-Family Residences	P	R	R	R	18.05A.250-.290
Single Room Occupancy Units					
Townhouses	P	P	P	P	18.05A.150-.240 or 18.05A.250-.290, 18.64

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	
2. OFFICES					
Banks	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(A)
Offices – Business	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Government	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Medical	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary Offices and Clinics	C	C	C	C	
3. RETAIL SALES					
Apparel and Accessory Stores	P	P	P	P	
Building Materials, Garden Supplies, and Farm Supplies	P	P	P	P	
Food Stores	R	R	P	P	
Furniture, Home Furnishings, and Appliances					
General Merchandise Stores	P	P	P	P	
Grocery Stores	P	P	R	R	18.05.060(C)
Office Supplies and Equipment					
Pharmacies and Medical Supply Stores	P	P	P	P	
Restaurants			P		18.05.060(A) & 18.05A.095
Restaurants, Without Drive-In or Drive-Through Service	P	P	P	P	
Specialty Stores	P	P	P	P	
4. SERVICES					
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios	P	P	P	P	
Hotels/Motels					

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Laundry and Laundry Pick-up Agency	P	P	P	P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	
Printing, Commercial			P	P	
Radio/TV Studios					
Recycling Facility - Type I	P	P	P	P	
Servicing of Personal Apparel and Equipment	P	P	P	P	
5. ACCESSORY USES					
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(B)
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(GG)
Garage/Yard/Rummage or Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P	5.24
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P	18.44.100
Residences Rented for Social Event, 7 times or more per year	C	C	C	C	18.04.060.DD
6. RECREATIONAL USES					
Auditoriums and Places of Assembly					
Art Galleries					
Commercial Recreation					
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	
Community Parks & Playgrounds	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(T)
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios					
Libraries					
Museums					
Neighborhood Parks/Village Green/Plaza	R	R	R	R	18.04.060(T), 18.05.080(N)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Open Space – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
Theaters (no Drive-Ins)					
Trails – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
7. TEMPORARY USES					
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P	
Mobile Vendors			P	P	
Model Homes	P	P	P	P	
Parking Lot Sales			P	P	18.06.060(Z)
8. OTHER USES					
Agricultural Uses, Existing	P	P	P	P	
Animals/Pets	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(C)
Child Day Care Centers	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(B), 18.04.060(D)
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P	
Conference Centers					
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(I)
Home Occupations (including adult day care, bed and breakfast houses, short-term rental – homestays, elder care homes, and family child care homes)	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(L), 18.04.060(JJ)
Hospice Care	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(M)
Non-Profit Physical Education Facilities	C	C	C	C	
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(U)
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(V)
Radio, Television, and other Communication Towers & Antennas	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(W), 18.44.100

Commented [NF2]: City Staff support requested change to allow but not require a day care center.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Schools	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(CC)
Sheltered Transit Stops	R	R	R	R	18.05.050(C)(4)
Social Organizations					
Utility Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(X)
Wireless Communications Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.44

LEGEND

P = Permitted C = Conditional R = Required

18.05.050 General standards

A. Project Approval or Redesignation.

1. Approval. Developments in the Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood Village, Urban Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts shall be reviewed according to the requirements of Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments.

2. Rezoning. Land in a NC, NV, UV, COSC, or district may be rezoned to a residential district (see Chapter 18.58, Rezones and Text Amendments) upon demonstration that the site is not viable for the designated uses due to site conditions, infrastructure or street capacity or--in the case of multiple ownerships--land assembly problems.

3. Interim Uses. The following requirements shall apply prior to approval of a Master Planned Development pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments:

a. Subdivision shall not be allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

b. One single-family home is allowed per existing lot of record prior to approval of a Master Plan.

c. Construction of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure which is in conjunction with neighboring or abutting projects is allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

4. Pre-existing uses.

a. Any use which was legally constructed prior to August 21, 1995, but which is not a permitted or conditional use under this Chapter, is allowed to continue under the zoning requirements in effect for that use prior to August 21, 1995, (e.g., as a permitted use, conditional use, limited use, special use, non-conforming use, or any other such zoning status, as may be applicable).

b. Any such zoning requirements applicable to said use (e.g., conditions attached to a conditional use permit), which were in effect on August 21, 1995, shall remain in effect for said use until such time as it is discontinued.

B. Project Size.


1. Villages. Urban villages and neighborhood villages shall be no less than 40 acres and no more than 200 acres in size, provided that at least 90 percent of all residences shall be within one-fourth of a mile of the perimeter of the village center. The perimeter of the village center means the boundary of the center identified on an approved Master Plan, consistent with Section 18.05.050(D)(2), Commercial Building--Location.

2. Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood center developments shall be no less than two acres and no more than ten acres in size.

3. Community Oriented Shopping Centers. Community oriented shopping center developments shall be no less than seventeen (17) acres and no more than 40 acres in size.

C. Village Center.

1. Required Center. Each village and each neighborhood center shall contain a village center with a village green or park (see Section 18.05.080(N), Private and Common Open Space), a sheltered transit stop and, as market conditions permit, businesses, services, and civic uses listed in Table 5.01. (See also Section 18.05.050(D)(2) Commercial Building--Location, and Chapter 18.05A, Design Guidelines for Villages and Centers.)



Village Center

FIGURE 5-1

2. Mixed Use. At least ten percent of the gross floor area of village centers in villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be occupied by residential units contained in mixed residential/commercial buildings. Exceptions to this requirement shall be granted if the applicant demonstrates that compliance is not economically feasible (based upon an independent market study accepted by the City).

3. Buildings Fronting on a Village or Center Green. At least sixty (60) percent of the total ground floor street frontage of the non-residential buildings fronting on a village or center green, park, or plaza shall be occupied by retail uses or professional or personal services. (Also see Section 18.05.080(M)(1) Height--Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens.)

4. Transit Stop. The sheltered transit stop required in 18.05.050(C)(1), Required Center, shall be located and designed in accordance with specifications provided by the City and approved by Intercity Transit.

5. Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction.

6. Location.

a. Separation.

i. Neighborhood village centers and neighborhood centers shall be separated from one another and from urban villages and community oriented shopping centers by at least one half mile.

ii. Urban village centers and community oriented shopping centers shall be separated from one another by at least one mile.

iii. The Hearing Examiner may allow closer spacing if the applicant demonstrates that the trade areas for the centers are distinct (e.g., segregated by physical barriers) or contain sufficient population (based on existing or planned density) to enable the affected centers to be economically viable.

b. Relationship to major streets.

i. Centers in established neighborhoods and neighborhood villages shall be located along collector streets to make them readily accessible for mass transit and motorists and to enable them to be a neighborhood focal point.

ii. Urban villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be located on sites abutting an arterial street. Such sites must have potential for accommodating moderate density residential development (e.g., 7 to 13 or 14 units per acre for COSC or UV districts respectively) and commercial uses scaled to serve households within a one and one-half (11/2) mile radius with frequently needed consumer goods and services.

D. Commercial Building Size, Location, and Type.

1. Size. The total gross floor area of all commercial uses (i.e., those uses specified in Table 5.01 under the general categories "Offices," "Retail Sales," and "Services") in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, community oriented shopping centers shall not exceed the maximum amounts specified in Table 5.02.

TABLE 5.02

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Min.94,985 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store. ~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	Office and Services Min. 5,000 sq. ft. ~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ ~~Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

Commented [BC3]: We rejected most of the proposed changes to Table 5.02. However, in Alternative Table 5.02 we accept in substantial part those changes, provided in order for the Alternative Table to apply, the developer must first satisfy the conditions OMC 18.05.055 below. Those conditions are designed to incentivize the developer to provide the grocery store, some restaurants, or a restaurant and bakery, and some studio apartments, which will be more affordable.

Commented [BC4]: Per the City's proposal, we accepted deletion of the maximum 175,000 sf limit for commercial square feet. We added the minimum 94,985 sf since this is the existing commercial minimum contained in the 2014 Master Plan. The proposed 52,500 sf minimum for all commercial is likely too low to support a village that provides necessary goods to surrounding residents within a short distance, including a reasonable sized grocery, shops, and restaurants, as well as offices. However, the developer and the city's replacement minimum of 52,500 sf is set forth in Alternative Table 5.02, and can be made applicable under the terms of proposed OMC 18.05.055 (below).

Commented [NF5]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC6]: We restored the existing text of Table 5.02 to provide a minimum value for retail exclusive of grocery. Assuming 810 units, the minimum floor space for retail (excl. grocery) is 60,750 sf (810 x 75 = 60,750).

Commented [BC7]: No minimum was stated in the original table entry. We added the 5,000 sq. ft. minimum for office/services which is the figure in the 2014 Master Plan. The developer's proposed minimum of 52,500 sf for office/services would leave NO sf minimum for retail or grocery under the developer's proposed commercial including retail minimum of 52,500 sf. In keeping with the City's proposed deletion of a maximum limit, we did not restore the proposed deletion of a maximum based on 200 sq. ft. per the authorized units/dwellings (810 units x 200sf = 162,000 total sq. ft.)

Commented [NF8]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.02 if applicable per 18.05.055

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq..ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: ~~50,000 sq. ft.~~ 52,500 sq. ft.	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: Min. 52,500 sq. ft. ~~Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

2. Location.

a. Commercial uses in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, and community oriented shopping centers shall meet the following location requirements. Commercial uses in urban centers shall be exempt from these requirements. (Staff note: these requirements have to do with placing all commercial uses within a block or so of the village green in villages and neighborhood centers. In an urban center, this would be impractical.)

b. Commercial uses shall be contiguous with or across a street from the village or center green/park.

c. Commercial uses shall not extend more than one block or 350 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in neighborhood villages and neighborhood centers.

d. Commercial uses shall not extend more than three blocks or 1,100 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in urban villages and community oriented shopping centers.

e. In an urban village or community oriented shopping center, the Hearing Examiner may allow buildings comprising up to 20 percent of the authorized commercial floor area to extend up to four blocks or 1,500 feet from the perimeter of the village green under the following conditions:

Commented [BC9]: The alternative table is in substantial part what the developer and the city have proposed. We are willing to have most of these values apply provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in proposed OMC 18.05.055 below.

Commented [BC10]: 52,500 is a very low amount of minimum space to provide for commercial covering retail (including a grocery) and office/services in a viable village center that supports the surrounding residents. This is borne out by the 2014 Master Plan which provides a minimum 30,000 sf for a grocery store and 94,985 sf for commercial. We are willing to accept this minimum provided it does not include the grocery store space.

Commented [NF11]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC12]: We increased the minimum to 52,500 sf to be consistent with the Combined Office & Services row below.

Commented [BC13]: For this to make sense, the minimum must be stated as Retail/Office combined, otherwise, there would be no minimum amount of commercial retail space necessary to provide for a grocery and basic retail stores and restaurants. In keeping with the City's proposal, we deleted the maximum.

Commented [NF14]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

i. The site's configuration or physical constraints (e.g., critical areas or steep topography) necessitate the location of commercial uses beyond the three block limit; or

ii. The proposed location of commercial uses would improve the project design, for example, by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the development (e.g., allowing buildings to screen parking lots from public rights-of-way), by increasing pedestrian accessibility, by allowing shared use of parking lots, or by allowing better integration of uses.

E. Mix and Location of Residential Uses.

1. Mix of Dwelling Types--General. Developments in the Urban Village, Neighborhood Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts must attain a mix of residential uses consistent with Tables 5.03A and 5.03B. Table 5.03A addresses the relationship between single-family and multifamily dwellings in general. Table 5.03B addresses the requirement for a variety of multifamily housing types, based on overall size of the project.

a. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Single-family detached residences, including designated manufactured homes

ii. Group homes with six (6) or fewer clients

iii. Single family residences above commercial uses (e.g., a single residence above a convenience store)

iv. Townhouses

v. Cottage housing

b. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Apartments with five (5) or more units per structure

ii. Boarding homes

iii. Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes

iv. Group homes with seven (7) or more clients

v. Multifamily residences above commercial uses (e.g., multiple apartments above retail or office uses)

c. Other residences.

i. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, the following uses are classified as "other" (i.e., neither "single-family and similar", nor "multifamily and similar"):

(a) Accessory dwelling units

(b) Nursing/convalescent homes and congregate care facilities

(c) Multifamily units in an urban village on the blocks contiguous to the town square.

ii. Such "other" uses are not counted in determining the required proportions of single-family and multifamily dwellings in Table 5.03A. However, such uses shall be counted in the calculation of total dwellings for purposes of Sections 18.05.080(B) Maximum Housing Densities and 18.05.080(C) Minimum Housing Densities, in the manner provided in those sections.

TABLE 5.03A

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	50% ~~50%~~ ~~15%~~	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75% ~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	25%~~25%~~ ~~65%~~	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	50%~~50%~~ ~~85%~~	50%

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.03A if applicable per 18.05.055

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	~~50%~~ 15%	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75%~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	~~25%~~ 65%	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	~~50%~~ 85%	50%

2. Mix of Dwelling Types--Requirement for Variety.

a. Urban villages, neighborhood villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall achieve a variety of dwelling unit types as specified in Table 5.03B.

b. For purposes of meeting the requirements of Table 5.03B, dwellings shall include the following four types:

i. Single-family detached dwellings (including manufactured housing);

ii. Townhouses;

iii. Duplexes; and

iv. Triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five (5) or more units per structure.

Commented [BC15]: We restored the original percentages used in Table 5.03A. However, we are willing to accept the proposed percentages (with the City's change) under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [NF16]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

Commented [BC17]: We are willing to accept the proposed percentages under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [BC18]: Per the city's comment below, we have restored 75% for the maximum percentage of total housing units of single family and similar dwelling types.

Commented [NF19]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

TABLE 5.03B

REQUIRED VARIETY OF DWELLING UNIT TYPES IN NV, UV, AND COSC

Number of Dwellings in Project	Minimum Number of Dwelling Types	Minimum Percent of Any Dwelling Type used in the Project (See also Table 5.03A)
1-70	2	25%
71-299	3	10%
300+	4	5%

c. Once the requirements of Table 5.03B have been met, other housing types--whether or not specified in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above--may be developed in any proportions within the requirements of Table 5.03A.

Example: Assume a neighborhood village with 400 dwelling units. According to Table 5.03A, at least 240 units (60% of the 400 total), and not more than 300 units (75%) must be single-family and similar dwelling types. At least 100 units (25%), and not more than 160 units (40%) must be multifamily and similar dwelling types.

According to Table 5.03B, the project must include four of the specified dwelling types. The developer chooses to build 240 single-family detached dwellings, meeting the requirement of 60% set in Table 5.03A. The developer also chooses to build 40 townhouse units (10% of the 400 total), 20 duplex units (5%--i.e., the minimum), and 80 units (20%) in triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five or more units. For the final five percent, the developer chooses to build 20 units of cottage housing, an optional housing type not required in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above.

3. Intensity of Development. The density of residential uses shall be highest around the village/community center and lowest adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:

i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and

ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.

b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:

i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and

ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

18.05.055 Incentives applicable to an urban village for completion of a village grocery store and other food amenities and construction of studio apartments.

Commented [BC20]: This section is the incentive section we propose.

A. Alternative Table 5.02, Alternative Table 5.03A, and the items identified in Table 5.05 shall apply and replace the corresponding tables and table provisions with respect to urban villages upon joint satisfaction of the conditions contained in subsections 1 -3, as determined by the city in a public notice of approval issued under subsection 4.

1. A grocery store of at least 10,000 square feet floor space is operational in the mixed-use district that (i) has a proven history of successful operation elsewhere, (ii) states its intent (which need not be legally binding) to operate at the site for at least 10 years, and (iii) sells the common items, including fresh produce, needed for meal preparation that are commonly stocked in grocery stores of comparable size. Any floor space that the grocery store allocates to spirits, wine, and beer shall not count toward the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet minimum, and during it operation the grocery store

shall maintain at least 10,000 square feet devoted to groceries, not including spirits, wine, or beer.

2. **At least three restaurants are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district or alternatively, at least two restaurants and a bakery are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district.**

3. **The urban village has given the city notice that (i) it wishes to proceed under this code section, (ii) subsections 1 and 2 above have been are currently met, and (iii) the urban village agrees to the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

4. **Upon receipt of notice under subsection 3 from a urban village, the city shall issue a notice of approval if it independently finds that subsections 1 -3 have been and are currently met consistent with the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

5. **The minimum floor space requirements for a grocery store contained in Table 5.02 and/or the master plan for the urban village shall not apply to a grocery store to be constructed pursuant to this subsection A.1.**

B. Every four years after the city has issued the notice of approval provided for under subsection A above, at least 15 percent of the apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued shall be no larger than 500 square feet of floor space. If this requirement is not met at a four-year interval, the city shall not issue any building permits for apartment units and/or dwellings over 500 square feet in the mixed-use area until this requirement is met. Any apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy was issued prior to the notice of approval shall not be counted in determining compliance with the 15% requirement.

A. Drive-through facilities.

18.05.060 Use standards

A. Drive-through facilities.

1. Banks, restaurants, pharmacies, and other businesses that primarily cater to pedestrians or walk-in customers are permitted to have a single drive-through lane.

2. Driveway access for a permitted single drive-through lane shall be allowed only through a common parking lot area in a Village Center, shall not impede direct pedestrian access to the building entry, and shall not be allowed on streets abutting a village green or park in a village center.

C. Grocery Stores. Urban Village (UV) and Community Oriented Shopping Center (COSC) District requirements: The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Commented [NF21]: City Staff recommend this change provided the applicant is supported in their request to allow instead of require this use in the village.

18.05.080 TABLES: Commercial Development Standards

TABLE 5.04

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (including mixed commercial/residential buildings)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	None.	None.	
FRONT YARD SETBACK	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(I)(1) 4. 18.05.080(K) 5. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. 18.05.080(K) 3. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking streets; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(K) 4. 18.05.080(L)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	30 feet for commercial structures; or	30 feet for commercial structures; or	45 feet;	3 stories, up to 45 feet;	18.05.080(M)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
(Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures.	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures; EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories 3 stories	2 stories 3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district. 4 Stories for mixed-use buildings facing the town square. 3 Stories elsewhere in the mixed-use district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	18.05.080(M)(10)
MAXIMUM BUSINESS OCCUPANCY SIZE (GROSS FLOOR AREA)	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one grocery store may be up to 50,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one building may be 50,000 sq. ft.	Residential floor area in a mixed-use building shall not be counted in determining the maximum building size.
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	85%	85%	85%	85%	
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS			For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	

(Ord. 6517 §16, 2007).

18.05.080 Development standards

A. General. Table 5.04 identifies the basic standards for commercial development (i.e., offices, retail sales, and services uses identified in Table 5.01) in the NC, NV, UV, COSC and districts. Table 5.05 identifies the basic development standards for residential uses in these districts. The reference numbers listed in these tables refer to the list of additional development standards below.

B. Maximum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Maximum Density. The maximum densities and average maximum densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations:

a. The area within streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" shall not be counted.

b. The area of the required minimum open space for the village or center (see Table 5.05) shall not be counted.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The density of a village center (as delineated in a master plan approved pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) and the density of the remainder of the project shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. The village center and the remainder of the project shall each comply with the maximum average density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Maximum Densities. The maximum housing densities shown in the top row of Table 5.05 refer to the maximum density of individual project components. The housing density for the overall project, however (i.e., all of the property subject to an approved Master Plan), shall not exceed the maximum average density for the district specified in the second row of Table 5.05. For example, a neighborhood village may contain an apartment complex with 24 dwelling units per acre provided that the average density for the entire development does not exceed 13 units per acre.

3. Convalescent Homes. Convalescent homes and nursing homes containing dwelling units which rely on shared cooking/dining facilities shall count as one dwelling unit for purposes of the maximum density calculation. Independent dwelling units (i.e., containing a bed, bathroom and a kitchen with a sink, stove, and refrigerator) in such facilities, however, shall be counted as individual housing units in the density calculation. The site containing a nursing/convalescent home depending on shared kitchen facilities shall be deducted from the land available for residential development when calculating the maximum density for the village or center. (The excess density shall not be transferred to other portions of the site.)

4. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory dwelling units built subsequent to the initial sale of the primary residence on a lot are not subject to the maximum density limits specified in Table 5.05. In addition, accessory units built on a maximum of 20 percent of a development's lots are not subject to the maximum density requirements, provided they are built prior to the time the primary unit on the lot is initially sold or receives occupancy approval (if built by the owner).

5. Density Bonuses. The maximum housing densities identified in Table 5.05 may be increased as follows:

a. Bonus for restoring degraded sites.

i. At the request of the applicant, the Hearing Examiner may grant a density bonus of up to 20 percent for sites on which damaged or degraded wetlands or stream corridors (e.g., streams and stream banks within the outer limits of the buffer required by OMC 18.32.435) will be restored and maintained according to specifications approved by the City.

ii. Sites proposed for this density bonus shall be posted with a notice describing the proposal and opportunities to comment. Property owners within 300 feet of the site shall be given notice of the

proposal and 15 days to comment. Such notice may be done concurrently with any other notice required by this Code.

iii. Prior to taking action on a request for a density bonus, the Hearing Examiner shall consider:

(a) the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies,

(b) the public's comments,

(c) the expected public benefit that would be derived from such restoration,

(d) the net effect of the restoration and the increased density on the site,

(e) the relative cost of the restoration and the value of the increased density, and

(f) the potential impact of increased density on surrounding land uses, traffic, infrastructure, schools, and parks.

iv. The City may require the developer to provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed restoration and other information as necessary to make a decision on the request.

b. Bonus for low income housing.

i. A density bonus shall be granted for low income housing (see Section 18.02.180, Definitions) at the rate of one additional housing unit allowed for each unit of low income housing provided, up to a maximum of a 20 percent density bonus.

ii. The applicant shall submit to the Department a document approved by the City Attorney stating that the low income housing which is the basis for the density bonus shall remain as part of the development for at least 20 years. This time period shall begin on the date that final inspection of all of the low income housing has been performed. This document shall be recorded, at the applicant's expense, at the Thurston County Auditor's Office as part of the chain of title of the affected parcels.

C. Minimum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Minimum Density. The minimum average densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations: [Note: Table 5.05 in Section 18.05]

a. The entire site shall be included in the minimum density calculation except streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, floodplains, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" and their associated buffers; tracts accommodating stormwater facilities required in compliance with the Drainage Design Manual; existing, opened street rights-of-way; and land to be sold or dedicated to the public, other than street rights-of-way (e.g., school sites and parks, but not street rights-of-way to be dedicated as part of the proposed development).

b. All dwelling units in convalescent homes/nursing homes and accessory units count toward the minimum density required for the site by Table 5.05, in the same manner as provided above in Section 18.05.080(B)(3) Maximum Housing Densities -- Convalescent Homes and 18.05.080(B)(4) Maximum Housing Densities -- Accessory Dwelling Units.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The minimum residential density of a village center and that of the remainder of a village or center shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. There shall be no minimum density requirement for a village center other than the requirement for mixed use buildings specified in Section 18.05.050(C)(2) Village/Community Center--Mixed Use

above. The procedures for calculating the required number of units are as provided in Sections 18.05.080(3)(1)(a), (2), and (3) above.

iii. The remainder of a village shall comply with the minimum density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Average Density. A housing project may contain a variety of housing densities provided that the average density for the entire development (i.e., all of the property subject to a single Master Planned Development approval) is neither less than the minimum density nor more than the maximum density established for the district in Table 5.05. No part of the development, however, may exceed the maximum density established in row one of Table 5.05 (see Section 18.05.080(B)(2) Maximum Densities).

3. Density Allowance for Site Constraints. At the request of the applicant, the Director or Hearing Examiner may reduce the minimum density required in Table 5.05, to the extent the Director or Hearing Examiner deems warranted, in order to accommodate site constraints which make development at the required minimum density impractical or inconsistent with the purposes of this Article (e.g., poor soil drainage, the presence of springs, steep topography (e.g., over 20 percent), rock outcrops, or wellhead protection areas). As a condition of granting a density reduction, the applicant must demonstrate that the minimum density cannot be achieved by clustering the housing on the buildable portions of the site (see Section 18.05.080(F) Clustered Housing).

4. Density Allowance for Natural Features/Habitat Protection. At the request of the applicant, the Director may reduce the minimum densities to the extent necessary to accommodate trees to be retained consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement. (Also see Section 18.05.080(F)(1), Mandatory Clustering.) At the request of the applicant, the Director may also authorize a reduction in the minimum density requirements in order to enable retention of Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Nonresidential Uses. The minimum lot size for non-residential uses (e.g., churches and schools) may be larger than the minimum lot size identified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05. Refer to Table 4.01 Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Districts, and Section 18.04.060 Residential Districts Use Standards for regulations pertaining to non-residential uses in residential areas. Also see Section 18.04.060(K) Group Homes for the lot size requirements for group homes.

2. Clustered Lots. Lot sizes may be reduced by up to 20 percent consistent with Section 18.05.080(F), Clustered Housing.

E. Transitional Lots.

1. Lot Size. The square footage and width of those residential lots in developments located in the NC, NV, UV, COSC, and districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than 85 percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.

2. Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the NC, NV, UV, and COSC and districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be the same as the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.

F. Clustered Housing.

1. Mandatory Clustering.

a. Criteria for clustering. The Hearing Examiner may require that the housing units allowed for a site be clustered on a portion of the site to:

i. Protect groundwater used as a public water source (e.g., wellhead protection areas); or

ii. Enable retention of trees (based upon a recommendation by the City's Urban Forester, consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement, Olympia Municipal Code); or

iii. Preserve Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

iv. Accommodate urban trails identified on Map 7-1 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

v. Preserve scenic vistas pursuant to Sections 18.20.070 View Preservation and 18.50.100 Scenic Vistas; or

vi. Enable creation of buffers between incompatible uses (see Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

b. Degree of clustering.

i. The approval authority may allow up to a 20 percent reduction in lot dimensions, sizes and setback requirements, consistent with the Uniform Building Code, to facilitate the clustering of the permitted number of dwelling units on the site.

ii. The required clustering shall not result in fewer lots than would otherwise be permitted on the site (at the minimum density specified in Table 5.05), without the written authorization of the applicant.

2. Optional Clustering.

a. Applicants for housing projects may request up to 20 percent reduction in lot sizes, dimensions, and building setback requirements in order to cluster housing and retain land for the following purposes:

i. To meet the criteria listed in Section 18.05.080(F)(1) Mandatory Clustering above; or

ii. To avoid development on slopes steeper than 20 percent; or

iii. To preserve natural site features such as rock outcrops or topographical features; or

iv. To otherwise enable land to be made available for public or private open space.

b. The approval authority may grant such requests if the approval authority determines that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.

G. Lot Width.

1. Measurement. The minimum lot width required by Table 5.05 shall be measured between the side lot lines at the point of intersection with the minimum front setback line established in Table 5.05.

2. Varied Lot Widths. The width of residential lots in the NC, NV, UV and COSC districts shall be varied to avoid monotonous development patterns.

a. No more than three (3) consecutive lots, uninterrupted by a street, shall be of the same width. This requirement does not apply to townhouses.

b. Lot widths shall be varied by a minimum of six (6) foot increments.

c. The minimum lot widths specified in Table 5.05 may be reduced by six (6) feet for individual lots to provide variety, provided that the average lot width for the project is no less than the minimum lot width required by Table 5.05.

3. Minimum Street Frontage.

a. Each residential lot, other than for townhouse and cottage housing, shall have a minimum of thirty (30) feet of frontage on a public street.




FIGURE 5-2

b. EXCEPTION: the City may allow the street frontage to be reduced (creating a flag lot) to the minimum extent necessary to enable access to property where public street access is not feasible (e.g., due to physical site conditions or preexisting development) or to protect environmentally Critical Areas (see Chapter 18.32 OMC).

c. Subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, and lot line adjustments creating flag lots (with street frontages of less than thirty (30) feet) are subject to the following conditions:

i. The project shall be designed to minimize the creation of flag lots; and

ii. Adjoining flag lots shall share a common driveway wherever possible; and

iii. All driveways accessing flag lots shall be designed to allow fire truck access to within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the residence(s) on the lot(s), unless alternate forms of fire protection approved by the Fire Department are provided (e.g., sprinkler systems); and

iv. The area of a flag lot which is less than thirty (30) feet in width shall not be considered part of the minimum lot area required in Table 5.05.

H. Front Yard Setbacks.

1. In the NV, NC, UV, and COSC districts, front yard setbacks for residential uses may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet under the following conditions:

a. When the garage or parking lot access is from the rear of the lot; or

b. When the garage is located at least ten (10) feet behind the front facade of the primary structure on the lot; or

c. When the driveway will be aligned to provide at least a twenty (20) foot long parking space between the sidewalk edge (closest to lot) and the garage.

2. Such setback reductions shall not be allowed where they would result in a setback of fifty (50) percent or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an abutting lot fronting on the same street. (See Design Guidelines, 18.05A.280, Garage Design.)

I. Maximum Front Yard Setbacks.

1. Proportion of Structure to be Built Within Setback.

a. At least thirty (30) percent of the front facade of the primary residential structure on the lot must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Table 5.05.

b. At least seventy (70) percent of the front facade of buildings fronting on a village or center green, park or plaza must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

2. Exceptions to the Maximum Front Yard Setback Standard. The following are exempt from the maximum front yard setbacks specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

a. Parcels with physical site constraints. The approval authority may allow larger setbacks than required by Tables 5.04 and 5.05 to accommodate steep or difficult topography, views, rock out-crops, environmentally Critical Areas, or trees designated for preservation.

b. Sensitive and high impact uses. The approval authority may allow greater front yard setbacks for nonresidential uses such as schools, nursing homes, public facilities, or utilities which may be sensitive to traffic noise or emissions, or warrant greater separation from adjoining property due to their potential impacts on adjoining land uses.

c. Flag lots, (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

d. Wedge-shape lots. (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

e. Dwellings which front on an arterial street or arterial boulevard.


J. Side Yard Setbacks.

1. Reduced Side Yard Setbacks. A side yard building setback shall not be required for one (1) side of a residential lot provided that it meets the following conditions:

a. If the distance between the proposed dwelling and property line is less than three (3) feet, the applicant shall provide evidence of at least a three (3) foot wide maintenance easement recorded with the deed of the applicable adjoining lot. Such easements shall provide access for the owner of the applicable lot (with a side yard setback of less than three (3) feet) to maintain the exterior of the wall and roof within three (3) feet of the side property line.

b. Side yard setbacks shall not be less than five (5) feet along a property line adjoining a lot which is not approved for reduced setbacks (e.g., a conventional lot with two (2) five (5) foot wide side yard setbacks) or less than ten (10) feet along property lines which abut a public rights-of-way.

2. Setbacks from Trails and Bike Paths. The minimum side yard setback adjoining a public bike path or walkway shall be ten (10) feet.



Zero Lot Line Housing
FIGURE 5-3

K. Measurement of Setbacks. Setback width shall be measured from the outermost edge of the building foundation to the closest point of the applicable lot line.

L. Encroachment into Setbacks.

1. Required setback areas shall be kept free of any building or structure higher than thirty (30) inches.

2. EXCEPTIONS: The buildings and projections listed below shall be allowed in the portion of the setback not contained in a utility, access, or other easement:

a. Accessory structures, including accessory dwelling units, may be located in a required rear yard and/or in the rear thirty (30) feet of a required interior side yard; however, if a garage entrance faces the rear or side property line, it shall be setback at least ten (10) feet from that property line.

b. Cornices, window sills, bay windows, flues and chimneys, planters, and roof eaves may project two (2) feet into the required yard area.

c. Marquees and awnings for commercial uses.

d. Fences in compliance with the fence height requirements specified in OMC 18.40.060.D Fences.

e. Swimming pools, hot tubs and satellite dish antennas may be placed in the rear or interior side yard setback area.

f. Up to fifty percent (50%) of a rear yards width may be occupied by a dwelling (primary residence or ADU) provided that the structure (foundation) is located at least ten (10) feet from the rear property line. For purposes of this Section, the rear yards width shall be measured in a straight line between the side property lines at the point of intersection with the rear property line.

g. Signs in compliance with OMC 18.43.




FIGURE 5-4

M. Height.

1. Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens or Plazas. Buildings in villages and community oriented shopping centers which front onto the required park, green or plaza (see 18.05.080(N)(2) Private and Common Open Space--Villages, and Community Oriented Shopping Centers) shall be at least two (2) stories in height. This requirement does not apply to food or grocery stores.

2. Commercial/Residential Transitions. Commercial buildings abutting lots designated for single family residential use shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height, whichever is less.

3. Roof Projections. The following structures may exceed the height limits specified for the district in Table 5.05 by eighteen (18) feet, provided that such structures do not contain floor space:

a. roof structures housing elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building;

b. fire or parapet walls;

c. skylights;

d. clock towers;

e. flagpoles;

f. chimneys;

g. smoke stacks;

h. wireless masts;

i. T.V. antennas;

j. steeples; and

k. similar structures.

4. Tall Buildings. In the NC, NV, UV, and COCS districts, buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height must comply with the following requirements:

a. The proposed building shall not be located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center. Public rights-of-way adjoining the village or center property boundary shall count toward this separation requirement. Exceptions to this provision shall be granted where topography, stands of trees (designated for retention and approved by the City's Urban Forester), or other site features block the visibility of the section of the building above thirty-five (35) feet in height from existing or potential residential areas (zoned and available for residential use) adjoining the site; and

b. Existing evergreen trees, which the City's Urban Forester determines do not pose undue risks for proposed site improvements or public safety and are appropriate for their location at their mature size, are retained where possible to help screen the building from the view of residents of dwellings abutting the property.

5. Places of Worship. The height of churches and other places of worship may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05 provided that the side yard width equals at least fifty (50) percent of the proposed height of the place of worship (including spires and towers).

6. Free-Standing Ornamental Structures. Free-standing ornamental structures such as clock towers, sculptures, monuments or other similar features approved as part of a master plan (see Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) shall not exceed 60 feet in height. These structures shall be located in the village center (see Section 18.05.050(C), Village/Community Center) and shall not contain signage.

7. Radio and Television Transmitting and Receiving Towers. The height of radio and television transmitting and receiving towers may exceed the maximum building height allowed in the district, subject to approval of the Hearing Examiner consistent with Section 18.04.060(Z).

8. Water Towers. Water towers may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05.

9. Perimeter Buildings. Except as otherwise provided in Section 18.05.080(M), Height, buildings located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty five (35) feet, whichever is less. This requirement shall not apply to the UV mixed-use district.

10. A building height waiver may be granted at project entries and along arterial or major collector streets within a Master Planned Community (NV, UV, and COSC) where slopes exist that would cause less than desirable height of building to width of street ratio (a ratio less than 1:4 building height to street width) not to exceed the permitted building height as measured from the fronting street edge.

N. Private and Common Open Space.

1. Development of Open Space.

a. Open space required by Table 5.05 shall be devoted to undisturbed native vegetation, landscaping, and/or outdoor recreational facilities. Driveways, loading areas, maneuvering space and parking lots shall not be considered part of this required space.

b. Required open space shall not be covered with impervious surfaces, except for walkways, tennis and basketball courts, swimming pools, or similar recreational uses which require an impervious surface.

c. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase the impervious surface coverage limits specified in Table 5.05 by up to five (5) percent to accommodate the walkways and recreational uses listed above (see also Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

2. Villages and Community Oriented Shopping Centers.

a. Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas

and type of access will be determined during the Master Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers (see Chapter 18.32, OMC).

b. Neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers must contain a neighborhood park or "green" between one (1) and four (4) acres in size located in the village or community center. This park, green, or plaza shall have an average slope no greater than five (5) percent; adequate drainage to allow active use in summer; and a width and length of no less than one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

3. Cottage Housing Developments.

a. A minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of private, contiguous, usable, open space shall be provided adjacent to each dwelling unit. No dimension of this open space area shall be less than ten (10) feet.

b. A minimum of fifteen hundred (1500) square feet or two hundred (200) square feet per unit, whichever is more, shall be provided in common open space (e.g., available for the use of all residents of the cottage housing development). This open space shall be contained in a contiguous area with no dimension less than thirty (30) feet. Such open space shall be sufficiently level (e.g., less than five (5) percent slope) and well drained to enable active use in summer.

4. Multifamily Housing.

a. In neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers, parcels or sites accommodating multifamily housing (e.g., triplexes, fourplexes, and larger apartment buildings) shall contain at least thirty (30) percent open space. However, such multifamily housing within one hundred (100) feet of a neighborhood park, green, or public or common open space, which is at least ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, shall only be required to retain fifteen (15) percent of the site in open space. Impervious surface coverage requirements shall be adjusted accordingly~~. Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.~~

Commented [BC22]: Rooftop courtyards are not open or visible to the public so should not count as open space.

b. At least fifty (50) percent of the open space required in 18.05.080(N)(4)(a) above shall be available for the common use of all residents of the multifamily housing.

c. Common open space shall be contiguous with the housing site (e.g., not separated from the dwellings by streets or barriers that impede pedestrian access) and shall be sufficiently level (e.g., five (5) percent average slope) and well drained to allow active use in summer. No dimension shall be less than fifteen (15) feet.

18.05.080 TABLES: Residential Development Standards

TABLE 5.05

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	24	24 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	24	18.05.080(B)
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	13	14 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	13	18.05.080(B)

Commented [NF23]: City Staff support. No other commercial zone has a maximum density, and this incentivizes increased units, however it is inconsistent in context of the remainder of the chart.

Commented [BC24]: These changes should apply only if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	7	7	7	7	18.05.080(C)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	3,500 sq. ft. = zero lots Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard. 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 5,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	18.05.080(D) 18.05.080(E) 18.05.080(F) 18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 80’ = duplex	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	18.05.080(G)
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	18.05.080(H) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK	25’	25’	25’	25’	18.05.080(I) 18.05.080(K)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	20’	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	15’ EXCEPT: 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots; 20’ with alley access.	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots.	18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.05.080(E)(2)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	18.05.080(J) 18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35’ EXCEPT: 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	18.05.080(M)
MAXIMUM ABOVE GRADE STORIES	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	50%	50%	50%	50%	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%	70%	18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	1 acre	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	18.05.080(N)

Commented [NF25]: City Staff does not support these changes. Mixed use buildings would be treated as commercial. This amendment would incentivize apartment only (no mix) in the commercial core.

Commented [NF26]: City Staff supports the concept, but a mixed use building is treated as commercial and must comply with commercial height standards. This section only applies to residential only buildings which should be required to include ground floor retail for additional height.

Commented [NF27]: City Staff does not support this change because it does not incentivize mixed use. Mixed use buildings are allowed additional height/stories.

Commented [NF28]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use. A mixed use building would be allowed additional coverage.

Commented [NF29]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use buildings. A mixed use building would already be exempt from open space requirements.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

Jackson Ewing

From: bruce mcdonald <mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; cronkk@ssymca.net
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan

Hello Jackson Ewing,

We are writing to you about our concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the proposed Briggs Village Master Plan.
It is our understanding that the proposed amendments will increase residential development and reduce planned commercial space and subsequent parking.

We would like to know if there has been data and community involvement that has driven proposed amendments. The background data to help make a decision based on the value and need of an amendment for additional residential development over commercial development would be information such as

1) the existing occupancy rate of the two high density developments at the intersection of Henderson and Yelm Hwy. We are a casual observer, yet it is very apparent that both of these complexes are not to full capacity.

2) an existing travel and parking study of the surrounding commercial businesses. Is there currently adequate parking during busy hours. I can assure that the YMCA currently does not have enough parking during many hours of the day, not just peak use hours.

3) The current existing need for a small commercial grocery store, again a study of the current area residents and how far they have to travel to find food. Will the amendment increase the people density without increasing the ability to live in the area. Are you building a larger food desert for the existing community.

4) Who will benefit from this amendment ?and how ?

5) It is understood that there is a nationwide residential shortage but a few more high-end homes replacing essential services like a grocery store, or pharmacy detracts rather than benefits the existing community.

6) Is this a proposed SEPA Amendment? If so, would it change the prior determination and require mitigation for the proposed amendment? Would the proposal be reviewed again and the public comment period be reopened?

Please share any information with us regarding our questions and add us to communication list on this issue.

We live within 2 miles of the Briggs YMCA and utilize the facility several times a week. We have enjoyed riding our bikes to the businesses of ice cream, and pizza.

Please deny this amendment as it is currently proposed and get more information about what the Briggs Village Area needs to be a thriving community.

Sincerely

Mary and Bruce McDonald
mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: cathy gilmore <thycamoregil@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Jackson-
I am requesting that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.
The parking situation for the Y is already ridiculous and needs more parking now. We do not need more residential housing! Originally there was to be a Thriftway in this area- all that is there is basically residential housing for seniors. I don't know what happened but I was disappointed not getting the grocery store, and to lose parking, add traffic, lose green space and strain our utilities with more housing is not acceptable.
Thank you
Cathy Gilmore
thycamoregil@msn.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Schofield <lschofiel@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 7:20 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Amendments to Briggs Village

Hello,
I cannot make the meeting to discuss plans to amend the current plan of more residential housing in Briggs Village. Originally there was supposed to be a grocery store along with an abundance of shared parking for businesses and residential.
I am against amendments that increase residential use while reducing or not holding to the promise of shared parking for businesses. I will use the Briggs YMCA as my example. I have been going to this business for over 20 years. The current parking has been a disaster for the past few years while making for a dangerous driving condition along the side road leading into the facility. This situation needs to be corrected and this amendment would do nothing but make the situation worse. If an amendment was developed that allowed additional off street parking for the general businesses in the area I could support an amendment. Without corrections to the existing situation, I cannot support amendments.

Larry Schofield
1330 68th Avenue SE, Tumwater
360.628.9592

Jackson Ewing

From: Marge Wieland <wielandmarge@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Development

I am against changing the zoning in Briggs Village. Parking at the Y is very difficult at times now. If the zoning is changed, it will be impossible.
Marge Wieland

Jackson Ewing

From: Russ & Mary Pitkin <russandmarypitkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Amendments

Please do not make any changes to the Briggs Village Zoning Plan. What may seem like a good idea to solve one problem ends up creating additional unforeseen problems. Making room for additional housing by increasing residential density will result in a decrease of currently planned commercial space which will increase demand for other infrastructure which then would not be accommodated from within the village area. The imbalance due to the zoning change will cause strain in the surrounding area.

I've seen these planning mistakes take place in other cities and once the damage is done it is irreversible and makes these areas less desirable to live in, not to mention the additional strain on all sorts of surrounding community infrastructure and the tremendous inconvenience to everyone when infrastructure capacity is exceeded and needs to be enlarged just because there was no planning consideration in advance.

Just a few examples: Has the impact of this change been reviewed with the school district for the potential increase to their school populations and do they currently have capacity? This is the responsibility of good community planning. What impact will the increase have on utilities? Is there adequate PSE infrastructure? Is there adequate sewer infrastructure? How will the increased number of personal vehicles impact the existing traffic circulation not to mention the overcrowding of parking that will occur. Is there adequate nearby open space for residents? We are after all animals and we do need outdoor space for ourselves and our pets.

The last place I lived, Portland, Oregon, the planners really messed up badly. They wanted to increase housing density to meet demand. They figured they would develop around existing neighborhoods taking up commercial space with five over one buildings (five stories of apartments over one level of commercial) which surrounded the neighborhoods. Developers talked them into building these 5 over 1 structures without parking so they could minimize costs and save time in construction. The city allowed this because their transit system was large enough to handle the additional load and people living in these structures would not need cars because transit was convenient. People still owned cars to get off for the weekend and on vacations so they totally maximize all curb side street parking in the neighborhoods causing some of the streets to be one directional at a times which really congested traffic at major intersections in the vicinity of these neighbors. This transition total change the character of the neighborhoods. These structures lined both sides of the major thoroughfares creating a canyon-like atmosphere keeping sunlight out at street level for a majority of the day and the old commercial enterprises either relocated or did not reopen destroying the small business community used by residents and the new commercial spaces are mainly vacant. Many of the old always crowded restaurants were on large plots with plenty of parking now under a 5 over one structure. They are gone and what is left is not anywhere as nice or convenient.

Jackson Ewing

From: Tonya Kehoe <tonyakehoeart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 12:00 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello, I am writing today to leave a comment about something that is really important to me and my family and many of my fellow neighbors here in Briggs Village community.
When we bought our home here last summer, we were told and understood in our paperwork that the center area will be developed with a real, actual grocery store. In addition, some retail and/or places to eat as well. This was a huge factor in buying here in Briggs.
I was given your email to write from a neighbor to declare that as a homeowner, I am adamantly opposed to the developer gaining approval to change the Briggs plans from the full grocery store and retail in the center. I am asking the City of Olympia deciders to not approve this as it is fundamentally the opposite of what we bought into in good faith.
I do not want it full of apartments, or mini mart or whatever shortcuts are being proposed . No, we need the grocery store and other neighbood amenities that were in the original approved plans.

Thank you for recording my comment in the record.

Tonya Kehoe

4302 Magnolia Dr SE
319-400-3297

Jackson Ewing

From: Rene Toolson <rene.toolson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Rezoning/Overall Planning Concerns

Dear Mr. Ewing-
I respectfully request the City of Olympia sustain its current zoning designation for the Briggs Village in order to preserve the original intent of the village concept. I have been a resident of Olympia for 17 years and utilize both the Plum St and Briggs Y. I also regularly visit the businesses in the Village. It is very typical that parking at the Y overflows into the surrounding area; additional pressures on parking would make the Y inaccessible to the majority of its users. I'm certain that within the main goal of the City is to support a healthy population, and the Y is a mainstay towards achieving that goal. Please add my voice to the upcoming hearing to occur on Monday 2/24/25 as opposing any zoning change.

I am continuously dismayed by the planning direction of the City, as it does not take into account current residents' experience, sufficient parking for new development, quality open space, yards, space between houses, or design standards that preserve historic integrity of neighborhoods. As a long term resident, it feels like the City is catering to developers under the fallacy of addressing the "missing middle" rather than leveraging our limited space using strong development standards. All of the most recent housing development in my neighborhood is not serving lower or middle class consumers, but has created oppressive, looming, large square-foot multi-housing units completely out of character with the surrounding homes and affordable only by upper and upper middle class consumers. The quality of life in our city is quickly declining as neighborhoods fill each empty lot with high density, large multi-units (both large individually and as a total unit) that leave no room for open space, yards/gardens, trees; most of this housing looms over nearby houses and pushes parking outward in front of those neighbors, and we see no improvement in the quality road and sidewalk infrastructure. I hope this direction does not continue in the Briggs Village community.

Thank you.

Rene Toolson
1600 Pine Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Jackson Ewing

From: Randy Person <rmperson@q.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 6:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Feb. 24, 2025 Urban Village Zoning hearing

Mr. Ewing:

The planning commission notice of public hearing for the Feb. 24, 2025 Urban Village Zone amendment discussion arrived in our mail on Feb. 20, leaving us precious little time to thoroughly review the extensive material. As referenced material notes, while the zoning applies to "all urban villages," since there is currently only one, the discussion has its bulls-eye directly centered on Briggs Village. We have been able to note the requested changes, and have reviewed the city staff's remarks, market information provided, as well as the thoughtful comments you have received so far. We have been nearby neighbors since the Yelm Highway was a 2-lane road that ended at a 4-way stop, and Briggs was a wonderful nursery.

Good arguments are made that there is a need for housing. Our quiet dead-end street has been transformed over the last few years by development of dozens of multi-family units on the Hansen St. extension. It seems the paint is hardly dry before someone is moving in as each unit is finished. However, it is critical that the base concept of the urban village not be lost. Find ways to add families if possible, but not at the cost of the vibrant town center that was presented at its inception.

It should be obvious that no business in Briggs Village would be viable if they depended on customers from only within the village itself. The design must accommodate those from the surrounding area who will access and patronize new establishments. Important for all, it is especially vital for regional services like the YMCA. We see that the area around the Y is often crowded today, and much is yet to be developed. If you do find a way to increase the village population, please be sure that it does not impact the ability of current and future businesses to be a successful part of the overall development. Any new residential units permitted must include off-street parking, so as to not impact the current design. As well, this provides the opportunity to provide protected EV charging, which many will agree will become more in demand as time passes.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Randy and Marise Person

801 South St. SE

Tumwater, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: JnL Ward <jkllw@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:36 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan changes

As a member of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned over the proposed changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. First, the plan included a grocery store to service the neighborhood. Then requested changes downsized the foot print for a grocery store. As a result there are apparently no grocers who would move in.

Even though I am not a resident of the community, I looked forward to a grocery store in the neighborhood that provided convenience near the Y.

Now the developers want to abandon the master plan in order to build apartments instead of retail designed to support a walkable neighborhood. Not only does this abandon the original plan but also creates a parking nightmare for the YMCA which was an anchor for the neighborhood.

Changes to the master plan have already ruined a great concept, why consider additional changes that would completely destroy the master plan? If anything, go back to the original plan or consider something that would include parking overflow for the Y.

It feels as if the YMCA is being ignored as part of the community and the needs of the community are being ignored for corporate gain.

Thank you for your consideration
Laura W.

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen Nicholas <karennicholasrn@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 9:59 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I am opposed to changing the original plan for Briggs. I live in one of the neighborhoods east of Henderson off Yelm Highway. I have been waiting for this development to come to fruition for a very long time. Please stay with the original plan. We who live in the surrounding area need businesses within walking distance. The ability to walk to a community shopping and entertainment area is good for our health and good for the environment.
More housing area will increase traffic and make walking on Yelm Highway even more challenging.
Thank you.
Karen Nicholas
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: GREG SAUL <gwsaul@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Community

Hello,

I'm an Olympia resident and Briggs YMCA member. I'm very concerned about the proposed changes to the Briggs Village Community zoning with respect to future congestion and parking challenges for the existing businesses.

I request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

Thank you,
Greg Saul
3103 31st Ct SE
Olympia

Jackson Ewing

From: Dan Zimmer <dzsz321@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 10:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

My spouse is handicapped - and we really need accessible parking at the YMCA. Parking is already a challenge! The strength and balance classes have really helped us both!! He has had multiple falls - and my back hurts from helping him up. With the class, he has had far fewer falls and it has been a huge help! He had recent heart valve replacement - and is working to recover his strength, stamina, and balance. Thank you for helping us in this effort to be able to find parking and participate in the wonderful, inclusive, and helpful YMCA program(s)!

Jackson Ewing

From: Gene Cinkovich <gcinkovich@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 11:47 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs urban development and Y

To whom it may concern.
I am a senior who used the Y three times a week for exercise and swimming. The parking as it stands now is difficult to find a spot at peak hours and especially during the spring and summer months when swim lessons are going on. It is too difficult for us seniors to park down the road and walk in as I have back and heart issues making it difficult and dangerous for me. Please take us into consideration when increasing your master plan to add more housing which decreases parking for the Y and surrounding businesses.

Thank you
Marlene Cinkovich

Jackson Ewing

From: CHARLES JOHNSON <chuckj4565@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 5:42 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs development

Dear Jackson Ewing: I am writing with the understanding that the original development plans are changing within the Briggs development property. The original plan was to establish a community friendly neighborhood with options for walking and retail space. Why would that plan be scrapped to increase the number of reidential units while decreasing the required commercial space valued in urban villages.

This not only defeats the original purpose of the Briggs property but puts a strain on existing parking infrastructure, which is already under pressure. This plan will greatly impact daily access to existing businesses and the well used YMCA.

Please look at the historical master plan, which gives value to the people of the community and not just the bottom dollar line of revenue. If people of Tumwater and Olympia wanted to live in total mass housing, lack of green spaces and sidewalks , they would have chosen to move elsewhere with a city atmosphere.

Please reevaluate your plan and think PEOPLE first. It is totally vital that current zoning stay in effect for the Briggs Village development and DO NOT turn our towns into a Seattle want-to-be.

Thank you for your time.

Jackson Ewing

From: Julie Groff <groffjuliec@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 9:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Dear Jackson,

Thank you for considering public feedback regarding the proposed Briggs Village development.

I am a member at the Briggs YMCA and use the facilities multiple times a week. Each time I visit, it is difficult to find parking. I, and other community members, often have to circle the parking lot a few times until a spot opens. On many occasions, we have had to park on the street by nearby businesses. I am concerned that with further development of the Briggs Village, parking will be become much more difficult or even impossible.

Please consider this burden in the planning of the Briggs Village and ensure that adequate parking and access to the Briggs YMCA and local businesses is readily available.

Thank you,

Julie Groff
Groffjuliec@gmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Dave & Cheryle <dcbroom@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 10:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Proposed Change

As a member of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned about any proposal to increase residential housing while decreasing commercial space. The Briggs Master Plan needs to continue to be implemented as envisioned rather than modified as suggested. Otherwise there will be a negative impact on our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryle and Dave Broom

Jackson Ewing

From: karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Gregory Quetin; Daniel Garcia; William Hannah; Tammy Adams; Aaron Sauerhoff; Raphael Garcia; Zainab Nejati
Cc: Jackson Ewing; Nicole Floyd
Subject: Urban Village proposed master plan changes

Members of the Planning Commission,

I have lived near the Briggs site since it was proposed as an urban village. The current concept of the urban village is a good one and fits with our Comprehensive Plan. I walk in this area regularly and would patronize businesses in the village.

The proposed changes to the urban village uses and proportions go too far in reducing the amount of commercial/retail within the development. The current residents of the village and the surrounding residential areas outside the village need to have access to services, retail and commercial in order to create a walkable neighborhood. As currently planned, the full development of the mix of uses could result in reduced car trips. As proposed, that would not be possible for this area. While one can walk in this area, there will not be enough destinations to actually reduce car trips.

There are enough people living near to this village center that the businesses will have nearby customers. And with Yelm Highway and Henderson nearby, they will also be able to attract some customers from outside the immediate area.

This large change to the urban village concept should precipitate an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. An urban village, by definition, has a mix of uses within walking distance of the residents. If these changes are made, this area should not be called an urban village anymore. It will simply be a large residential development with a few small businesses located in it. That change requires much more outreach and analysis than a simple text amendment.

The goals and policies of the Transportation and Land Use chapters of the Comprehensive Plan speak to a more walkable city and the concept of an urban village. I have copied a small selection of those below.

Karen Messmer

> Land Use Chapter Vision: Our Vision for the Future: A walkable, accessible, vibrant city.
>
> Goal 1. Land use patterns, densities and site designs are sustainable and support decreasing automobile reliance.
>
> Goal 24. Mixed use developments, also known as "villages," are planned with a pedestrian orientation and a coordinated and balanced mix of land uses.
>
> PL24.11 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 only 50% of the housing be single-family.

Jackson Ewing

From: Sharonne O'shea <sharonneoshea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello,
I understand the need for additional, affordable housing in our community and I do support that. Not, however, with the expense of creating food deserts (Mini marts do not alleviate that) and car dependent living situations, which means additional expenses for people to live there not just additional pollution for our community. Please support ALL residents of our community by making accessible fresh food available in ways that do not require vehicle use in areas of high density. I think people who need access to housing also need access to food. Have YOU ever been dependent on a bike and/or bus to get groceries? I have. It's not easy even when fully able bodied.

Sharonne

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

Jackson Ewing

From: Jason Roberts <jroberts432@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 4:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (File 24-0313)

Lead Planner Jackson Ewing:
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed amendments in zoning for the Briggs Urban Village (File 24-0313). I am against this property being used to increase the multifamily housing units allowance and reducing the required commercial square footage. I am also against the increased building height being proposed. The original plan took into account the needs of both businesses and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. This corner of Olympia and Tumwater needs greater access to stores and businesses that are walkable and add to the sense of community. My wife and I purchased our home in 2007 looking forward to the promised benefit of a village of small commercial occupancies, restaurants and grocery store. In short, areas for people to gather and enjoy. This proposed change would create inadequate green spaces for this change in population density. Our local parks and dog parks already lack adequate parking to accommodate the demand. Building additional apartments will completely change the feel and character of the neighborhoods that surround the area. More housing here will only make traffic and parking around the existing businesses more challenging. Increasing the housing density here will also strain the resources of the public schools and emergency response services.

I ask that this proposal is not approved. Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Roberts

Jackson Ewing

From: STEVE HALL <merlin13@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 4:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Urban Village Master Plan

Hi Jackson ,
Thanks for taking input on behalf of the Planning Commission on the proposed changes to the Briggs Master Plan.

I rarely weigh in on city issues since my retirement from the City five years ago.

However, I feel strongly about these proposed changes and believe I can provide a unique perspective.

In short I served with the city as the Assistant City Manger during the development of the concepts and excruciating details for Briggs. To say the least, it was a difficult and prolonged process.

While I understand the market dynamics and the severe need for housing that make land use changes seem reasonable for the Master Plan, the reduction of shared parking for the overall development does not make sense.

Parking was big issue during the development of the master plan and any causal observation of the existing area demonstrates that even now parking is a scarce commodity.
The shared parking of the planned commercial center, which is now being severely reduced, was critical to the success of the concept. The previous owners of the village sold the plan on being able to meet the parking needs of the entire urban village. In short, you can't change part of the plan without impacting the other elements.

I'd urge the Planning Commission and the City Council to not approve any land use changes unless the amendments require substantial additional shared parking.

Thanks you for your consideration

Steve Hall

Jackson Ewing

From: Esther Adams <922esther@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village--No Zoning Changes

I understand that the Olympia Planning Commission is considering zoning changes, potentially impacting the Briggs YMCA and surrounding development.
I feel strongly that the Briggs Village Master Plan and Urban Village zoning should not be altered. The original concept must be allowed to prevail as intended and as promised to our community.
Sincerely,
Esther Adams

To Whom it May Concern,
I am writing as a concerned neighbor that lives close to Briggs Village. My house is on the corner of Ross Circle and Middle Street and I have lived here since 2000. Briggs Village was “marketed” by the city to the surrounding neighborhood as an urban village that would contain a mix of single family homes, multi family dwellings, commercial space and open community green space. It was a hard sell at the time but the surrounding community accepted it because with the mix of commercial space, living space and ample green space it was felt that there would not be as much car traffic as in a traditional neighborhood. This has been true, however with every apartment unit that is built car traffic has increased. It is especially felt on Middle Street in the mornings and afternoons as cars cut through Middle Street to get to the high school and avoid the bottle neck of the traffic light at Henderson and North Street.

It appears that the developer now wants to change the zoning so that they can increase the amount of apartments in the development thereby decreasing the undeveloped commercial space and also decreasing future green space requirements. We’ve been told that if they build more apartments they will count rooftop courtyards as open/green space. That is ridiculous as the entire neighborhood would not have access to them. Rooftop courtyards are fine to have but they should in no way, shape or form count as open space or green space for the neighborhood. The existing parks in Briggs are heavily used by the neighborhood and they add to the appeal of the urban village.

We as the surrounding neighbors were promised more commercial space in this urban village. For example a grocery store which has never materialized. The current commercial businesses appear to be popular and are frequented by many of the surrounding neighbors that walk or bike vs using cars to patronize the businesses. In my opinion the developer has not made good faith efforts over the years to attract more commercial businesses and wants to take the easy way out by getting the zoning changed so they can throw up more apartment buildings. This would skew the original design of Briggs Village and for the current residents and existing homeowners of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhood it would be a slap in the face and a decision made in bad faith.

By allowing the developer to substantially change the use and esthetics of the existing Briggs Urban Village plan it will negatively impact surrounding property values. Families currently owning properties in Briggs Village purchased based on the Urban Village plan…defined, designated use areas within the development. By bowing to the developers request to substantially alter the existing plan, the City will be negatively impacting current owners as well as existing businesses. The developer does not live in Briggs Village…do any of you?

Please do not allow the requested zoning changes. Leave the zoning as-is.
Thank you for considering my opinion.

Lori Collet

Jackson Ewing

From: C. Stanley <calstan7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Casey Schaufler
Subject: Comment on File #24-0313

Good evening - I received a notice of public hearing on this matter and regret that I am unable to attend. I'd like to submit my public comment and to have it considered by the Planning Commission. This message isn't part of a coordinated campaign, just my personal comments.

I am a resident of Briggs Village - I rent one of the townhomes along the back by Kettle View Park. I agree that more housing is needed in our area. However, I disagree with the type of housing that this zoning proposes. This proposal would allow for an increase to four stories, which would do two things: decimate the value of the surrounding properties by eliminating any sort of views that they currently have; and continue to perpetuate the growth of a style of living that no one wants, but is forced to endure.

Local developers, to their credit, have been creating new opportunities for housing. Unfortunately, they are only interested in maximizing profit rather than provide useful housing for families. Too often, they are building 1-2 bedroom/1 bathroom apartments with "open concept" living areas that combine kitchens, living rooms, and dining areas in one tiny space. Families need more space. A typical renting family is 1 parent, maybe two, with 2 kids. While those kids can share a room as kids - they become teenagers, and the style of housing this proposal suggests is not conducive to families. It just makes them suffer for being too poor to buy a house by confining them to a tiny space in the name of "additional housing".

I agree that the area should have reduced commercial zoning. We don't need more businesses in the Briggs Village area, but we do need a convenience store like the Frog Pond or the Pit Stop - local community stores that are easy to access by walking.

In short, I am in favor of changing the zoning to create more residential housing and reducing commercial zoning, but I am adamantly opposed to the type of housing this proposal contains. If the planning commission cannot amend the proposal to require legitimate housing, then it should reject the proposal altogether.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Stanley
Resident of Briggs Village
360-701-5692

Jackson Ewing

From: Rachel Smith <rackelberry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:14 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Sten village zoning

Hello! I'm unable to attend the meeting tonight and would like to submit written comments instead. I am opposed to increasing the number of apartments and decreasing the commercial component of Briggs Village.

This would be a step backward and a retreat from the city of Olympia's goals of walkable neighborhoods. This area is desperately in need of services. The few businesses that are established here are booming. I live nearby and have no choice but to drive for almost every service. We've been eagerly awaiting the arrival of a grocery store for years. If you change the zoning now, it will be an enormous lost opportunity.
Rachel Smith
4610 Village Dr SE
Olympia 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Schaufler
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:48 AM
To: TOM-CORY PLANTENBERG
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Meeting tonight

Good morning, Cory –
I have forwarded your message to my colleague, Jackson Ewing, who is the planner processing the application for the code amendment. He is tracking all written feedback and is consolidating it for the record. If you would like to testify on this topic during the public hearing, you may do so by attending in person at Olympia City Hall or by signing up to testify via Zoom (link to registration). Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Kind regards,
Casey Schaufler (he/him)
Associate Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.753.8254 | cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: TOM-CORY PLANTENBERG <tomandcory@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:42 AM
To: Casey Schaufler <cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting tonight

I would like to comment on the planned changes to the Briggs area plan.

I am a resident of Olympia and a member of the South Sound YMCA. I workout and swim at both the Briggs YMCA and the Plum Street YMCA. I wish Plum Street had a pool. It has become increasing difficult to park at the Briggs Y. As they have grown their membership the current parking is not adequate. As I live on the westside public transportation is not an option. The area needs more parking not less. Please do not change anything to reduce the parking at the Briggs area. If anything it needs to be increased. I read the analysis and I could not see where any of the information would support reducing the additional parking currently needed much less in the future.

Cory Plantenberg

Jackson Ewing

From: Dawn Utter <dutter1111@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking concerns.

To whom it may concern
I am a member of the Briggs YMCA. I and my granddaughters enjoy the many programs and classes they offer. I've had only one complaint since we became members. Finding a parking spot. I would hope that this would be a concern of anyone in the community. The Y offers many learning opportunities for the youth in our area. Many seniors get much needed exercise and knowledge from programs and classes. If more businesses or housing go into the immediate area of Briggs YMCA then the Parking issue will become worse. This could result in lower memberships and opportunities for continued or new classes being offered.
Thank you for your time.
Dawn Utter

Jackson Ewing

From: Doug Spohn <douglasspohn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Doug Spohn
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Changes

Hello Jackson —

I am writing to you in reference to proposed zoning changes by the City of Olympia.

Specifically, I want to support the decision to NOT change the current zoning within the Briggs Village community.

It is my understanding that proposed zoning changes will reduce the availability of commercial space and within the Village. A nice blend of residential, commercial, and parks was the original design of the Briggs Village plan — to make Briggs Village an attractive walkable community. A change of zoning will forever ruin the “vision” of the Briggs Village community. It was destined to become a jewel of the city.

I don’t want to see the original plan go away. It’s been hard enough living with multi-year delays and the ongoing barriers that have prevented the original Briggs Village plan from being fully realized.

Thank you for seriously considering my concerns.

Doug Spohn
120 State Ave NE #168
Olympia, WA
360-888-3455

Jackson Ewing

From: melissa Palmer <melipalmer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA Parking

The development that is occuring in the Briggs area is impressive, however there are significant challenges on parking as it currently stands. Given that the Briggs YMCA serves residents in surrounding areas that have no choice but to drive in, any changes to parking that impacts the commercial entities will only exacerbate the challenge.
My family has elementary age kids and the Briggs is a place we frequent and hope to be able to without the concern of driving 15 minutes there (not on a bus line nor in a neighborhood with sidewalks) to not be able to park. We ask that changes to parking in that area balance all needs of the development in the area and address avoid contributing to access challenges for those who have not choice but to drive in to use the services at the Briggs YMCA.

Thank you
Melissa Palmer
6033 Hansen St SE, Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Celeste <celeste.papier@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:29 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking Reduction

I am unable to attend the hearing this evening. Please count my voice expressing concerns over reduced parking for the Y. It is quite frequently difficult, especially for the senior citizens, to find adequate parking currently. Any additional pressure on parking will create an untenable situation. Some of us drive quite a distance and it would be very unfortunate and unsustainable to arrive and have to turn around because no easily walkable parking is available. Especially for those of us with mobility issues who depend on the pool for exercise.
Thank you,
Celeste

Jackson Ewing

From: Carole Cropley <cyelporc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:41 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: parking at the YMCA

The Y serves manny people who need to park close to the facility -- children, older people, people with physical limitations. While they might not require "handcapped parking permits", they still need to be able to be close to the building in order to use it. Please protect our precious parking!
Carole Cropley
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: Alexandra <alexandra.kasuske@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:43 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA Parking

I am opposed to the property proposal. Currently, there is not enough parking for the businesses and the YMCA.

The proposed changes will lead to a less user friendly community.

A Kasuske

Jackson Ewing

From: Jessica Shabatura <jessicashabatura@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:02 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Master Plan

Hello and thanks for the opportunity to voice my concerns. My family and I live near the Briggs center and often utilize the restaurants and Y community center. We were thrilled with how well this urban development had been planned to integrate high density, housing and attractive services that build community.

I am writing to encourage you to adhere to the original Briggs Master plan that will continue to keep a balance between commercial offerings, housing, and parking for those of us who wish to patronize the businesses but live offsite. If parking became a greater challenge than it is currently, I could see my family opting to drive a few more miles into town rather than soar for a place to park.

Thanks for your concern and consideration.

Jessica

Cell: 479.790.6433

Jackson Ewing

From: Gordie Gill <Gordie@glenlyon.ca>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:13 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; Nicole Floyd; Tim Smith
Cc: Glenn Wells; Heather Burgess
Subject: Re: Briggs planning commission meeting

Jackson:

RE: Public hearing to today

I believe the City should address some of the misrepresentations made by YMCA or would I say a lack proper disclosure in particular with regard to parking. As you are aware, the City allowed the YMCA to expand without the YMCA first securing adequate parking for this expansion. Now the YMCA is impling in their email to the public that this zoning change will result in lack of parking for Briggs Village.

Furthermore, I believe the city should address the city's current parking policy of parking for new residential units being that the developer does not have to provide any parking for residential units and it will be left to the developers discretion on how many parking spots to provide for these new residential units.

I believe the YMCA in its own interest by sending out this email has tried to turn the public against this development.

I believe the change in the zoning code tries to balance the interest of not only the residents in Briggs Village, market conditions and need for the housing in Olympia.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Gordie Gill
Nextgen Offices Inc.
604-728-2948
gordie@glenlyon.ca

On Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 10:43 AM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Glenn and Gordie,
>
> The public hearing for the proposed amendments is this evening. There has been intensive public interest, and I expect it to be well attended.
>
> We will be the first item on the agenda. The city will present first then you will have an opportunity to provide any additional comments. Please only focus on the zoning code changes, not on the Briggs Master Plan. We need to make it clear to the public these are two separate applications and processes.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

*All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

-----Original Message-----
From: Glenn Wells <glennwellsarchitect@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Gordie Gill <gordie@glenlyon.ca>
Subject: Briggs planning commission meeting

Hi Jackson,
Do we have a planning commission meeting this evening? I don't believe I have an invite. If we do, maybe you could tell me when we'll be on the agenda and what the format will be.
Thanks
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Antonio M Ginatta <giant@hey.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:17 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: please don't prioritize parking over housing at Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Jackson,

Good morning. I received an email from the YMCA asking me to share my concerns about changes to zoning at Briggs Village that could reduce the number of parking spots, and that this could put a strain on parking infrastructure.

I wish I heard more from the YMCA on how to engage with the city on how to push for more housing for people who are unsheltered. That seems more like a YMCA priority. To prioritize parking spaces for cars over housing density is wrong-headed and not in tune with pressing Olympia housing priorities.

I'd urge the city to continue with its plan to prioritize denser neighborhood villages that will lead to greater use of public transportation. Olympia should stop prioritizing where cars sleep over where people sleep.

Best,

Antonio Ginatta
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: Heidi Hague <haguehc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to you concerning the proposed zoning changes in the Briggs Village area. As a frequent patron of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned that said changes will negatively affect not only my ability to use the YMCA in the evening because of further limited parking, but also affect the walkability of the neighborhood, and negatively affect the environment by forcing neighborhood residents to drive further for services that had been previously planned for the neighborhood. I respectfully request that the proposed changes be denied and that the Briggs neighborhood remains the wonderful environment it has been since inception.
Sincerely,
Heidi C. Hague
Briggs YMCA Patron

Jackson Ewing

From: Ken Smith <hiredhands@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:30 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Change to Briggs urban village plan

I strongly oppose any change to the original plan And urge others to do so. Bringing residential and commercial units together in urban villages is what this area needs more of. The original plan was sound and is still viable even now. The city needs to help businesses to make this successful and sustainable.
Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen Sweeney <klangsweeney@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:39 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Urban Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a frequent user of the YMCA and am concerned about the developer who has proposed more residential housing which decreases the available commercial space. The original plans called for shared commercial parking space. The parking at the YMCA has become increasingly difficult for the numerous members of this Y community. The original plans also included a grocery store, walkable areas and increased green space. We have been waiting for a grocery store (not a small AM/PM) for a long time. I would certainly use this grocery store when visiting the Y, as would many other people. The retail stores that are there already are doing very well. They are often packed with people, which increases parking pressures more.
The City continues to talk about neighborhood centers or urban villages as great ideas, but this idea is going in the opposite direction. Until the developer meets the original obligation of providing a grocery store, other retail establishments and shared commercial parking space, they should not be allowed to change the original plans and zoning.
Thank you!
Karen Sweeney

Jackson Ewing

From: Molly Hoghaug <mollol44@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Parking

Hi there,
I'm not able to attend the seminar, but I am a member at the Briggs YMCA and I wanted to email my concerns about the possibility of re-zoning some land in Briggs Village. As it is, I often have to park down the street from The Y when I come from classes. I oppose anything that will put even more strain on the parking availability and walkability of the neighborhood Thank you.
Molly Hoghaug
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Abbo Peterson <abbopeterson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: My public input for the amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jackson Ewing,

This is my public input for the amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages.

My wife and I have lived in Briggs Village since November 2020. We love living here and it's a wonderful planned neighborhood. We live on Briggs Drive SE and face the undeveloped portion of the neighborhood and will be directly impacted by the additional development.

My input is about the 12 amendments marked in red in the City document "Attachment 1. Draft amendments (includes city commentary)" and the 6 items in the bullet list on page 2 in the City document "PC staff report Amendments to the OMC 18.05".

SUMMARY
I **support** the amendments, with one exception and a couple concerns.

I support the amendments because they add needed flexibility for development while maintaining the value and benefits of an "urban village."

My support is also based on considering the multiple needs and stakeholders related to the amendments and continued development of Briggs Village. That broader view can results in better decisions, even when that means not everyone gets exactly what they want.

Finally, I know there are vocal opponents to the amendments. Some are going to great lengths with outreach to the community, detailed letters, signatures and broader topics. I also know the views of vocal opponents don't always match the views of people who don't speak up or get involved.

I urge the Planning Commission to objectively hear all input, be mindful of those who don't speak up, focus on the multiple needs and stakeholders and make their decision based on the broad view and not just the vocal opponents.

ADDITIONAL POINTS
The amendments provide much better flexibility for inevitable changing market and other conditions
Things change. Sometimes dramatically and often unexpectedly. Plans we make sometimes work and sometimes don't. When they do, it's usually because we can be flexible. In the case of Briggs Village, completing the original plan is not working, in part, because the City code is not flexible enough. The

market and other conditions are different now and the amendments are providing flexibility so the neighborhood development can continue.

The amendments and OMC 10.05 are accounting for a wide variety of different needs and stakeholders
Neighbors who live in Briggs Village. People having a hard time finding a new place to live in the Olympia area. Developers, architects, builders and construction workers. Business and store owners. City planners. Balancing all those needs is hard. I think the amendments are a small step to help balance those needs.

The original Briggs Village plan was a vision, not a promise
It was a fantastic vision. I understand why so many neighbors want it completed as planned. Being able to walk to a big grocery store and other shops is an incredible idea. I want that too. However, the Briggs Village vision was not a promise. Many things changed since the original plan and those changes make it impractical and unwise to complete Briggs Village exactly as it was planned. However, that doesn't mean the remaining development will be bad. It will be different, but it will still be a fantastic neighborhood we should all be proud to live in.

I do not support the following amendment:
From page 25 of "Attachment 1 - Draft amendments…":
"Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.

Commented [JE8]: Including rooftop court yards as open space is consistent with how open space is calculated for multifamily residential uses throughout the city."

I would support that amendment only if the rooftop courtyard area is easily accessible to all residents of the neighborhood. If it's not open space for the entire neighborhood (the urban village), it should not be included in the open space calculation for the entire neighborhood.

Regarding the JE8 comment, while it may be "consistent with how open space is calculated for multifamily residential uses throughout the city," urban villages are more than just "multifamily" residential developments.

Two areas of concern for me
Item from the bullet list in the "PC staff report…" document:
"Increasing the allowed percentage of multifamily housing in urban villages from 50% to 85%. Retaining a max of 75% of single family and setting a minimum single family of 15%"

An urban village of 85% multifamily and 15% single family home doesn't feel like a village to me. However, I can accept that as long as the other required elements of an urban village are completed, e.g., retail shops, public spaces, walking paths and trails.

From page 13 of "Attachment 1 - Draft amendments…":
"The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area."

I'm very happy a grocery store remains a required element in an urban village. While I support the maximum size of 50,000 square feet, I'm concerned there is no minimum size or details about types of smaller grocery stores.

I highly recommend:

1. Adding a minimum size
2. Adding examples of groceries store sizes for reference. List examples of stores that are about 50K, 25K, 10K, 5K, 2K square feet.

In conclusion…

I'm passionate about solutions that best meet the needs of multiple stakeholders, even when that means not everyone gets exactly what they want. I also think solutions that can be flexible and adapt to change have much better results than those that don't.

Please consider my input as a balanced view of the proposed amendments. Please also be mindful of balancing vocal opposition with alternate perspectives, including those who are not speaking out.

Thank you,
Abbo Peterson

Jackson Ewing

From: Mail.comcast.net <eydie.vargas@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning changes at Briggs Village

I live at Silverleaf & see how many cars do park near YMCA & other nearby businesses. Also my concern as a pedestrian, I walk to the YMCA 5 days a week, and often walk in that area on weekend, as there will be more traffic , Pedestrian crossing for Henderson may need to be addressed. I prefer to cross At the crosswalk across from Humblecow & not at the Yelm highway/henderson crossing to avoid cars turning on to Henderson at red light.
Thank you,
Edith Vargas
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Alan Hardcastle <alanhardcastle1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns regarding proposed amendments to the zoning code (OMC 18.05)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am a long-time member of the Board of Trustees for the South Sound YMCA, which includes the facility at Briggs Village. I am also a user of this facility, as are hundreds of other YMCA members.

I have concerns regarding proposed changes to the zoning code that would increase the number of multifamily housing units, while reducing the required commercial space available to businesses that would support residents in and around the Village community.

While I strongly support the need for additional housing in our region, in this case I am concerned that the proposed changes to the zoning code could cause or exacerbate challenges such as parking, and/or compromise the potential of the original Briggs Village design and intent (greater walkability, local open/green spaces, limited auto use and emissions, related positive health impacts, and the provision of essential local services and amenities that support healthy community living). A true Urban Village concept supports these and other benefits, but I am concerned that the proposed changes will create an imbalance that severely limits its intended effectiveness.

The Briggs YMCA already faces significant parking challenges, and a considerable expansion of additional housing units is likely to increase parking demand, traffic congestion and auto emissions throughout the Village. Before the Planning Commission rules on the proposed zoning code changes, I urge the Commission to conduct traffic and parking impact studies to determine the likely effects on local residents, visitors and customers of current and potential future businesses and service providers, including the YMCA. I believe we need to better understand the likely impacts the proposed changes will have before a decision is made.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Alan Hardcastle
Olympia
360-485-8844

Jackson Ewing

From: Adrienne Touart <aptouart@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Potential Briggs Village rezone

Thank you for including my comments. Pandora Touart, Briggs member for 7.5 years

Briggs YMCA is the only affordable family athletic/recreation center between here and Shelton or Lakewood. It is heavily used, more now with much increased population density. We can barely imagine the future...

Parking has been poor to severely inadequate for several years. Note: there is no parking available on Henderson or Yelm Hwy. Pioneer Park lots are too far away and therefore, useless for seniors, small children and the rest of us.
Briggs users and staff are currently parking on future driveway aprons, in the pediatric DDS office and coffee lot as well as all along what is planned for a residential street in the development. Briggs is short at least 35-40 parking spaces right now. If you drive up the west street that fronts the existing residential homes in the daytime the street is full of occupant cars, precisely what will happen on the no./so. roadway closer to Henderson immediately north of Briggs Y.

Rezoning for fewer parking spaces (to the benefit of the developers) leaves Briggs users with NO place to park. I and many others who now circle the Briggs lot and then opt for whatever space we can find outside that lot will no longer be able to attend classes with a specific time (i.e. not flexible attendance).

Please DO NOT change the existing zoning requirements for Briggs Village. If changed, the health and well-being of a lot of people will be impacted. We rely on the Y.

OR, if developers want increased density, then Quid pro quo: Briggs is given a small strip to accommodate 40 cars.

February 10, 2025
Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati

Olympia Planning Commission

Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Commission Members and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as business owners in Briggs Village to provide our perspective regarding the proposed zoning change that would reduce the amount of commercial space in the Briggs Village urban core. It is our understanding that the owner of the remaining undeveloped land in Briggs Village, Mr. Gordie Gill, has asked the City of Olympia to amend the urban village zoning code to allow him to reduce the amount of commercial space and increase the amount of residential space. It is also our understanding that Mr. Gill has commissioned a market study that provides an opinion that commercial development, in particular a grocery store, is not viable in the Briggs Village urban core both because of insufficient nearby population and because the surrounding neighborhoods do not want a store or more commercial options.

We each own a business on the property located at 4528 Maple Lane SE, Olympia, owned by Dr. Andrea Mason. The main building houses Olympia Pediatric Dentistry (Dr. Mason), Humble Cow Ice Cream, Briggs Taphouse, Fit Life Studio, iLash & Esthetics, Amber & Aloe Spray Tan Studio, and Jaymes Paige Hair Studio. Fika Coffee is located in a neighboring building. Our opinion, as business owners who interact with the local neighbors and whose livelihood depends on understanding local demand, is that Briggs Village has enormous unmet demand and will support all types of businesses.

We would have been happy to tell whoever performed the market study for Mr. Gill about the pent-up demand for more commercial activity in the Briggs Village urban core, but nobody asked. We would also have been happy to discuss our views on the commercial potential for Briggs Village with staff from the City analyzing the proposal, but again, nobody asked. Existing businesses provide real-world information about demand, consumer sentiment, and possible obstacles to a proposed plan, so we would like to be involved with future discussions regarding the zoning around our businesses.

While we would each like to learn more about the proposals, we can provide some general comments.

First, the local residents want and will support more businesses, including a grocery store, restaurants, shops, and many others.

Second, the existing businesses want more commercial activity. A large percentage of our clients walk to our businesses – and they often frequent more than one business per visit. It is not unusual for a neighbor to come for a haircut and then go out for pizza; or for a parent to walk their child to the dentist's office and then get an ice cream reward. More businesses will increase this dynamic – "business creates business" is a true phrase.

Third, we support additional residents (i.e., customers!), but parking is an issue that will have to be addressed. Existing businesses already face a parking shortage, and increasing residential space without increasing walkable services will only make the problem worse. There need to be enough businesses here so local residents can choose to go car free if they want.

We chose to locate our businesses in Briggs Village largely because of the promises implied in the zoning and master plan – a walkable neighborhood with a mix of residences and commercial spaces. We do not oppose additional residences, but we would ask that the City keep its promises to the existing businesses and residents of a vibrant commercial urban village core.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Meegan Cronk Name:Meegan Cronk Business: Humble Cow Ice Cream
Levi Hendricks Name:Levi Hendricks Business:Briggs Taphouse
Tessa Effland Name:Tessa Effland Business: Fit Life Studio

Dear Planning Commission members and Jackson Ewing:

I, Brian Faller, am writing in support of the substitute amendments submitted by the Briggs Community. I live in Sten Village, adjacent to Briggs Village, and am one of the four authors of the substitute amendments.

I want to start my comments by asking: What's the problem that Gill's amendments seek to fix?

Gill says that he needs more flexibility to convert commercial space into residential space? Why more residential and less commercial?

First, Gill has no need at this point for more residential units. Jackson Ewing informed me that between 200-300 residential units remain to be built. So there's tons of housing Gill can still build. The recent Jolt article by Jim Lazar contains a graph showing that market rate apartments are not currently undersupplied (vacancy rates are 5%). The real problem is the lack of affordable housing. Our substitute amendments would incentivize Gill to increase affordable apartment units.

Second, why reduce commercial space? Commercial space is essential to having an URBAN VILLAGE—it is the CORE of the shopping and businesses of a walkable urban village. A real grocery store –not a mini mart-- is required to anchor the core. Under OMC 18.05.020, the urban village grocery is to serve not just the immediate Briggs neighborhood but the surrounding neighborhoods.

The 2014 Master Plan sets 94,985 sf as the minimum commercial area to support an urban village. Gill's amendments would reduce that by 45%--to 52,500 sf. However, according to Jackson Ewing, the

Taphouse/Humble Cow/Dentist complex is 16,000 sf. That leaves only a 36,500 sq. ft. minimum. See Table 1 below.

That little required commercial space would gut the commercial core. The city set the commercial minimum at 95,000 sq. ft. for a reason. That was the amount necessary to have successful commercial center. That still remains true.

Gill wants us to believe commercial space doesn't work in Briggs Village. That's pure baloney. The businesses there now are flourishing. The two commercial lots that Gill sold, he sold for multiple times their assessed values. That's real evidence of market demand, not abstract conjecture.

The fact is that over the last 10 years Gill done little if anything to attract retail and office business. He hasn't listed any lots in the MLS; he's provided no evidence he has sought out a real grocery store —not - a mini mart size---or offered any incentive to a grocery like the last owner did (who agreed to pay $8-10 million to build and equip a 25,000 sf store). Gill has a legal obligation under the urban village code and Master Plan to deliver the commercial and a real grocery, and yet there is no evidence has done anything to meet that obligation.

The businesses that finally came to Briggs Village—the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, etc., came despite Gill, not because of him. The lot containing the businesses, the owner was only able to get only after badgering Gill to sell it, and paying the extortionate price of $1m, which is more than 2 times the lot's then assessed value of $412,000. He did an even harsher shakedown of a second buyer who bought the lot just north of that. Gill sold that lot for or $1,445,000, over 4 times the then assessed value of $332,500.

Gill's intransigence to supplying a grocery and commercial is clear bad faith on his part. Instead of incentivizing the grocery and commercial, he's discouraging them by his price gouging. Instead of making a real effort to get a grocery or commercial, he's trying to downsize the grocery and commercial.

The city shouldn't reward Gill for his bad faith by passing his amendments. His amendments would drastically reduce the commercial requirement and would hand him a windfall. If they pass, he could simply turn around and market Briggs Village to another owner at a handsome profit.

More importantly, passing Gill's amendments, would betray the commitment the city made to the people of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods. That commitment was to provide an urban village that would have a commercial core that could met their daily needs within a walkable distance or short drive.

Having said this, we think that there is another way forward that could produce a win-win for all, where the Briggs community gets the village grocery and restaurants and a bakery, Gill gets more residential and less commercial, and the city gets more affordable apartment units.

That's the purpose of our substitute amendments.[1] They create an incentive for Gill to deliver the grocery and the commercial and affordable housing. The amendments incentivize Gill because they would reduce the commercial requirement and increase residential units, but only if Gill *first* actually delivers a real grocery store over

[1] Please note that there is an omission in Alternative Table 5.02 of the Substitute Amendments. Both of the references to "retail/office combined minimum" should include this parenthetical: "(the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)."

10,000 sf and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery. He would also have to commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less, which would provide more affordable housing.

We are certainly open to negotiate the terms of the substitute amendments, but what we do know is that without a real incentive we are unlikely to ever see a real grocery store and a functional commercial center at Briggs Village.

February 24,
Brian Faller
4460 Village Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Table 1 on next page below

Table 1: EFFECT OF GILL PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Metric	Existing requirements.	Gill proposal	Effect
Commercial space minimum (retail (incl grocery) & office and services)	Table 5.02, OMC 18.05.050: no min. 2014 Master Plan: Comm. Min. 94, 985 sq. ft. min.	New Table 5.02 52,500 sq feet min.	Reduces the com. min. from 94,985 to 52,500 sq ft. (45% reduction) Remaining commercial min. is 36,500 sf. after subtracting existing commercial:[2]
Retail min. including grocery	90,750 sq. ft. Retail min. 60,750 sq. ft plus grocery store per Table 5.02[3] 2014 Master Plan:. grocery store 30,000 sq. ft. min.	No retail min. referenced New metric Combined Retail/office-services: 52,500 sq. ft. [4]	Reduces retail min. from 90,750 sq. ft. to 0 sf min. since all 52,500 sq. ft. can be office-services. Remaining combined retail/office min. is 36,500 sq. ft. after subtracting existing commercial:[5]
Office and services combined minimum	Table 5.02 no min. 2014 Master Plan: Office & services 5,000 sq. ft. minimum	No office/service min. references New metric Combined Retail/office services: 52,500 sq. ft.	Reduces office & services min from 5,000 sf to 0 sf (since all 52,500 sq ft can be retail) Remaining combined retail/office is 36,500 sq. ft.

[2] According to the city, the existing parcel with Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, Humble Cow and Briggs Table House, Fit for Life, Fit Life Studio, iLash & Esthetics, Amber & Aloe Spray Tan Studio, Jaymes Paige Hair Studio, and Fika Coffee has 16,000 sq. ft. of commercial.

[3] Table 5.03 provides for a minimum retail of 75 sq. ft. per authorized unit exclusive of the grocery. There are currently 810 authorized units, resulting in a retail minimum of 60,750 sq. ft. plus the grocery store.

[4] Gill's actual proposal is for a 50,000 sq. ft. minimum, but since "combined retail/office & services" is the same as "commercial", the 50,000 minimum would create a conflict with the 52,500 minimum he proposed for commercial and his other "combined retail/office & services" minimum of the same amount . Thus, we assume, Gill meant 52,500 sq. ft.

[5] See note 1 above.

January 21, 2025

Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

City of Olympia, Planning Commission
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA 98501

Re: Amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 related master planned villages.

I am writing on behalf of the Thurston County Chamber of Commerce to express support for the staff recommendations regarding OMC18.05 related master planned villages and efforts to amend the code that would result in additional housing units to master planned villages, including Briggs Village.

The Thurston Chamber finds that the entire region has a housing crisis. There is a well-documented need for more housing, of all types, across the county. The lack of housing hinders our ability to sustain the local economy and is disproportionately hard on young families. The proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 will directly help address the region's housing crisis and the public's use and interest will be served the proposed changes.

Last June, the Thurston Chamber conducted a statistically valid and reliable survey of 500 registered Thurston County voters. The survey, administered by Elway Research, asked participants to assign a "grade" to community attributes, like you would in school. The survey found that almost 70 percent of participants handed "Housing Affordability" a grade of D or F (1.07 GPA). The Thurston Chamber believes that these survey results demonstrate the overall strength of voter awareness for greater actions that will address our housing crisis and support for growth, development, and additional housing.

The Thurston Chamber of Commerce encourages the Planning Commission to approve the staff recommended changes to OMC 18.05 related to master planned villages. Please contact us by emailing DSchaffert@thurstonchamber.com or calling (360) 357-3362 if you have any questions regarding our support for the resolution. Thank you.

Sincerely

Doug Mah, Director, Public Policy Division

Cc: David Schaffert, President and CEO
Thurston Chamber Board of Trustees

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Culhane <culhane_tom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Olympia Planning Commission consideration of zoning changes at Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments aim to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, specifically as they apply to Briggs Village. If this change were to occur it would strain the parking infrastructure at the Briggs YMCA, which is a tremendous asset to the surrounding community.

The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. Zoning requirements, at that time, also took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable community. This included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial properties.

However, all that would change at Briggs Village under the current proposal to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space. That is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered. The proposed changes would lead to fewer services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on current parking, leading to a less walkable neighborhood. We want to ensure all residents have access to critical services. The changes proposed, would decrease access and lead to development that does not meet our community's needs.

Tom Culhane
1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: PAMELA BAER <pamdabaer@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:37 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Hello,

I'm writing to voice my concerns regarding possible rezoning the Briggs Village Master Plan thereby increasing the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space.

Since the last residential units went in it's been extremely difficult to procure a parking spot while visiting the Briggs YMCA. When I patronize the Briggs Taphouse or Humble Cow Ice Cream shop it is often hard to find parking for them as well. An increase of residential units would indeed increase pressure on current parking.

Sincerely,

Pamela Baer
YMCA Member

Jackson Ewing

From: Barbara Price <bl.price@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:45 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

I am writing to object to the proposed zoning changes at Briggs Village. Parking for people who use the YMCA is almost non existent already. They will be forced to cancel classes, etc. This land was donated to the YMCA by the Briggs family and now developers want to destroy it. Please do not approve the zoning change. There is no where for gym members to park.

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Prosser <ladybuglaff@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

To Whom It May Concern;

The Briggs YMCA is an integral asset of the community, and reduced parking would severely impact the members. Hundreds of children come to the YMCA for positive social interaction, healthy recreation, and life-skills education, which sets the tone for the rest of their lives, in building self-esteem and a strong foundation for lifelong success.

Reducing parking would be detrimental to many of these children, who may be prohibited from enjoying all the positive experiences that could change the trajectory of their life's journey, to the benefit of all society. Reduced parking (and availability/accessibility) to the facility, will result in many members moving their membership elsewhere, adversely affecting the local economy, and all residents of the community.

The Briggs YMCA creates a sense of community and family among its members and in the surrounding neighborhoods, bringing people closer together in mutual comaraderie, as well as profits to local businesses, a vibrant economy, and a close-knit community.

For the benefit of the community and local economy, I strongly urge you to keep the YMCA parking unchanged, for the sake of the community and all the children.

Thank you,
Nancy Lafferty

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Jackson Ewing

From: Rob Cook <notsoloud@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: File Number: 24-0313 Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05)

Good day!

My name is Rob Cook and I have been a resident of Thurston County since 1969. Over that time, I have seen growth, both good and bad and based on my experience with living with outcomes, both as a resident, an HOA President and volunteer I felt obligated to share my concerns.

As you know, the original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure by incorporating access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community.

Zoning requirements took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable community. This included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial properties. This is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

When Briggs was built [1997] and then expanded [2000], decisions were made and approvals granted by the City regarding the parking capacity at the time based on the Briggs Village plan and the grocery store parcel. The 'grocery store' parcel that was designed to be the 'overflow' parking that ensured Briggs Village functioned smoothly.

At present there is often barely any parking available at the Briggs Y and a change in zoning would make it even worse. It seems like this is an opportunity to maintain the existing zoning or at the very least, pursue a compromise that allows the owner to develop but maintain as aspect that allows overflow parking. From an outsider's perspective it appears that the owner may not have the concerns of the community at heart given the present state of this property. Now would be a great opportunity for him to not only make a profit but help the community as well.

Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rob Cook
6026 Braywood Lane SE
Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Whitaker <tom@greendolphinenterprises.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking vs proposed residential zoning change

As a regular user of the Briggs YMCA facility I am frequently confronted with a lack of parking spaces even though I am often able to adjust my times of attendance. The number of dedicated parking spaces for Y users is woefully inadequate. Street parking is frequently the only option. And that option will disappear as increased residential development fills curbside spaces with cars, trucks, boats, and trailers. I don't think the nearby dental office, coffee and ice cream shops want YMCA patrons parking in their dedicated lots.

The Y is bordered on three sides by streets that provide no parking spaces. I think that the nearest public parking is at Pioneer Park which is close to ½ mile south of the Y. I'm unsure if parking the small park on the western edge of existing residences is considered to be public parking. But even it is about ¼ mile distant.

Briggs is a valuable and heavily use public facility in need of at least 50 additional dedicated parking spaces. Would it not be possible for the property developer to cede a strip of land immediately north of the Y parking lot to add very much needed additional parking spaces in exchange for their proposed requested rezone?

Thomas Whitaker
2925 Boundary St SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Sherri Barrett <kikismama7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

It is already so difficult to park at Briggs YMCA, especially if you have a mobility issue. I used to go to Cindy Foley's water aerobics classes at 9 am on Monday, Wednesday, Friday; but had to stop because the parking lot would totally fill up and there would be multiple cars circling the parking lot to find a spot. If I could walk well, I would park on the street further out, but have knee arthritis which make walking any incline, stairs, or distances impossible for me for the past 34 years (yes I had worn off all my kneecap cartilage by age 29).. So I stopped going to the classes when people started getting aggressive to get the spot that just opened up because I feared an accident. So now I go in the early afternoon during the week and today at 1:15 pm on a Monday, the parking lot was completely full so I had to resume circling the parking lot and it took about 10 minutes to find a spot. I have already looked into taking the bus or using a Dial-a-Lift while using my motorized scooter, but it adds so much time and the bus service to this location is not frequent. It is frequent near my home on the westside. Due to my arthritis, working out in the water is my only option to get cardiopulmonary exercise. If I don't I get pneumonia and this has happened mulitiple times. I credit the YMCA with extending my life and helping me survive COVID. I know that many people doing water aerobics are like me, dependent on working out in the water to maintain health. Please do not make it more difficult to park at the YMCA, It will cut off access for vulnerable people in our community.

Sherri Barrett

Jackson Ewing

From: Gayle T. Bonnett <bonnegt@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning Amendments to Briggs Village

Jackson Ewing, Lead Planner

I am strongly opposed to the zoning amendment increasing the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in Briggs Village.

I'm a 30 plus year resident of southeast Olympia and presently go to the Briggs YWCA three or more times a week. It is too far for me to walk, I no longer ride a bike, the bus schedules don't work, so I need to drive my car and park in the Y's parking lot. Even with trying to schedule my Y trips at the lower parking volume times, the parking lot and adjacent side streets have very limited parking available.

Parking in Brigg Village is a limited and needs to be increased, not reduced through the proposed amendment. If residential units are increased, additional parking requirement of two to three parking spaces per unit need to be included in the Building and Zoning requirements.

Thank you,

Gayle Bonnett

Jackson Ewing

From: Michelle Gipson <gipsonm@ssymca.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:58 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Subject: Opposition to Proposed Zoning Amendments to the Urban Village Zone, OMC 18.05

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am Michelle, a staff member of the South Sound YMCA located in Briggs Village. I am writing to express our opposition to the proposed zoning amendments to the Urban Village Zone, OMC 18.05.

While we understand and support the need for more housing, it is crucial that development does not come at the cost of necessary commercial services. We urge the Planning Commission to consider a balanced approach that accommodates both residential growth and the needs of commercial entities that serve this community. Additionally, placing commercial and housing near each other to reduce car travel and encourage walking/biking aligns with the original intent of Briggs Village.

Our community is already grappling with woefully limited parking. The proposed zoning amendments to increase residential density without expanding parking facilities will exacerbate these challenges.

Thank you for considering our position.

Sincerely,

Michelle Gipson

Jackson Ewing

From: Paula Moore <moore_paula@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Concerns

I write about the zoning changes for Briggs Village. I am a member of the YMCA. I also a resident of the Pioneer Elementary school catchment area. I have two concerns about the possible changes to the development.

Impact to Briggs YMCA
I am concerned that the design changes will limit parking and access to the Briggs YMCA. Briggs is the ONLY swimming pool gym in the City of Olympia. Evergreen, Discover Aquatics, and Tumwater Valley are all outside of City Limits. Additionally, the YMCA provides financial assistance for families, so the Briggs is affordable. Reducing the parking means that the pool will be used more by people nearby and less by the broader community. It is unreadable to assume a parent of young children can navigate the bus from across town for a 30 min swim lesson. They need parking. Preserve it. We live near water and it's important families can access swim lessons.

Pioneer Catchment Area Needs More Family Apartments
Pioneer has more capacity for children. It has one of the lowest family apartment counts in the school district. The two family apartment complexes in Briggs Village are popular. I've been glad to see more types of family housing feed into Pioneer. Build more of it. Locating family apartments in Briggs Village makes sense. It brings economic diversity to Pioneer, Washington, and Olympia HS. Kids can access the YMCA. Kids can access Kettle View Park. Kids can bike over to Pioneer, Washington, and OHS and the playgrounds and friends in the area. It's designed for families. Build more 2 and 3 bedroom apartments with parking.

Thank you for your time.

Paula Moore
360-489-7147

Jackson Ewing

From: Toni Weaver <weaveroly@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:24 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning changes in Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

PLEASE no zoning changes in Briggs Village. Take a look at all the apartments and the new condo building that have built up there, with no commercial businesses to support them. We need grocery stores, restaurants, whatever to entice these people to shop in their own neighborhoods and they will need parking spaces to provide that interest and loyalty. Please listen to what the voters in that area are asking for and provide what they would need.

Toni Weaver
1520 Palomino Dr SE, Unit 222
Olympia 98501
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Sara Larsen <sllenssen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village zoning comments

I have some concerns about the proposal to change the zoning codes for the Briggs Urban Village.

With the infrastructure as it is, the impact of so many new dwellings would be challenging. Already several of the intersections can be difficult to navigate particularly as a pedestrian at certain times of day. As I understand the urban village concept, one of the goals is to create walkable communities with elements such as businesses and grocery stores within the community. With two senior housing developments on the corner in addition to numerous apartments already in the urban village, having a real grocery store rather than a mini mart seems like a wise choice.

Although I understand that trying to plan ahead necessitates anticipating growth, it seems like the 5 current apartment complexes are usually advertising as now leasing. I wonder if there really is a need for that many additional units. It doesn't seem like the site could realistically handle the increased number of vehicles that would result from increasing the number of apartments. Adding additional units of apartments seems like it would likely exacerbate an already crowded parking situation as well.

Just creating higher density does not make an urban village. Although I was originally somewhat skeptical about the urban village plan, seeing neighbors walking to Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, and the coffee shops has convinced me that the original plan was a good idea. Adding a grocery store would further the ideal of creating a walkable community. Please keep our community walkable by not crowding in too many housing units.

Sara Larsen
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Jeanne Miller <jamiller_studio@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: proposed amendments to Briggs Development Plan

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am against changing the original Briggs Village Master Plan. Increasing the number of residential units in Briggs Village would not only increase traffic and exacerbate existing parking problems, but it would also put a strain on our already overburdened schools. Instead of more housing, the "village" badly needs a grocery store. Alterations to the original plan should NOT be allowed.

Thank you.

Jeanne Miller

1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Kuba Bednarek <bednarej@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I would like to comment on proposed amendments to Briggs Village plan.
Please prioritize housing. Please building more housing for people; less housing for cars. Please prioritze a grocery store and work with local grocers to vill the space (i.e. Food Co-op, Spuds, Jays farmstand).
Please also include mixed use spaces by including commercial space build under housing.

Thanks kindly,
Jakub Bednarek
Olympia WA SE neighborhood.

Review of Briggs Village

Commercial Market Demand Study

by Brian Faller, J.D., M.A.

February 22, 2025

My name is Brian Faller. I live at 4460 Village Dr. SE, Olympia, WA.

I am retired attorney. I retired in 2020, after having practice law for over 35 years. I have extensive experience critically reviewing expert quantitative reports and appraisals, including income capitalization studies and comparative sales studies which are similar to the demand analysis performed here. I estimate I have critiqued over 80 expert quantitative reports, including about 30 appraisals during my career, assisted in preparing at least 30 expert reports with quantitative analysis, and have deposed or cross-examined at least thirty experts on matters including quantitative analysis. Two examples of my work: As lead council for the City of Seattle, I worked extensively on appraisals with MAI appraisers for open space condemnations, I also work extensively with a claims expert critically reviewing over 50 complex outage loss claims resulting from a 3-day outage in downtown Seattle. As lead council for the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, I worked extensively with two leading forest economists preparing expert reports and cross-examined opposing forest economists on matters involving complex quantitative analysis regarding the economic production of over 2 million acres of state forest land.

MAJOR CREDIBILITY PROBLEMS WITH THE MARKET STUDY

The author of the market study is anonymous. At no place in the study is the person or persons who authored the study identified or their qualifications stated.[1] Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the author(s) to

[1] The only clue to its authorship is a reference to an acronym on the bottom of page 17, "CAI interviewed…". I googled this acronym and found that CAI may represent the Community Associations Institute, a large umbrella organization, which has no market studies publicized on their website. Nor does their site mention market analyses as a regular product.

answer questions, correct errors, and supply missing data. That is especially important here because the study did not provide any of the excel spreadsheets or other data showing the data and basis of the calculations.

In my 35 years practicing law reviewing expert reports, I have never seen a report that does not identify the author. No court or tribunal would ever accept an "anonymous" study, and the Planning Commission and City should do not do so.

I enlisted the assistance of Mike Ruth, a former lead trainer for ESRI who provided trainings around the world, and who is now a Professor at Evergreen State College, teaching GIS. I asked him to replicate the market study tables and he was unable to do so—he was able to replicate the population analysis, and it in fact showed that the figures ESRI produced came from American Community Survey (ACS) 2018-2022, which was not disclosed by the study. Such data would most likely not include all of the additional population that moved into Briggs Village late in 2022 or afterward. Mike said that had he been able to contact the author, he probably could likely have replicated the ESRI data runs if they were done properly and checked the study's modeling and assumptions.

The single real estate broker consulted is anonymous and his/her statements indicate a lack of knowledge of Briggs Village. The study (p. 18) says a broker was contacted but does not identify the person and their qualifications. Anonymity does not allow one to assess the broker's knowledge of the market, credibility, or contact them to confirm information. The study says the broker stated that because a Briggs Grocery would not be visible from Yelm Hwy, Briggs Village would not be a suitable location. That opinion is contradicted by numerous local groceries. The Hagens on the west-side is not visible from Cooper Point or Black Lake. The Trader Joe's on Black Lake is tucked away in a corner. The Tumwater Safeway is not visible from Capital Way, QFC and Safeway in Lacey are not visible on Yelm Hwy, the Walmart on Yelm Hwy in Lacey has limited visibility and requires one to drive about 3 blocks out of the way to enter, etc.

The "stakeholders" consulted are anonymous and appear to lack actual knowledge of the appeal of the Briggs Village site. The study (p. 18) discusses comments from "stakeholders," but provides no information who they are and why they are stakeholders. Their comments are subjective conclusions without supporting data. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the commenters.

The study states (p. 18) that the anonymous "stakeholders" said that the Briggs Village site has "low gravity" or attraction to customers. That unsubstantiated conclusion is inconsistent with a number of facts, the study fails to mentioned: The businesses at and immediately adjacent to Briggs Village are doing a brisk trade: including, the Starbucks, the Briggs Taphouse, Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, and the Humble Cow. Further, the conclusion does not take account of the high traffic from Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs Y Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekends. The "stakeholders" comments about the "low gravity" of the Briggs site seem uninformed.

Several aspects of the study suggest a bias towards the conclusions that the developer wants it to reach. The study author does that disclose that he/she knows that his client, the developer, is seeking the city's approval to lower the size of the grocery store size at Briggs Village and the overall size of the commercial. However, the study indicates that the study author was given a copy of the City's applications to change the commercial and grocery requirements due to fact that author referred to numbers only available from the applications. For example, on page 3, the author erroneously stated "A range of 1,500 to 12,000 square feet is allocated for a grocery store." These numbers are not the existing requirements,[2] but changes to the Master Plan the developer seeks.[3] .

The discussion below also highlights a number of unreasonable assumptions, obvious omissions, and failures to provide data, that in my opinion the author should have directly addressed, if he/she were seeking to be objective.

[2] The current 2014 Master Plan states that the grocery must a minimum of 30,000 sf and a maximum of 35,000 sf.

[3] Similarly, on page 25, the study erroneously states: "Briggs Village is slated for a total of 1250 residential units." Currently, the 2014 Master Plan states the unit number is 801. The 1250 units are what the developer is requesting that the city approve.

THE MARKET STUDY'S GROCERY GAP ANALYSIS (Exhibit 12, & p. 20) IS FLAWED.

1. **The market study did not validate the use of a five-minute drive radius from some undefined point in Briggs Village to define the "Briggs Village Trade Area" (BVTA) as a trustworthy tool.**

Selection of a five-minute drive to define the BVTA (with correction) appears arbitrary and may significantly distort the supply-demand gap. This can be seen by looking at the gaps between supply and demand resulting using three, four, and six minute drives to define the BVTA.

For 3 and 4 minutes, the Tumwater Safeway would fall outside of the BVTA and the only grocery would be the three mini-marts, which we estimate to have annual sales of $1,500,000. To calculate the supply-demand gap in a three or four minute drive BVTA, you subtract the sales from the food-beverage spending. Since we don't know the spending in three and four minute minutes, we can reasonable estimate it since the 3 minute population is 26% of the 5 minute population (Ex. 11 of study). 26% of $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) is $11,091,600 (3-minute spending estimate). $11,091,600 spending minus 1,500,000 sales is $9,591,600 (demand gap), nearly double the study's 5 minute BVTA estimated demand gap of $5,570,000. According to the grocery store size metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the 3-4 minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 19,183 sf.*

A six-minute BVTA would add a number of neighborhoods to BVTA. We don't have actual data for 6-minute BVTA spending and sales. However, they can reasonably be estimated. The 6 minute BVTA created by Mike Ruth https://arcg.is/iTmv10 (see also figure 1 after last page) shows two new stores in the trade area: Spuds, Ramirez Mexican Home which ESRI shows to have a collective sales of $961,000. So the estimate 6 minute grocery sales is $37,035,000 (5 minute) plus $961,000 = $37,996,000. Six minute spending can be estimated by increasing the 5-minute spending proportionate to the population increase from 5 to 6 minute BVTA. Population increases from 12,904 to 16,770, a 30% increase.[4] Thus, the six minute spending is estimated to be 1.30 x $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) = $60,658,000. $60,658,000 spending minus $37,996,000 sales = $22,662,000 demand gap. According to the grocery store size

[4] See attached excel spreadsheet.

metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the six-minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 45,324 sf.*

Here's a summary of the differences in selecting a 3-4, 5, and 6 minute drive time for the BVTA.

	Demand Gap $	Size of Grocery store supported
3-4 minute BVTA	$9,591,000	*19,183 sf*
5 minute BVTA	$5,570,000	11,200 sf
6 minute BVTA	$22,662,000	*45,324 sf*

The wide range of demand gaps and store sizes for the BVTAs based on three/four, five, and six minutes shows that a valid analysis should have looked at a range of trade area sizes to determine the size that would best reflect market demand.

Even if a five-minute BVTA were defensible here, the assumption that none of the Safeway sales would transfer to the BVTA is unreasonable and invalidates the gap analysis.

The assumption of no transfer to Briggs is contrary to any reasonable view of the facts.

Strong evidence exists that given a choice, a large number of residents in Briggs Village and surrounding neighborhoods, would prefer to shop close to or within a walkable distance. The gap analysis did not give weight to the large walkable population *immediately* around Briggs Center: five large multi-building complexes (Parkview Apartments (72 units), Briggs Village Apartments (72 units), Copper Leaf Residences (92 family units), Silver Leaf Residences (200 senior units); the Village Cooperative (67 upscale condo units), and the hundreds of town homes and detached homes in Briggs Village.

Further, the assumption that no traffic at Safeway would transfer to Briggs does not take account of the high traffic at Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs Y Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekends. It is reasonable to expect that many Y users would transfer some shopping to the more convenient Briggs grocery

The assumption also did not give weight to the fact that hundreds of people in the surrounding neighborhoods now walk from their homes to the YMCA, and to Starbucks, the Briggs Tap Room, the Humble Cow, and the other businesses at that site. Those neighborhoods include, the Farm, Orvas Court, Sten Village, the Cove, Holiday Hills, Brigadoon, and the Tumwater neighborhoods just northwest of Briggs Village.

The assumption did not give any weight to the fact that the Starbucks across from the YMCA was an instant success upon opening (including transfer sales from other Starbucks). It also did not consider the thriving businesses in Briggs Village (the Starbucks grange, the dentist, the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow), which draw people into the village and to each other's businesses.

All of these indicate that a significant likelihood that the residents in the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods would transfer a significant amount of their grocery purchases from the Safeway to the Briggs Village grocery if the Briggs Village grocery carried a full range of items commonly used for meal preparation. If the gap analysis were conservatively corrected to assume that residents of BVTA would shift just 10% of their grocery shopping ($3,600,000) from Safeway (@36,000,00 sales) to the Briggs Village grocery, the five-minute BVTA gap would be $9,170,000, not the $5.57 million presented in the market study. Thus, if this erroneous assumption is corrected by assuming a conservative 10% transfer of business, *the five-minute BVTA under the $500/sf metric would potentially support a grocery store of 18,340 sf.*

2. **Population estimate in the gap analysis did not consider people in Briggs Village, including those who moved in late 2022 and the over 1,000,000 new residents who will likely be added to Briggs Village if the currently unbuilt and proposed units and homes are constructed.**

The market study identifies the source of the five-minute BVTA population of 12,904 as the "ESRI Business Analyst, 2023; Community Attributes, 2023." However, the study does not supply the actual data as an appendix and it does not state how or when the ESRI data was collected. Mike Ruth an GIS and ESRI specialist model the 5 minute drive time population, and his results agree with

demand study. However, he found that the source for the population was the American Community Survey 2018-2020 estimate.[5]

My AI research indicates that ACS surveys do not specifically track housing starts or occupancy permits. Thus it seems it unlikely that any of the population of the new large complexes (Copper Leaf (96 family units), Silver Leaf (192 senior units), and the Village Cooperative (63 senior upscale condos)), and six new duplexes behind Cooper Leaf were included in the 12,904 figure. If they were not included, that would miss up to 450-500 persons who would be within a short easily walkable distance from the Village center, increasing market demand by about 3.5-3.8%. The market study author did not address that issue or provide any information about the specific datas or sources of his population data.

Further even if the population data were accurate to some point in time in 2023, it would still miss the hundreds of additional residents that would occupy the hundreds of units in Briggs Village yet to be built. Of the 810 units that are now permitted, about 200 -300 units have not yet been built. The developer has requested the city to add 440 more units. Built-out of the 30 Briggs West single homes would add between 70-90 people. These new units and homes could collectively add more than 1,000,000 new people to Briggs Village, who would frequent the businesses at the Briggs center. One thousand new residents who live at Briggs Village, would increase the BVTA demand by about 7.8%.

Cumulatively, the population additions discussed above could increase demand at Briggs Village by 7.8% to 11.3%. These increases would result in respective supply-demand grocery gaps of $8,893,130 and $10,384,365, which would support grocery stores of 17,786 sf and 20,768 sf.

ACS Population Summary

Briggs Village Drive Times
Town Square Ln SE, Olympia, Washington, 98501
Drive time: 5, 6 minute radii
Latitude: 47.00667
Longitude: -122.88203

	5 minutes				
		2018-2022 ACS Estimate	Percent	MOE(±)	Reliability
	TOTALS				
	Total Population	12,899		843	
	Total Households	4,707		266	
	Total Housing Units	4,940		266	
	POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT				

3. **Combining corrections from the erroneous assumption of no transfer and the missing population, results in a much larger grocery store.**

	Correction amount $	SF of grocery
No transfer correction	**3,547,000**	
Pop. correction	**3,123,000 – 4,714,000**	
5 minute demand	**5,570,000**	
Total corrected demand	**12,240,000 – 13,831,000**	**24,480 - -27,662**

.

Jackson Ewing

From: Kuba Bednarek <bednarej@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I would like to comment on proposed amendments to Briggs Village plan.
Please prioritize housing. Please building more housing for people; less housing for cars. Please prioritze a grocery store and work with local grocers to vill the space (i.e. Food Co-op, Spuds, Jays farmstand).
Please also include mixed use spaces by including commercial space build under housing.

Thanks kindly,
Jakub Bednarek
Olympia WA SE neighborhood.

Jackson Ewing

From: Craig Adair <dcadair@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:13 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: File: 24-0313 Community Planning and Development

Jackson,

My wife and I wish to submit the following input prior to the public hearing tonight regarding housing and commercial development in Briggs Village:

We read about Briggs Village around 2000, and we liked the idea of single and multifamily residences along with commercial development including a grocery store. We moved from the Steamboat area to Briggs Village in early 2010 as we prepared for retirement. We retired in 2014 and 2015 and live in a single-family home. We will soon be 78 and 76 years old and our next move may be to a Briggs Village apartment. A grocery store within short walking distance was part of our retirement plan and it has not happened yet. Gordie may be the third Briggs developer since 2010, and all developers have said that moving forward has been hampered by the Olympia Planning Commission. We hope that this is not true. In closing, we want the developer and the city to know that people make life decisions based on what they think is reasonable information. We hope that we won't have to alter our plans.

Sincerely,
Lynne & Craig Adair
1508 Brighton Way SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Hillary Harper <hmharp2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

Good afternoon,

I am writing as a citizen and home owner in area of Yelm and Henderson to respectfully request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

As I write this, I am listening to the emergency response of yet another accident at Yelm and Henderson. The irresponsible growth without an infrastructure increase has led to dangerous and reckless driving and an unsafe pedestrian environment in the area of schools. Please consider other impacts of packing in thousands more apartment units on traffic, safety, schools and the environment.

Thank you,

Hillary M. Harper

Jackson Ewing

From: Rose Curtis <s.rose.curtis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Please support new businesses and parking

Dear Olympia Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my support for maintaining the current Briggs Village Master Plan, ensuring space for a neighborhood grocery store, adequate parking for the YMCA, and a traffic signal at Henderson Blvd SE and Orchard Lane SE to improve safety at this busy intersection.

I acknowledge the current real estate market's demand for increased residential development. However, rather than reducing commercial space, a mixed-use approach—integrating residential units above commercial spaces like a grocery store—would allow for both necessary housing growth and essential community services. This strategy aligns with the original Urban Village vision, ensuring that commercial spaces remain viable while meeting residential needs.

Concerns with the Proposed Zoning Amendments

As being discussed in the Olympia Planning Commission's Feb. 24 agenda, the proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 would:

- Remove the requirement for a set amount of commercial space per residential unit.
- Increase multifamily housing allowances and remove density limits.
- Allow more residential units while decreasing space for essential businesses like grocery stores.

While these changes aim to support housing, they risk eliminating vital services and increasing parking strain, particularly for community spaces like the YMCA, which already faces parking limitations.

Why a Grocery Store and adequate Parking Are Essential for Briggs Village

- Briggs Village is in a food desert. Reducing commercial space could eliminate the possibility of a grocery store, making it even harder for residents to access fresh food.
- Mixed-use development (grocery below, residential above) ensures commercial viability while addressing housing needs.
- Parking constraints for the YMCA will worsen if commercial and residential growth isn't balanced properly.

Safety Concern: Traffic Signal at Henderson & Orchard Lane SE

Additionally, I strongly urge the city to prioritize a traffic signal at Henderson Blvd SE and Orchard Lane SE. This intersection is currently hazardous for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers, and increased residential density will only amplify safety risks.

Preserving the Original Urban Village Vision

The original Briggs Village Master Plan was thoughtfully designed to balance housing, businesses, green spaces, and walkability. I ask that the council:

1. Preserve space for a grocery store through mixed-use zoning rather than reducing commercial space.
2. Ensure adequate parking for the YMCA and other community services.
3. Implement a traffic signal at Henderson & Orchard Lane SE for improved safety.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate your commitment to making thoughtful planning decisions that serve both current and future community needs.

Best Regards,

Samantha Curtis

Briggs Denizen

Jackson Ewing

From: Irina Razvina <irina.razvina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Urban Village zoning and Briggs Village Master Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a concerned resident contacting you regarding Briggs Village Master Plan and Urban Village zoning. Just a couple of Saturdays ago I went to patron a business in the Briggs Village area. Not only was it extremely difficult to find parking, it was actually quite difficult to drive down one of the streets in that area because there were so many cars parked on the side of the road, making two-way traffic virtually impossible. I visited another business in the Briggs Village area late on a Monday morning, and had the same issue -- too many cars, not nearly enough parking, hard to even drive down side streets in the area. As a long-term resident of Thurston County, and having now lived in this area of Thurston County for 8 years, I am extremely concerned about the proposal to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages. I do not believe we currently have enough infrastructure to support all the residents in this area, and increasing the number of residential units allowed will only make the problem worse.

Respectfully,

Irina Razvina
(360) 791-9813

Jackson Ewing

From: Mattie Sobotka <mattiesobotka@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:45 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: YMCA Community Re-zoning

Hello,

I have become aware that there are **proposed zoning changes to the neighborhood surrounding the YMCA Briggs community. I strongly encourage you to NOT reszone this area** to include more residential space and instead leave it under the current zoning plan.

The original plan is exactly what is needed in our Thurston County communities. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. This is how humans are supposed to live, connected to community and connected to each other.

I understand there are housing pressures in Thurston County, but removing the few examples we have of good communities is not the way to do it. **Please do not rezone this area.**

Thank you for your time,
-Mattie Sobotka

Jackson Ewing

From: Barbara Putnam <barbara.putnam7@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking Challenges at Briggs

I am writing you with my concerns that the current city plans to increase housing without increasing parking is going to be too difficult for current businesses and people living in the area to find viable parking.

It already takes us a long time to find parking without an increase in housing. I go to the Briggs YMCA several times a week. It is a critical part of keeping my health in old age. Do NOT increase housing with adequate additional parking as a requirement. We are already pretty pushed.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Barb Putnam
1226 Devon Loop NE
Olympia, WA. 98506

Jackson Ewing

From: Mandy Weeks <mandyweeks@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:28 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning

Dear Olympia Planning Commission,

I understand the Olympia Planning Commission is considering zoning changes in Briggs Village that will lead to INCREASED PARKING DIFFICULTIES and will limit access to services including the Y. The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an “urban village” with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business & residents with regard to infrastructure. I love this structure, but even now parking if difficult during busy time.

The Y is critical to the neighborhood, providing a space for activities for all neighbors. Your plan will lead to fewer services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on current parking, leading to a less walkable neighborhood and less of a neighborhood with activities for all neighbors.

Thank you,

Mandy Weeks-Green
YMCA Member and Olympia Resident

esri
THE SCIENCE OF WHERE®

ACS Population Summary

Briggs Village Drive Times
Town Square Ln SE, Olympia, Washington, 98501
Drive time: 5, 6 minute radii
Latitude: 47.00667
Longitude: -122.88203

		5 minutes
		2018-2022
		ACS Estimate
	TOTALS	
	Total Population	12,899
	Total Households	4,707
	Total Housing Units	4,940
	POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	
	Total	12,521
	Enrolled in school	3,533
	Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	204
	Public school	69
	Private school	135
	Enrolled in kindergarten	119
	Public school	83
	Private school	36
	Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	794
	Public school	765
	Private school	30
	Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	845
	Public school	794
	Private school	50
	Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	882
	Public school	882
	Private school	1
	Enrolled in college undergraduate years	517
	Public school	453
	Private school	64
	Enrolled in graduate or professional school	171
	Public school	74

	Private school	97
	Not enrolled in school	8,988

		5 minutes
	POPULATION AGE 65+ BY RELATIONSHIP AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Total	2,176
	Living in Households	2,146
	Living in Family Households	1,600
	Householder	726
	Spouse	602
	Parent	174
	Parent-in-law	10
	Other Relative	63
	Nonrelative	25
	Living in Nonfamily Households	546
	Householder	489
	Nonrelative	57
	Living in Group Quarters	30

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE AND SIZE	
	Family Households	3,380
	2-Person	1,235
	3-Person	969
	4-Person	719
	5-Person	342
	6-Person	60
	7+ Person	55
	Nonfamily Households	1,327
	1-Person	1,005
	2-Person	239
	3-Person	81
	4-Person	2
	5-Person	0
	6-Person	0
	7+ Person	0
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE UNDER 18 YEARS BY	
	HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Households with one or more people under 18 years	1,824
	Family households	1,824
	Married-couple family	1,195
	Male householder, no wife present	200
	Female householder, no husband present	430

	Nonfamily households	0
	Households with no people under 18 years	2,882
	Married-couple family	1,381
	Other family	174
	Nonfamily households	1,327
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE 65 YEARS AND OVER,	
	HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Households with Pop 65+	1,423
	1-Person	434
	2+ Person Family	929
	2+ Person Nonfamily	59
	Households with No Pop 65+	3,284
	1-Person	571
	2+ Person Family	2,450
	2+ Person Nonfamily	263

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLD TYPE BY RELATIVES AND NONRELATIVES FOR POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS	
	POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS	
	Total	12,859
	In Family Households	11,061
	In Married-Couple Family	8,343
	Relatives	8,265
	Nonrelatives	78
	In Male Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	884
	Relatives	723
	Nonrelatives	160
	In Female Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	1,835
	Relatives	1,747
	Nonrelatives	88
	In Nonfamily Households	1,798

		5 minutes
	POPULATION AGE 5+ YEARS BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	
	AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH	
	Total	12,208
	5 to 17 years	
	Speak only English	2,304
	Speak Spanish	160
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	151
	Speak English "not well"	10
	Speak English "not at all"	0

	Speak other Indo-European languages	76
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	76
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	129
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	129
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	18 to 64 years	
	Speak only English	6,542
	Speak Spanish	179
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	171
	Speak English "not well"	8
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other Indo-European languages	190
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	190
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	452
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	399
	Speak English "not well"	53
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	65 years and over	
	Speak only English	2,030
	Speak Spanish	83
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	83
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other Indo-European languages	30
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	30
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	32
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	20
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	12

	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0

		5 minutes
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY PLACE OF WORK	
	Total	5,855
	Worked in state and in county of residence	4,827
	Worked in state and outside county of residence	1,028
	Worked outside state of residence	0

		5 minutes
	SEX BY CLASS OF WORKER FOR THE CIVILIAN EMPLOYED POPULATION 16 YEARS	
	AND OVER	
	Total:	5,972
	Male:	2,992
	Employee of private company workers	1,547
	Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	156
	Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	192
	Local government workers	253
	State government workers	529
	Federal government workers	144
	Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	164
	Unpaid family workers	7
	Female:	2,979
	Employee of private company workers	1,056
	Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	73
	Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	387
	Local government workers	401
	State government workers	808
	Federal government workers	61
	Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	186
	Unpaid family workers	7

		5 minutes
	POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS AND PRESENCE OF A COMPUTER	
	Total	12,859
	Population <18 in Households	3,358
	Have a Computer	3,340
	Have NO Computer	18
	Population 18-64 in Households	7,355

	Have a Computer	7,321
	Have NO Computer	34
	Population 65+ in Households	2,146
	Have a Computer	2,072
	Have NO Computer	74

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS AND INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS	
	Total	4,707
	With an Internet Subscription	4,543
	Dial-Up Alone	6
	Broadband	4,271
	Satellite Service	90
	Other Service	25
	Internet Access with no Subscription	80
	With No Internet Access	85

		5 minutes
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION	
	TO WORK	
	Total	5,855
	Drove alone	3,793
	Carpooled	486
	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	123
	Bus or trolley bus	27
	Light rail, streetcar or trolley	0
	Subway or elevated	34
	Long-distance/Commuter Train	21
	Ferryboat	41
	Taxicab	0
	Motorcycle	44
	Bicycle	35
	Walked	68
	Other means	87
	Worked at home	1,218
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS (WHO DID NOT WORK FROM HOME)	
	BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK	
	Total	4,637
	Less than 5 minutes	134
	5 to 9 minutes	462
	10 to 14 minutes	1,267

	15 to 19 minutes	887
	20 to 24 minutes	510
	25 to 29 minutes	185
	30 to 34 minutes	383
	35 to 39 minutes	112
	40 to 44 minutes	215
	45 to 59 minutes	176
	60 to 89 minutes	128
	90 or more minutes	179
	Average Travel Time to Work (in minutes)	

		5 minutes
	FEMALES AGE 20-64 YEARS BY AGE OF OWN CHILDREN AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
	Total	3,743
	Own children under 6 years only	235
	In labor force	204
	Not in labor force	31
	Own children under 6 years and 6 to 17 years	141
	In labor force	112
	Not in labor force	29
	Own children 6 to 17 years only	1,263
	In labor force	981
	Not in labor force	281
	No own children under 18 years	2,104
	In labor force	1,722
	Not in labor force	383

		5 minutes
	CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION BY AGE & TYPES OHEALINSURANCE	
	OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE	
	Total	12,778
	Under 19 years:	3,543
	One Type of Health Insurance:	3,379
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,972
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	36
	Medicare Coverage Only	0
	Medicaid Coverage Only	924
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	447
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	154
	No Health Insurance Coverage	10
	19 to 34 years:	1,982

	One Type of Health Insurance:	1,630
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,064
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	145
	Medicare Coverage Only	5
	Medicaid Coverage Only	384
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	32
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	224
	No Health Insurance Coverage	128
	35 to 64 years:	5,095
	One Type of Health Insurance:	4,315
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	3,247
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	288
	Medicare Coverage Only	50
	Medicaid Coverage Only	535
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	190
	VA Health Care Only	6
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	428
	No Health Insurance Coverage	351
	65+ years:	2,159
	One Type of Health Insurance:	607
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	69
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	0
	Medicare Coverage Only	538
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	0
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance:	1,551
	Employer-Based & Direct-Purchase Health Insurance	18
	Employer-Based Health & Medicare Insurance	643
	Direct-Purchase Health & Medicare Insurance	346
	Medicare & Medicaid Coverage	55
	Other Private Health Insurance Combos	0
	Other Public Health Insurance Combos	0
	Other Health Insurance Combinations	488
	No Health Insurance Coverage	0

		5 minutes
	POPULATION BY RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL	
	Total	12,854
	Under .50	331
	.50 to .99	512
	1.00 to 1.24	83
	1.25 to 1.49	106
	1.50 to 1.84	828

	1.85 to 1.99	69
	2.00 and over	10,925

		5 minutes
	CIVILIAN POPULATION AGE 18 OR OLDER BY VETERAN STATUS	
	Total	9,438
	Veteran	956
	Nonveteran	8,482
	Male	4,495
	Veteran	807
	Nonveteran	3,688
	Female	4,943
	Veteran	149
	Nonveteran	4,794
	CIVILIAN VETERANS AGE 18 OR OLDER BY PERIOD OF	
	MILITARY SERVICE	
	Total	955
	Gulf War (9/01 or later), no Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	214
	Gulf War (9/01 or later) and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	81
	Gulf War (9/01 or later), and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), and Vietnam Era	20
	Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	137
	Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01) and Vietnam Era	32
	Vietnam Era, no Korean War, no World War II	291
	Vietnam Era and Korean War, no World War II	0
	Vietnam Era and Korean War and World War II	0
	Korean War, no Vietnam Era, no World War II	38
	Korean War and World War II, no Vietnam Era	0
	World War II, no Korean War, no Vietnam Era	0
	Between Gulf War and Vietnam Era only	97
	Between Vietnam Era and Korean War only	46
	Between Korean War and World War II only	0
	Pre-World War II only	0

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY POVERTY STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	Income in the past 12 months below poverty level	226
	Married-couple family	43

	Other family - male householder (no wife present)	102
	Other family - female householder (no husband present)	25
	Nonfamily household - male householder	47
	Nonfamily household - female householder	9
	Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level	4,481
	Married-couple family	2,533
	Other family - male householder (no wife present)	141
	Other family - female householder (no husband present)	535
	Nonfamily household - male householder	483
	Nonfamily household - female householder	788
	Poverty Index	39

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY OTHER INCOME	
	Social Security Income	1,429
	No Social Security Income	3,278
	Retirement Income	1,520
	No Retirement Income	3,187

		5 minutes
	GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN	
	THE PAST 12 MONTHS	
	<10% of Income	21
	10-14.9% of Income	128
	15-19.9% of Income	132
	20-24.9% of Income	292
	25-29.9% of Income	166
	30-34.9% of Income	101
	35-39.9% of Income	68
	40-49.9% of Income	169
	50+% of Income	493
	Gross Rent % Inc Not Computed	27

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE INCOME IN THE PAST	
	12 MONTHS	
	Total	4,707
	With public assistance income	44
	No public assistance income	4,663
	HOUSEHOLDS BY FOOD STAMPS/SNAP STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	With Food Stamps/SNAP	302

	With No Food Stamps/SNAP	4,405
	HOUSEHOLDS BY DISABILITY STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	With 1+ Persons w/Disability	1,352
	With No Person w/Disability	3,355

	Data Note: N/A means not available. Population by Ratio of Income to Poverty Level repr income in 2022, adjusted for inflation. **2018-2022 ACS Estimate:** The American Community Survey (ACS) replaces census sample monthly from January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2022. Although the ACS includes ma significant differences between the two surveys including fundamental differences in surve **Margin of error (MOE):** The MOE is a measure of the variability of the estimate due to sam estimate with 90 percent confidence. The range of uncertainty is called the confidence int reports an estimate of 100 with an MOE of +/- 20, then you can be 90 percent certain the **Reliability:** These symbols represent threshold values that Esri has established from the Cc measures the amount of sampling error relative to the size of the estimate, expressed as a	
		High Reliability: Small error is small relative to
		Medium Reliability: Es
		Low Reliability: Large relative to the estimat

Source: U.S.		Reliability:

©2025 Esri

Percent	MOE(±)	Reliability
	843	
	266	
	266	
100.0%	747	
28.2%	365	
1.6%	54	
0.6%	48	
1.1%	42	
1.0%	107	
0.7%	106	
0.3%	42	
6.3%	110	
6.1%	111	
0.2%	31	
6.7%	120	
6.3%	117	
0.4%	25	
7.0%	207	
7.0%	207	
0.0%	51	
4.1%	147	
3.6%	145	
0.5%	42	
1.4%	76	
0.6%	70	

0.8%	52	
71.8%	376	

100.0%	227	
98.6%	227	
73.5%	206	
33.4%	103	
27.7%	101	
8.0%	72	
0.5%	14	
2.9%	59	
1.1%	22	
25.1%	111	
22.5%	94	
2.6%	38	
1.4%	6	

71.8%	247	
26.2%	139	
20.6%	165	
15.3%	95	
7.3%	154	
1.3%	72	
1.2%	30	
28.2%	167	
21.4%	153	
5.1%	76	
1.7%	55	
0.0%	7	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
38.8%	235	
38.8%	235	
25.4%	129	
4.2%	140	
9.1%	147	

0.0%	0	
61.2%	214	
29.3%	147	
3.7%	35	
28.2%	167	
30.2%	139	
9.2%	89	
19.7%	112	
1.3%	35	
69.8%	252	
12.1%	142	
52.1%	231	
5.6%	78	

100.0%	843	
86.0%	869	
64.9%	523	
64.3%	521	
0.6%	28	
6.9%	520	
5.6%	448	
1.2%	76	
14.3%	541	
13.6%	511	
0.7%	56	
14.0%	239	

100.0%	740	
18.9%	308	
1.3%	138	
1.2%	141	
0.1%	33	
0.0%	0	

0.6%	53		
0.6%	53		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
1.1%	124		
1.1%	124		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	3		
0.0%	3		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
53.6%	412		
1.5%	105		
1.4%	108		
0.1%	28		
0.0%	0		
1.6%	69		
1.6%	56		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
3.7%	125		
3.3%	97		
0.4%	47		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	6		
0.0%	6		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
16.6%	227		
0.7%	121		
0.7%	121		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.2%	19		
0.2%	19		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.3%	16		
0.2%	10		
0.0%	5		
0.1%	36		

0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	346	
82.4%	322	
17.6%	162	
0.0%	3	

100.0%	382	
50.1%	231	
25.9%	208	
2.6%	48	
3.2%	55	
4.2%	81	
8.9%	87	
2.4%	59	
2.7%	64	
0.1%	10	
49.9%	223	
17.7%	142	
1.2%	38	
6.5%	45	
6.7%	94	
13.5%	161	
1.0%	66	
3.1%	59	
0.1%	12	

100.0%	843	
26.1%	512	
26.0%	514	
0.1%	28	
57.2%	411	

56.9%	410	
0.3%	33	
16.7%	227	
16.1%	220	
0.6%	49	

100.0%	266	
96.5%	265	
0.1%	28	
90.7%	274	
1.9%	38	
0.5%	30	
1.7%	30	
1.8%	36	

100.0%	346	
64.8%	288	
8.3%	172	
2.1%	136	
0.5%	23	
0.0%	0	
0.6%	90	
0.4%	21	
0.7%	108	
0.0%	0	
0.8%	114	
0.6%	39	
1.2%	66	
1.5%	65	
20.8%	163	
100.0%	308	
2.9%	69	
10.0%	69	
27.3%	202	

19.1%	119	
11.0%	92	
4.0%	89	
8.3%	84	
2.4%	46	
4.6%	73	
3.8%	58	
2.8%	59	
3.9%	92	

100.0%	245	
6.3%	66	
5.5%	66	
0.8%	22	
3.8%	49	
3.0%	39	
0.8%	36	
33.7%	187	
26.2%	176	
7.5%	92	
56.2%	188	
46.0%	173	
10.2%	114	

100.0%	840	
27.7%	521	
26.4%	517	
15.4%	370	
0.3%	25	
0.0%	0	
7.2%	347	
3.5%	178	
0.0%	0	
1.2%	60	
0.1%	30	
15.5%	302	

12.8%	262	
8.3%	149	
1.1%	91	
0.0%	11	
3.0%	218	
0.3%	41	
0.0%	0	
1.8%	95	
1.0%	110	
39.9%	314	
33.8%	296	
25.4%	283	
2.3%	97	
0.4%	39	
4.2%	127	
1.5%	90	
0.0%	28	
3.3%	112	
2.7%	126	
16.9%	227	
4.8%	135	
0.5%	34	
0.0%	1	
4.2%	127	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
12.1%	207	
0.1%	28	
5.0%	118	
2.7%	97	
0.4%	35	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
3.8%	96	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	843	
2.6%	161	
4.0%	447	
0.6%	88	
0.8%	27	
6.4%	329	

0.5%	61	
85.0%	710	

100.0%	443	
10.1%	126	
89.9%	421	
47.6%	251	
8.6%	105	
39.1%	244	
52.4%	268	
1.6%	66	
50.8%	261	
100.0%	126	
22.4%	85	
8.5%	44	
2.1%	13	
14.3%	54	
3.4%	28	
30.5%	53	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
4.0%	28	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	7	
10.2%	42	
4.8%	23	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	266	
4.8%	146	
0.9%	31	

2.2%	138	
0.5%	41	
1.0%	24	
0.2%	20	
95.2%	255	
53.8%	183	
3.0%	36	
11.4%	141	
10.3%	93	
16.7%	155	

30.4%	146	
69.6%	260	
32.3%	193	
67.7%	246	

1.3%	63	
8.0%	72	
8.3%	45	
18.3%	89	
10.4%	65	
6.3%	62	
4.3%	74	
10.6%	127	
30.9%	188	
1.7%	23	

100.0%	266	
0.9%	31	
99.1%	265	
100.0%	266	
6.4%	151	

93.6%	253	
100.0%	266	
28.7%	214	
71.3%	244	

esents persons for whom poverty status is determined. Household income represents

data. Esri is releasing the 2018-2022 ACS estimates, five-year period data collected
ny of the subjects previously covered by the decennial census sample, there are
ey design and residency rules.

npling error. MOEs enable the data user to measure the range of uncertainty for each
erval, and it is calculated by taking the estimate +/- the MOE. For example, if the ACS
value for the whole population falls between 80 and 120.

efficients of Variation (CV) to designate the usability of the estimates. The CV
percentage.

CVs (less than or equal to 12 percent) are flagged green to indicate that the sampling
the estimate and the estimate is reasonably reliable.

timates with CVs between 12 and 40 are flagged yellow-use with caution.

CVs (over 40 percent) are flagged red to indicate that the sampling error is large
e. The estimate is considered very unreliable.

	high		medi um		low

6 minutes		
	2018-2022	
	ACS Estimate	**Percent**
TOTALS		
Total Population	16,770	
Total Households	6,099	
Total Housing Units	6,430	
POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
Total	16,296	100.0%
Enrolled in school	4,595	28.2%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	247	1.5%
Public school	77	0.5%
Private school	170	1.0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	138	0.8%
Public school	94	0.6%
Private school	44	0.3%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	1,081	6.6%
Public school	1,011	6.2%
Private school	71	0.4%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	1,132	6.9%
Public school	1,060	6.5%
Private school	71	0.4%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1,087	6.7%
Public school	1,075	6.6%
Private school	13	0.1%
Enrolled in college undergraduate years	685	4.2%
Public school	612	3.8%
Private school	74	0.5%
Enrolled in graduate or professional school	224	1.4%
Public school	113	0.7%

Private school	112	0.7%
Not enrolled in school	11,701	71.8%

6 minutes		
POPULATION AGE 65+ BY RELATIONSHIP AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Total	2,766	100.0%
Living in Households	2,732	98.8%
Living in Family Households	2,017	72.9%
Householder	901	32.6%
Spouse	761	27.5%
Parent	234	8.5%
Parent-in-law	31	1.1%
Other Relative	63	2.3%
Nonrelative	26	0.9%
Living in Nonfamily Households	716	25.9%
Householder	638	23.1%
Nonrelative	78	2.8%
Living in Group Quarters	34	1.2%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE AND SIZE		
Family Households	4,302	70.5%
2-Person	1,626	26.7%
3-Person	1,141	18.7%
4-Person	930	15.2%
5-Person	402	6.6%
6-Person	121	2.0%
7+ Person	81	1.3%
Nonfamily Households	1,797	29.5%
1-Person	1,378	22.6%
2-Person	318	5.2%
3-Person	97	1.6%
4-Person	5	0.1%
5-Person	0	0.0%
6-Person	0	0.0%
7+ Person	0	0.0%
HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE UNDER 18 YEARS BY		
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Households with one or more people under 18 years	2,317	38.0%
Family households	2,317	38.0%
Married-couple family	1,544	25.3%
Male householder, no wife present	269	4.4%
Female householder, no husband present	504	8.3%

Nonfamily households	0	0.0%
Households with no people under 18 years	3,782	62.0%
Married-couple family	1,754	28.8%
Other family	230	3.8%
Nonfamily households	1,797	29.5%
HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE 65 YEARS AND OVER,		
HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Households with Pop 65+	1,810	29.7%
1-Person	566	9.3%
2+ Person Family	1,165	19.1%
2+ Person Nonfamily	79	1.3%
Households with No Pop 65+	4,289	70.3%
1-Person	811	13.3%
2+ Person Family	3,137	51.4%
2+ Person Nonfamily	341	5.6%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLD TYPE BY RELATIVES AND NONRELATIVES FOR POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS		
POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS		
Total	16,717	100.0%
In Family Households	14,291	85.5%
In Married-Couple Family	10,908	65.3%
Relatives	10,814	64.7%
Nonrelatives	94	0.6%
In Male Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	1,164	7.0%
Relatives	929	5.6%
Nonrelatives	234	1.4%
In Female Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	2,220	13.3%
Relatives	2,109	12.6%
Nonrelatives	111	0.7%
In Nonfamily Households	2,426	14.5%

6 minutes		
POPULATION AGE 5+ YEARS BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME		
AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH		
Total	15,889	100.0%
5 to 17 years		
Speak only English	3,012	19.0%
Speak Spanish	206	1.3%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	194	1.2%
Speak English "not well"	13	0.1%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%

Speak other Indo-European languages	104	0.7%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	104	0.7%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	162	1.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	162	1.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other languages	2	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	2	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
18 to 64 years		
Speak only English	8,501	53.5%
Speak Spanish	299	1.9%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	282	1.8%
Speak English "not well"	16	0.1%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other Indo-European languages	254	1.6%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	254	1.6%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	577	3.6%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	508	3.2%
Speak English "not well"	69	0.4%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other languages	5	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	5	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
65 years and over		
Speak only English	2,553	16.1%
Speak Spanish	128	0.8%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	128	0.8%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other Indo-European languages	33	0.2%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	33	0.2%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	50	0.3%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	28	0.2%
Speak English "not well"	3	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	19	0.1%

Speak other languages	2	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	2	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY PLACE OF WORK		
Total	7,745	100.0%
Worked in state and in county of residence	6,372	82.3%
Worked in state and outside county of residence	1,366	17.6%
Worked outside state of residence	7	0.1%

6 minutes		
SEX BY CLASS OF WORKER FOR THE CIVILIAN EMPLOYED POPULATION 16 YEARS		
AND OVER		
Total:	7,861	100.0%
Male:	4,020	51.1%
Employee of private company workers	2,083	26.5%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	240	3.1%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	236	3.0%
Local government workers	323	4.1%
State government workers	727	9.2%
Federal government workers	192	2.4%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	213	2.7%
Unpaid family workers	7	0.1%
Female:	3,841	48.9%
Employee of private company workers	1,368	17.4%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	89	1.1%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	512	6.5%
Local government workers	482	6.1%
State government workers	1,032	13.1%
Federal government workers	88	1.1%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	264	3.4%
Unpaid family workers	7	0.1%

6 minutes		
POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS AND PRESENCE OF A COMPUTER		
Total	16,717	100.0%
Population <18 in Households	4,364	26.1%
Have a Computer	4,337	25.9%
Have NO Computer	28	0.2%
Population 18-64 in Households	9,621	57.6%

Have a Computer	9,569	57.2%
Have NO Computer	52	0.3%
Population 65+ in Households	2,732	16.3%
Have a Computer	2,647	15.8%
Have NO Computer	86	0.5%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS AND INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With an Internet Subscription	5,852	96.0%
Dial-Up Alone	10	0.2%
Broadband	5,503	90.2%
Satellite Service	107	1.8%
Other Service	25	0.4%
Internet Access with no Subscription	132	2.2%
With No Internet Access	115	1.9%

6 minutes		
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION		
TO WORK		
Total	7,745	100.0%
Drove alone	5,022	64.8%
Carpooled	597	7.7%
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	207	2.7%
Bus or trolley bus	54	0.7%
Light rail, streetcar or trolley	0	0.0%
Subway or elevated	56	0.7%
Long-distance/Commuter Train	31	0.4%
Ferryboat	66	0.9%
Taxicab	1	0.0%
Motorcycle	72	0.9%
Bicycle	54	0.7%
Walked	107	1.4%
Other means	95	1.2%
Worked at home	1,589	20.5%
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS (WHO DID NOT WORK FROM HOME)		
BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK		
Total	6,156	100.0%
Less than 5 minutes	169	2.7%
5 to 9 minutes	712	11.6%
10 to 14 minutes	1,631	26.5%

15 to 19 minutes	1,227	19.9%
20 to 24 minutes	634	10.3%
25 to 29 minutes	247	4.0%
30 to 34 minutes	465	7.6%
35 to 39 minutes	165	2.7%
40 to 44 minutes	291	4.7%
45 to 59 minutes	221	3.6%
60 to 89 minutes	162	2.6%
90 or more minutes	233	3.8%
Average Travel Time to Work (in minutes)		

6 minutes		
FEMALES AGE 20-64 YEARS BY AGE OF OWN CHILDREN AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Total	4,862	100.0%
Own children under 6 years only	321	6.6%
In labor force	276	5.7%
Not in labor force	45	0.9%
Own children under 6 years and 6 to 17 years	218	4.5%
In labor force	153	3.1%
Not in labor force	66	1.4%
Own children 6 to 17 years only	1,552	31.9%
In labor force	1,219	25.1%
Not in labor force	334	6.9%
No own children under 18 years	2,771	57.0%
In labor force	2,243	46.1%
Not in labor force	528	10.9%

6 minutes		
CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION BY AGE & TYPES OHEALINSURANCE		
OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE		
Total	16,635	100.0%
Under 19 years:	4,601	27.7%
One Type of Health Insurance:	4,369	26.3%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	2,721	16.4%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	56	0.3%
Medicare Coverage Only	0	0.0%
Medicaid Coverage Only	1,066	6.4%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	497	3.0%
VA Health Care Only	29	0.2%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	210	1.3%
No Health Insurance Coverage	22	0.1%
19 to 34 years:	2,602	15.6%

One Type of Health Insurance:	2,171	13.1%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,519	9.1%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	181	1.1%
Medicare Coverage Only	5	0.0%
Medicaid Coverage Only	432	2.6%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	34	0.2%
VA Health Care Only	0	0.0%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	257	1.5%
No Health Insurance Coverage	175	1.1%
35 to 64 years:	6,684	40.2%
One Type of Health Insurance:	5,742	34.5%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	4,380	26.3%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	403	2.4%
Medicare Coverage Only	54	0.3%
Medicaid Coverage Only	628	3.8%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	243	1.5%
VA Health Care Only	34	0.2%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	552	3.3%
No Health Insurance Coverage	391	2.4%
65+ years:	2,747	16.5%
One Type of Health Insurance:	788	4.7%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	82	0.5%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	1	0.0%
Medicare Coverage Only	705	4.2%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	0	0.0%
VA Health Care Only	0	0.0%
2+ Types of Health Insurance:	1,959	11.8%
Employer-Based & Direct-Purchase Health Insurance	20	0.1%
Employer-Based Health & Medicare Insurance	800	4.8%
Direct-Purchase Health & Medicare Insurance	446	2.7%
Medicare & Medicaid Coverage	68	0.4%
Other Private Health Insurance Combos	0	0.0%
Other Public Health Insurance Combos	0	0.0%
Other Health Insurance Combinations	624	3.8%
No Health Insurance Coverage	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
POPULATION BY RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL		
Total	16,712	100.0%
Under .50	448	2.7%
.50 to .99	573	3.4%
1.00 to 1.24	125	0.7%
1.25 to 1.49	166	1.0%
1.50 to 1.84	962	5.8%

1.85 to 1.99	134	0.8%
2.00 and over	14,303	85.6%

6 minutes		
CIVILIAN POPULATION AGE 18 OR OLDER BY VETERAN STATUS		
Total	12,289	100.0%
Veteran	1,241	10.1%
Nonveteran	11,048	89.9%
Male	5,888	47.9%
Veteran	1,042	8.5%
Nonveteran	4,846	39.4%
Female	6,401	52.1%
Veteran	199	1.6%
Nonveteran	6,202	50.5%
CIVILIAN VETERANS AGE 18 OR OLDER BY PERIOD OF		
MILITARY SERVICE		
Total	1,241	100.0%
Gulf War (9/01 or later), no Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	288	23.2%
Gulf War (9/01 or later) and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	127	10.2%
Gulf War (9/01 or later), and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), and Vietnam Era	28	2.3%
Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	181	14.6%
Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01) and Vietnam Era	34	2.7%
Vietnam Era, no Korean War, no World War II	359	28.9%
Vietnam Era and Korean War, no World War II	0	0.0%
Vietnam Era and Korean War and World War II	0	0.0%
Korean War, no Vietnam Era, no World War II	41	3.3%
Korean War and World War II, no Vietnam Era	0	0.0%
World War II, no Korean War, no Vietnam Era	0	0.0%
Between Gulf War and Vietnam Era only	130	10.5%
Between Vietnam Era and Korean War only	53	4.3%
Between Korean War and World War II only	0	0.0%
Pre-World War II only	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY POVERTY STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level	318	5.2%
Married-couple family	45	0.7%

Other family - male householder (no wife present)	102	1.7%
Other family - female householder (no husband present)	35	0.6%
Nonfamily household - male householder	74	1.2%
Nonfamily household - female householder	62	1.0%
Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level	5,781	94.8%
Married-couple family	3,253	53.3%
Other family - male householder (no wife present)	214	3.5%
Other family - female householder (no husband present)	652	10.7%
Nonfamily household - male householder	685	11.2%
Nonfamily household - female householder	977	16.0%
Poverty Index	42	

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY OTHER INCOME		
Social Security Income	1,803	29.6%
No Social Security Income	4,296	70.4%
Retirement Income	1,940	31.8%
No Retirement Income	4,159	68.2%

6 minutes		
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN		
THE PAST 12 MONTHS		
<10% of Income	46	2.2%
10-14.9% of Income	161	7.9%
15-19.9% of Income	184	9.0%
20-24.9% of Income	371	18.1%
25-29.9% of Income	233	11.4%
30-34.9% of Income	150	7.3%
35-39.9% of Income	86	4.2%
40-49.9% of Income	193	9.4%
50+% of Income	568	27.7%
Gross Rent % Inc Not Computed	55	2.7%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE INCOME IN THE PAST		
12 MONTHS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With public assistance income	60	1.0%
No public assistance income	6,039	99.0%
HOUSEHOLDS BY FOOD STAMPS/SNAP STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With Food Stamps/SNAP	342	5.6%

With No Food Stamps/SNAP	5,757	94.4%
HOUSEHOLDS BY DISABILITY STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With 1+ Persons w/Disability	1,717	28.2%
With No Person w/Disability	4,382	71.8%

MOE(±)	Reliability
861	
276	
298	
767	
368	
53	
46	
42	
107	
106	
38	
112	
115	
37	
124	
118	
31	
208	
208	
92	
148	
146	
42	
74	
72	

45	
398	

233	
234	
211	
105	
103	
79	
39	
59	
22	
118	
101	
41	
7	

255	
144	
171	
100	
154	
63	
30	
175	
161	
79	
52	
9	
0	
0	
0	
241	
241	
132	
148	
148	

0	
223	
153	
34	
175	
145	
97	
115	
38	
264	
150	
240	
80	

861	
886	
545	
542	
31	
531	
456	
83	
543	
512	
58	
248	

757	
312	
150	
154	
34	
0	

60	
60	
0	
0	
127	
127	
0	
0	
21	
21	
0	
0	
436	
102	
105	
22	
0	
68	
55	
0	
0	
125	
98	
48	
0	
25	
25	
0	
0	
233	
128	
129	
6	
0	
18	
18	
0	
0	
16	
9	
27	
39	

15	
15	
0	
0	

372	
349	
167	
23	

405	
249	
218	
58	
56	
85	
90	
62	
64	
10	
231	
137	
40	
51	
99	
168	
72	
56	
12	

861	
516	
517	
33	
435	

435	
62	
234	
226	
49	

276	
274	
31	
283	
38	
30	
33	
51	

372	
308	
174	
138	
40	
0	
92	
26	
108	
13	
116	
42	
69	
65	
173	
332	
72	
106	
205	

129	
92	
89	
85	
48	
72	
63	
60	
94	

255	
62	
61	
23	
50	
42	
43	
189	
178	
92	
201	
187	
114	

859	
524	
519	
374	
25	
0	
345	
180	
116	
70	
30	
308	

266	
156	
91	
12	
218	
40	
0	
95	
114	
333	
314	
301	
103	
36	
124	
91	
30	
113	
125	
234	
141	
41	
15	
131	
0	
0	
213	
29	
124	
99	
37	
0	
12	
99	
0	

861	
162	
448	
93	
46	
313	

75	
732	

465	
131	
444	
266	
109	
259	
278	
67	
271	
131	
86	
45	
16	
55	
27	
57	
15	
0	
28	
0	
7	
46	
23	
0	
0	

276	
147	
31	

138	
42	
25	
41	
267	
190	
58	
142	
101	
163	

150	
273	
197	
259	

49	
60	
47	
91	
68	
67	
74	
135	
192	
28	

276	
32	
276	
276	
151	

264	
276	
220	
250	

JAN BLACK
Olympia, WA 98501

February 23, 2025

From: jblackinteriors@comcast.net
To: Jackson Ewing – jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Briggs Urban Village

Jackson Ewing – Associate Planner:

My name is Jan Black. I live in Sten Village which is only several blocks from the Briggs property. Twenty five years ago the planned development was to create a park like setting with mix housing and a boutique style grocery store. The idea was to develop a sustainable community where people could live and have access to the bus line to commute to work limiting car traffic and congestion.

I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units from three floors to four floors. It will alter the scale and overall feeling of the entire area creating more of a city environment. The proposed amendment to the Village will drastically alter the intent of the original plan by increasing more vehicle traffic, increase pressure on current parking and decrease access to the current facilities that now exist. The development that has already taken place in the last several years along the Yelm highway and Henderson has already created an increase in traffic and accidents in the village area as well as limiting parking to the Briggs YMCA.

The proposed amendment will simply be an Urban Sprawl compromising the quality of life that we as residents envisioned in the original plan for the Briggs Village. I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the commercial space with the Village.

Best Regards,

Jan Black

Mr Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner, City of Olympia 15 February 2025

Subject: Proposed Breach of Briggs Village Development Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

We write as deeply concerned residents of Briggs Village to demand accountability for the recent proposal to replace planned retail developments, including a promised grocery store, with additional apartment complexes. This change is blatantly inconsistent with the original Master Plan and constitutes a direct violation of the commitments made to the community. The proposal raises serious legal and community concerns that require address and resolution.

Breach of Offering Plan

The 2014 Briggs Village Master Plan clearly mandates the creation of a mixed-use district centered around a vibrant Town Square designed to serve as a community hub. This district was intended to balance residential living with accessible retail amenities, including essential services such as a grocery store. The plan's design intent, as described on page 4, emphasized a "lively and varied retail experience" and included "visibility and accessibility for retail tenants" to ensure residents could conveniently access daily necessities without relying on vehicular transportation.

The unilateral intent to replace retail spaces with high-density housing is an egregious breach of these commitments and undermines the principles on which the development was marketed to prospective buyers and tenants. Such a material deviation constitutes a violation of the offering plan and may expose your organization to significant legal liability under Washington State consumer protection laws for misrepresentation and potential "bait-and-switch" tactics.

Impact on Community

1. **Access to Essential Services:** A grocery store and other retail establishments were presented as integral features of Briggs Village, promoting walkability and reducing dependence on cars. Without these amenities, residents are forced to bear increased burdens of time and cost associated with traveling outside the community for basic needs. This failure contradicts the pedestrian-friendly vision outlined in the Master Plan and erodes the quality of life for all residents.
2. **Traffic and Safety Concerns:** The replacement of retail spaces with additional apartment units will significantly exacerbate traffic within the community. The Town Square, as envisioned, was to be a safe, family-oriented gathering place. The addition of high-density housing, combined with the absence of promised retail, creates vehicular congestion that threatens the safety of children and pedestrians, particularly in areas designated for recreation and socialization.

Demands for Action

This current developer's intention demands rejection. We insist that you take the following actions without delay:

1. Provide a detailed and transparent explanation for the abandonment of retail components, including the grocery store, as originally planned.
2. Commit to reinstating the promised retail amenities in alignment with the original design intent and provide a timeline for implementation.
3. Develop and share a comprehensive mitigation plan to address traffic and safety concerns arising from the proposed increase in residential density.

Conclusion

Residents of Briggs Village relied on the representations made in the Master Plan when making significant financial and personal commitments to this community. Current proposed changes represent a flagrant betrayal of these assurances and threaten to irreparably damage trust within the community. We demand that you fulfill your obligations and honor the commitments that formed this development's original foundation.

Failure to address these concerns will leave residents with no choice but to pursue all available legal and regulatory remedies to hold you accountable and protect our community's interests.

We request a written response addressing these concerns within 14 calendar days of this letter's date. The residents of Briggs Village will not tolerate further disregard for our rights and expectations.

Sincerely,

Marcia K. and Franklin A. Wilson

1526 Brighton Way SE,

Olympia, Washington 98501

From: Jon Swanson <jon.swanson@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2025 6:57 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Grocery store and future small shops at Briggs Village

Hello!

I hear that the developer of Briggs Village is filing to cancel the proposed development of small business and grocery store properties along Henderson, near the YMCA.

This would be a poor long term decision for the area, and I am opposed.

(PS: if there's something else I should do here, please let me know. I got a flyer asking me to email the Planning Commission asking it to not allow this)

Thank you,
Jon Swanson
1405 Brighton Way SE, Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Ellen Cavanaugh <emcavanaugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2025 7:35 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Hi Jack,

I have some serious concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Briggs Development. In order to maintain the original vision of the village (and the reason we bought a home here), we cannot increase the height of the buildings in the town square nor reduce it the commercial space as Gordie has proposed.

Gordie has failed to genuinely try to fulfill the original plan; rather, he's trying to make more money with his proposal. I suggest that someone obtain proof about the "recent" interest that Gordie said Spuds has in putting in a store. The date of that interest is prior to their build on Old Hwy 99 in Tumwater. He complains about limited interest but it's his greed that has gotten in the way of completing his commitment to the City of Olympia.

Over and over again, Gordie has violated his own HOA (not holding annual meetings, failing to maintain the community property, wasting water because of unmanaged irrigation lines). He is not genuinely concerned about Olympia or our little village.

Please hold firm and don't accept this proposal. It will degrade the vision, decrease property values, and increase the population density overwhelming schools and streets.

Sincerely,
Ellen Cavanaugh
1608 Bellerive Wy SE
Olympia, WA
360.951.6020

Jackson Ewing

From: Matt Murray, Realtor <matt@pnw-realty.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Support

Hi Jackson,

I am writing in support of the proposed code changes for Briggs Village because they're a practical solution to Olympia's growing need for housing. More homes, including those with ADUs, mean more options for people looking for a place to live, whether it's a home buyer, renters, or families needing more flexibility.

These updates make sense. They help address affordability and increase housing supply, all while making better use of the space we have. Olympia needs more housing, and this is a step in the right direction.

Best,Matt Murray, Realor

Matt Murray, Realtor
Van Dorm Realty

Call or Text 360.259.6315

Website linktr.ee/mattm.realtor

Whats my Home worth bit.ly/3xCT1qQ

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Schaufler
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:36 AM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: FW: Briggs Village Amendments

Please do not reply to this email.

Good morning, Commissioners –
Please see the comments below. The public hearing for this topic is coming up on Monday. Thank you.

Kind regards,
Casey Schaufler (he/him)
Associate Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.753.8254 | cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: Jim Lazar <jim@jimlazar.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 8:30 PM
To: Casey Schaufler <cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Briggs Village Amendments

Please enter these comments into the record of the Planning Commission on the Briggs Village proposed amendments.

I am writing in general opposition to the amendments proposed for Briggs Village. It may be possible to craft an acceptable compromise that preserves the current level of retail development, and allows affordable-housing apartments above some of that retail.

I live within a half-mile of Briggs Village, and have since the development was proposed. I carpooled to some of the meetings with Gary Briggs. The pledges that were made by Gary Briggs, in obtaining approval for this Urban Village are not being realized. This leads to a declining confidence in the role of land use planning, resentment by the neighborhood, and possibly some unfortunate changes..

I have served as the Democratic Precinct Officer for Olympia Precinct 235, which includes Briggs Village for more than a decade. I have probably walked door-to-door there more than almost any other person. I've watched it grow, and I've talked with residents. It's a good place, and I hope it will continue to develop in the way that was promised.

I like the idea of having an urban village within easy walking and cycling distance. We occasionally eat at the brewpub, and we ride our trikes through Briggs frequently. But I want what was promised, not what maximizes the profits of the developer. I worked my neighbors to reduce their level of dogmatic opposition, pointing out the benefits of having a pub, a grocery store, a bakery, and some restaurants nearby.

Among the expectations for this development were:

a) A grocery store, restaurants, and other retail establishments;

b) Professional offices over the retail, enabling people to work in our immediate neighborhood, reducing commuting traffic;


c) A mix of roughly equal numbers of apartments, single-family attached, and single-family detached homes;

Yes, the demand for office space is lower, as more people telecommute. Substituting some apartments for some of the professional office may be appropriate. But reducing the retail square footage is NOT appropriate.

Several years ago, the developer asked for a change to eliminate the obligation for professional office over retail; now they want apartments over retail. That was a compromise of the original expectation. Now the developer wants to put three stories of apartments above a much more limited amount of retail. That would be a compromise of the original expectation.

I do not have an objection to allowing additional apartments. But I would listen carefully to the people who live in Briggs Village today on that question. They bought expensive homes on an understanding of the ultimate character of the neighborhood. The are entitled to receive what was promised to them.

While Olympia has a shortage of affordable housing, it does not have a shortage of market-rate apartments, such as those in Briggs Village. In fact, if you walk around Briggs Village, you will see For Lease signs on every one of the apartment complexes, but almost no For Sale or For Rent signs on the single-family or townhouse properties. That is a hint that the market rate apartment market is glutted at the moment. In fact, we have the highest rate of vacancy in a dozen years. At the end of this comment are photos of the for lease signs in Briggs Village.



We do have a shortage of affordable housing in Olympia. And if the Planning Commission supported an increase, above 50%, in the ratio of apartments to other dwellings, it would be responsible to require that any additional apartments allowed be affordable housing: a rate that people can pay with 30% of their income, if their income is 80% of the area median income. Those would be **300 - 500 square-foot apartments, including mostly studio units,** not the current mix of mostly 800 - 1300 square-foot one to three bedroom apartments.

I do have a strong objection to a reduction of the retail square footage. I would love to see a bakery, a Thai restaurant, a Mexican restaurant, and a sandwich shop. These would go well with the pub/pizza place and ice cream shop there now. These are exactly the kind of businesses we anticipated when Briggs was approved. Holding firm on the retail footprint will help to make these kinds of businesses possible.

During the original consideration of the Briggs Master Plan, we were enticed to believe that the Stormans family (Ken Stormans lives just a few blocks from Briggs Village) would be bringing a Thriftway to Briggs Village, and the size limit of 50,000 square feet was designed to accommodate that, but not a Safeway/Haggens size store of 60,000 - 120,000 square feet. The idea was a market that would appeal to those of us who can walk or cycle there, but not so much those who would drive from other areas.

There are other grocery companies that operate smaller stores -- Aldi is one that comes to mind. Their stores are typically under 20,000 square feet, but carry a very wide range of fresh, frozen, produce, and shelf products. Trader Joe's is another smaller-store operator, as is Tacoma Boys. All of these offer a wide enough range of products to serve the local "run to the store" market, and each would also serve some other demand.

This development involved compromise by the community and by the applicant (Gary Briggs). Briggs did not get everything he wanted, and the community came with very diverse interests. The requirement for a minimum level of retail, a minimum and

maximum level of apartments, and a mix of single-family, apartment, townhouse, and senior housing was carefully crafted to make the development work for the developer, the neighborhood, and the future residents.

Today approximately a thousand people reside at Briggs Village. My precinct is one of the largest populations of any in the County. These folks are entitled to the retail services that was promised as a part of their decision to move there. Please do NOT reduce the minimum grocery store size or the total retail square footage. The current developer needs to engage a realtor with expertise in retail and restaurant tenancy. I believe that grocery, retail, and restaurant tenants would be successful in this location.

Finally, I'll note that the Briggs Village management is inattentive to maintenance, and should not be granted approval of changes until they address these maintenance issues. There are more than twenty places where sidewalk heaves create tripping hazards. Despite multiple formal complaints, filed on the City's OlympiaConnect app, these have not been fixed. The trail network has not been maintained. Vegetation in the future retail area (mostly blackberries and Scot's Broom) encroaches onto the sidewalk. The irrigation system floods the sidewalk along Henderson Boulevard. Cars regularly park blocking the sidewalks and bike lanes. The City will not enforce the parking that blocks sidealks, because the "retail streets" remain private, not public streets. We've asked the Briggs Village management to sign these areas to reduce parking blocking the sidewalks, with no response. I've inserted some photos below.

To summarize, I recommend no reduction to the required retail in Briggs Village. Substituting affordable housing apartments above the retail (replacing the originally planned professional office) is probably fine. The allowance of that apartment construction should be concurrent or following the retail development. One way to do that is to hold the square footage ratio of apartments to retail constant, so that each group of apartments can only be built as the retail is built.

I understand that the Friends of Briggs Village has developed an alternative set of amendments. I urge the Planning Commission to give these **equal consideration** to the amendments developed by the applicant and the City Manager's staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lazar

1907 Lakehurst Dr. SE

Olympia, WA 98501

Examples of For Lease signs at Briggs Village, January, 2025


BRIGGS
Apartments
EST 2019
VILLAGE
MOVE IN TODAY!
360.485.5161
BRIGGSVILLAGEAPARTMENTS.COM


NOW LEASING
Copper Leaf
2 & 3 BEDROOM
Luxury Apartment Homes
360.515.5025 · CopperLeafOly@gmail.com



Examples of Unrepaired Sidewalk Tripping Hazards at Briggs Village





--
Jim Lazar
1907 Lakehurst Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98501
360-786-1822

Jackson Ewing

From: Annette Wells <12annettewells@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Fwd: Briggs
Attachments: Outlook-e5pmycqs.png; Outlook-wkxmhf4l.png; Outlook-0ehtcgm0.png

Dear Planning Commission,

We are asking you to honor the original Briggs Village commitment to build a grocery store in our community.

We bought a home 15 years ago in Briggs Village because we wanted to be part of a village, with a grocery store, farmer's market, gathering space, and walkable opportunities to gather, shop, and connect with neighbors.

I cannot even count how many times we talk about a grocery store in our own home, not to mention with neighbors. It's almost daily. We are still holding out hope. It is a significant priority for many of us and one of the main reasons we all bought homes in this community.

We want to walk over and buy groceries for dinners, or grab a coffee, or meet friends on a bench outside the store after a bike ride in our neighborhood.

15 years after purchasing a home in Briggs Village, we now own our home. (Yay!!!) We are nearing retirement and the appeal of a walkable grocery store is on the top of our list of needs/wants.

Please honor the initial city code to build a grocery store in Briggs Village. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Annette Wells & Casey Ward
1432 Harvest Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Briggs Village

Annette Wells (she/her)

Teacher-Librarian

Salish Middle School

Extension 38202 (Please wait 6 rings and if it goes to voicemail, call back or email me)

Currently reading:

[cid:ecf4fe5b-3301-4f5e-a054-eabb2ed986b9]

Just finished:

[cid:cda51954-d965-43a9-89c2-f846988072f3][cid:da7aa492-9ca3-40b0-a9d3-65b563d7c61c]

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

Public records are available upon request under the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW. Unless exempt from disclosure, email communication is a public record that may be disclosed to a third party under the Act.

Jackson Ewing

From: Haley Coughlin <haleyjoy.coughlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:07 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Planned zoning changes

I am a Thurston County resident and I am not interested in the proposed amendments. Briggs village does not need more residential housing. It was meant to be walkable and have businesses with the residences. Thank you

February 19, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

On half of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the Briggs Community), I am attaching a letter signed by 263 community members over the last two weeks.


This letter reflects the great concern of the Briggs Community about the proposed code amendments that would reduce the commercial space in the Briggs Village. The developer has made clear he intends to use these code amendments to allow him to drastically reduce the size of the required Briggs Village grocery store to the size of a mini-mart.

To date the public has **not** had an opportunity to ask the staff and the developer questions about these complex proposed code amendments and what they would mean for Briggs Village and the promised real grocery store. The Planning Commission has not held any meetings/forums/workshops that would allow for such questions and interchange.

These letters request the Planning Commission to reset the comment deadline and hold at least two meetings where the public can ask the city staff *and* the developer questions about the amendments and the intended outcomes. Those meetings may result in the development of solutions that are a win-win for all interests.

Sincerely,

Betty Bailey
The Village Cooperative
1520 Palomino Dr. SE #305
Olympia, WA 98501



February 5, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati
Olympia Planning Commission

Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Commission Members and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the "community") regarding the proposed amendments to the Urban Village ordinance, OMC 18.05. These amendments were developed between the developer Gordie Gill and the staff of Community Development and Planning **without** any outreach to the community.

The proposed amendments would reduce the requirements for commercial space and apparently pave the way for the developer to reduce the planned grocery store (promised over 20 years ago) to a mini mart and substitute more apartments (which are not affordable) in place of a real grocery store.

It is essential that the Planning Commission give the community a fair and reasonable opportunity to ask City staff and the developer questions about these proposed amendments and the reasons for them and to understand the implications for the community. To date no such opportunity has been provided, and the community is being asked to comment on the amendments by February 20, 2025, without having had a chance to get its questions answered and under standard this complex and highly significant changes.

The Planning Commission and City should extend the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public forums or workshops

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
1, 2	Cathy and Rick Williams	4632 Village Ct SE Olympia 98501
3	[illegible]	4629 Village Ct SE Olympia 98501
4	[illegible]	4627 Village Ct SE 98501
5	Jan Black	4623 Village Ct SE
6	[illegible]	4618 Village Ct SE
7	[illegible]	4624 Village Ct. SE
8	Kimberly Couture	4620 Village Ct SE

	Name	Address
9	Susan L. Smith	4614 Village Ct. SE
10	George Smith	4614 Village Ct SE
11	Jon Peterson	4612 Village Drive SE
12	Lisa Peterson	4612 Village Drive SE
13	Miki Conrad	4525 Village Dr SE
14	Robert Conrad	4525 Village Dr SE
15	Will Flora	4470 village Dr SE
16	Darrell Hagney	1505 Yelm Hwy SE DarrellHagney@Gmail.com
17	Bob Dent	1804 Yelm Hwy SE
18	Hannah Kim	1804 Yelm Hwy SE

	Name	Address
19	Pete + Kirsten Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
20	Kirsten Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
21	Maria Maki	1802 Yelm Hwy SE
22	Sharon Krieger	4910 Orvas Ct SE
23	David Krieger	4910 Orvas Ct SE
24	Dera Wallace	5025 Orvas Ct SE
	chordabord@gmail.com	
25	Tim Flotlin	5012 Orvas Ct. SE
26	Kim Flotlin	5012 Orvas Ct SE
27	Diane Williams	5020 Orvas Ct. SE

	Name	Address
28	Scott Reese	5028 Orcas Ct SE Olympia WA 98501
29	Elizabeth Enfield	5036 Orcas CT SE Olympia WA 98501
30	Ben Enfield	5036 Orcas CT SE Olympia WA 98501
31	Dustin Games	5092 Orcas Ct. SE 98501
32	Sara Games	5092 Orcas Ct. SE 98501
33	Heidi Durkee	5045 Orcas Ct SE. 98501 360-292-3658
34	Elyette Weinstein	5000 ORCAS Ct 98501
35	Phil Jones	5000 ORCAS Ct. 98501

	Name	Address
36	Sara Larsen	4935 Orvas Ct. SE
37	Steve Larsen	4935 Orvas Ct. SE
38	Genera Hawkins	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
39	Steve Hawkins	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
40	Arie Dragt	4925 Orvas Ct. SE
41	Cameron Parkerim	1707 Yelm Hwy
42	Christine Ha	4636 Village Dr Se
43	Marsha Lorentsen	4606 Village Dr. SE.
44	Laura Schleyer	303 Wilson St NE

	Name	Address
45	Kristi Ayn Lorentson	4606 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
46	Renee Tedder	4605 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
47	Craig Tedder	4605 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
48	Meegan Cronk	4528 Maple Lane SE Olympia WA 98501
49	Rashaan Ganga	4530 Briggs Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501 rashaan.ganga@gmail.com
50	Katherine Ramirez	4530 Briggs Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
51	Lana Smith	4530 Briggs Dr SE OLY WA 98501
52	Cassandra Lew	4530 Briggs Dr SE 204 Olympia, WA 98501
53	Yana INGRAHAM	4530 Briggs Dr. SE

	Name	Address
54	Stephen INGRAHAM	4530 Briggs Dr. SE
55	Josh Arnett	4580 Briggs Dr. SE. jsharnettmd@gmail.com
56	Martha Perez-Gutie	4526 Briggs Dr SE Apt 102
57	Corey Baum	4421 Briggs Dr SE
58	Samuel Lowe	4401 Briggs Dr. SE
59	SMW	4327 Briggs Dr. SE
60	Richard Ramos	4520 Hayesson Blvd SE
61	Anne Mahrodi	1798 Yelm Hwy
62	Shane Jorgeson-Ramirez	21606 Krumpton St

	Name	Address
63	Stephen Lyles	4520 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
64	Pamela Lyles	4520 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
65	Claudia Smith	4515 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
66	Tracy Mahler	4515 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
67	Shannon Sue	4410 VILLAGE DR SE OLY WA 98501
68	MIKE McGAULEY	4410 VILLAGE DR SE OLY 98501
69	MAC ACARADO	4247 MAGNOLIA DR SE
70	Lahela Peterson	1408 Harvest Ave SE Oly, WA
71	Andrew Peterson	1408 Harvest Ave SE Oly, WA

	Name	Address
72	Sarah Skeuris	1748 Iden Hwy E, Olympia 98501
73	Hannah Harrison	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
74	Jefferson Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
75	Melinda Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
76	Dante Harrison	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
77	Melody Harrison Taylor	1420 Harvest Ave SE Olympia 98501
78	Casey Ward	1432 Harvest Ave SE Oly 98501
79	Annette Wells	1432 Harvest Ave SE Oly 9850
80	PREM ARORA	1418 HARVEST AVE SE, ~~LACEY~~ OLYMPIA 98501

	Name	Address
81	NATASHA ARORA	1438 Harvest Ave SE, Olympia WA 98501
82	Peter Gallagher	1414 Harvest Ave SE
83	Betty Gallagher	1414 Harvest Ave SE
84	[signature]	1522 Harvest Ave SE
85	Kelly Bowers	1522 Harvest Ave SE
86	Debra Bigelow	4110 Henderson Blvd SE
87	Lisa McLean	1519 Brighton Ave SE
88	Becky McLean	" "
89	Sam Shakespeare	4128 Mary St SE
90	Dario de la Fuente	4117 Mary St

	Name	Address
91	Cricket Construction	4117 Myrtle Ct.
92	Sean McIntosh	4225 Briggs
93	Dr. Avshalom Brock-Levi	4225 Briggs Dr. SE D201
94	Toni Brock-Levi	" "
95	Diamond Redd	" "
96	Matthew Redd	" " E-306
97	[signature]	" " E304
98	[signature]	" " C 301
99	[signature]	E 102

2025, without having had reasonable access to the information necessary to understand these complex and highly significant changes and their purported justification.

It is therefore incumbent on the Planning Commission and City to strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public forums or workshops with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop. Only after those workshops should the Planning Commission and City decide whether to proceed with an ordinance amendment, and if so, then schedule new comment period and potential public hearing.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
Silver Leaf 195	Marion M. Freels	4540 Henderson Blvd SE Apt 316 Olympia WA 98501
196	Trevor T. Sanders	4625 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
197	[illegible]	4625 Village Dr SE, Olympia 98501

	Name	Address
100	Jessica Brown	C301
101	Melissa Johnson	1603 Bellevue Way SE
102	Maureen Callender	1535 Bellevue Way SE
103	Andrew Callender	1535 Bellevue Way SE
104	[signature]	1539 Bellevue Way SE
105	Stacey Plumley	1539 Bellevue Way SE
106	Yasmin Rivera	1543 Bellevue Way SE
107	Shawna Purcell	1503 Vineyard Ave SE
108	Wade Ahnzo	1539 Brighton Way SE

	Name	Address
109	WADE ALONZO	1838 Brighton Way SE
110	PAUL MOORE	1532 Brighton Way SE
111	Tami Moore	1532 Brighton Way SE
112	Irene Rickard	4329 Braggs Dr SE
113	David B Merchant	1520 Brighton Way SE
114	Shelley Pilley	1520 Brighton Way SE

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
115	Krista L Brown / Krista Brown	Briggs Dr SE brown.kristalynn@gmail.com
116	[signature] / Chris D. Lovette II	Briggs Dr SE
117	MCross / Melissa Cross	Briggs Dr SE mfcswanson@gmail.com
118	[signature]	Briggs Dr SE poojitran@gmail.com
119	[signature]	Briggs Dr. Youstafa.i.ibrahim@outlook.com
120	Genevieve Baglio	4407 Briggs Dr
121	Woodie Logan	woodielogan@yahoo.com 4405 Briggs Dr SE
122	Maggie Logan	4405 Briggs Dr SE
123	Brenda Neely	4403 Brigg DR SE
124	Richard Humberg	4403 Briggs Dr SE.

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
125	Craig Adair Dale Craig Adair	deadair@comcast.net
126	Lynne Adair Lynne Adair	adairl@comcast.net
127	Wenjuan Zhao	wenjuan0715@gmail.com
128	Alex Ge	yuanlong79@gmail.com
129	Megan Kendall	meganKendall2000@gmail.com
130	Charles Kendall	charlesKendall2000@gmail.com
131	NICK LAWSON	nick_lawson93@yahoo.com
132	KRISTINA LAWSON	" "
133	Levi	Limahmhu@hotmail.com
134	Idan Beyer	1110 South St, SE Turnwater
135	Gary Dilbeck	"
		4160 Village Dr SE

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
136	Hugh Cotton / Hugh Cotton	1441 Harvest Ave SE
137	[illegible] Ernest Merritt	[illegible] Biggs Rd. SE
138	E'Heguse ELIZABETH LEGURE	4135 Maple St SE
139	Walter	1536 Bellerive way
140	Justin Elms	1540 Bellerive Way
141	Dianna Kaiser	1629 Bellerive Way SE
142	Adrienne Kuhn	1625 Bellerive Way SE
143	[illegible]	1605 Vineyard Ave SE
144	Zhan Zhao	1511 Vineyard Ave. SE.
145	Ben Solis	ben.solis@hotmail.com
146	Jeff James	JeffCJames.com
147	CARRIE JAMES	DAYLOC48C HOTMAIL.COM

	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
148	Shidong Zhang	1513 Brighton Way SE
149	[signature]	elishia.ski@live.com
150	[signature] Francis Stefanowski	1507 Brighton Way SE
151	[signature] Sandra Albrecht	1423 Brighton Way SE
152	[signature] MATT ALBRECHT	1423 Brighton Way SE
153	[signature] Kelly Aumen	1422 Brighton Way SE.
154	Annika Sandvold	1428 Brighton Way SE
155	[signature] Scott Zylka	1434 Brighton Way SE
156	[signature] Elizabeth Zylka	1434 Brighton Way SE

with the city staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second forum/workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

	Name	Address
157	[illegible]	4950 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 9850[illegible]
158	(Sharon) Weinberg	" " " " "
159	[illegible]	1007 Survey Trace SE Tum WA 98501
160	Erin Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Oly. WA 98501
161	Levi Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
162	Jonah Zeitlin	4424 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
163	Huckleberry Smith	4510 Village Dr Se Oly WA 98501

	Name	Address
164	~~Dennis~~/ Susan McDonald	4619 Village Ct SE Oly 98501
165	Dennis McDonald	4619 Village Ct SE Oly 98501
166	Jeffahny Magadey	4410 Village Dr SE Oly 98501
167	Andrew J Krawczyk	4500 village Dr SE, olympia WA 98501
168	Casey Gathman	4500 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
169	Catherine Goering	4480 Village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
170	Galen Smith	4510 village Dr. SE Olympia WA 98501
171	K. Flynn Kyle Flynn	4510 Village Dr. SE Olympia, WA 985
172	Dorothy Gathman	4580 Village Dr SE WA 98501

	Name	Address
173	Tim Baker	4611 Pheasant Chase SE Olympia 98501
174	Sarah White	4620 Village Cir SE Olympia 98501
175	Norah White	4620 Village Cir SE Olympia
176	Chris Mathwig	4630 Village Circle olympia
177	Tess Clapp	4621 Village Circle Olympia
178	Melyay Clapp	4621 Village Circle Olympia
179	David Dunlap Jr.	4611 Village Circle SE Olympia, WA 98501
180	David Dunlap III	4611 Village circle SE olympia wa, 98501
181	Asher Zeitlin	4424 Village drive SE

	Name	Address
182	Frances Davis	4615 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
183	Thom Davis	4615 Village Dr SE Olympia, WA 98501
184	Paul Flock	4470 Village Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
185	Sarah Jones	4302 Magnolia Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
186	TONYA KEHOE	4302 MAGNOLIA DR SE OLYMPIA WA 98501
187	Mall Farwell	4477 Harvard Ave SE Olympia WA 98501
188	Heather Coughlan	4250 Maple St SE Oly WA 98501
189	WYATT Palmer	4225 Briggs Dr SE Olympia WA 98501
190	Kristin Palmer	4225 Briggs Dr SE Olympia WA 98501

	Name	Address
191	Donald Stenhope	4225 Briggs Drive
192	Sara Hursley	4225 Briggs #163
193	Robert Seals	1519 Brighton Way
194	Emma Seals	1519 Brighton Way

understand these complex and highly significant changes and their purported justification.

It is therefore incumbent on the Planning Commission and City to strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule at least two public workshops with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes, ask questions and get answers, and propose alternative solutions. A second workshop will allow the parties to follow up on the prior discussions and address issues and possible solutions generated as a result of the first workshop. Only after those workshops should the Planning Commission and City decide whether to proceed with an ordinance amendment, and if so, then schedule new comment period and potential public hearing.

Signed below residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods:

* **1520 Palomino Dr SE, Olympia – Village Cooperative of South Sound**

198 Betty Bailey — # 305
Name Betty L. Bailey — Address: 1520 Palomino Dr SE

199 Charles Chester — # 109
Name Charles Chester — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

200 Richard B Sloan — # 209
Name Richard B Sloan — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

201 Laurie Smith — # 219
Name ~~Karen Krause~~ Laurie Smith — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

202 Karen L Krause — # 117
Name Karen L Krause — Address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

203 Lynn M. Thorn — # 311
NAME — address 1520 Palomino Dr SE

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
204	Gloria Strait	#204
205	John Hoover (John Hoover)	#210
206	Barbara Hatfield (Barbara Hatfield)	1520 Palomino Dr SE #316 Olympia WA 98501
207	Ivri Messinger (Ivri Messinger)	#315 1520 Palomino Dr SE 98501
208	[illegible] (Peg Chapuseu)	#116
209	Aileen E Gardner (Aileen Gardner)	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #118 98501
210	Toni D. Weaver (Toni Weaver)	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #222 9850
211	Chuck & Barb Soule (Chuck Soule Barb Soule)	1520 Palomino Dr SE #203 98501
212	Mary Ann "Dave Webster (Mary Ann + Dave Webster)	1520 Palomino Dr. S.E. #313 98501

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
213	Mary Martin Blair Name Mary Martin-Blair	# 322
214	Meredith S. Blundell Name Meredith S. Blundell	# 115
215	Joan Neff Name Joan Neff	# 3016
216	David A. Beech Name David A. Beech	#308
217	Thomas E. Ciapusci Name	#116 Address
218	TERESA ANN CIAPUSCI Name	#116 Address
219	Dawn Foreman Name Dawn Foreman	# 104 Address
220	Sally Salzberg Name Sally Salzberg	#212 Address
221	Janice Ramsdell Name	#317 Address
222	Sandra McKinney Name	#301 Address

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

223 Becky Brewer — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #106
Name / Becky Brewer — Address

224 Dave Timbrook — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #118
Name Dave Timbrook — Address

225 Gail Wood — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #314
Name — Address

226 Richard E. Lince — 1520 PALOMINO DR SE #309
Name Richard E Lince — Address

227 Mark Rumple — 1520 Palomino Dr. SE, Olympia #315
Name Mark Rumple — Address

228 Martha Shinners — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #207
Name Martha Shinners — Address

229 Jerry Locke — 1520 PALOMINO DR. SE #202
Name — Address

230 Carol Perry — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #323
Name — Address

231 Ann Schwerchter — 1520 Palomino Dr SE #120
Name — Address

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
232	Joan Halverstadt #121	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501
233	HARMON EATON	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501 #103
234	Mary Ellen McKain	#221 1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia 98501
235	DALE WENZELBURGER	#220 1520 PALOMINO DR SE OLYMPIA 98501
236	John Allen	1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly 98501 #112
237	Jane VanDuathon	1520 Palomino Dr. SE #215 Olympia, WA 98501
238	Beverly Hutnik	1520 Palomino Dr SE #216 Olympia WA 98501
239	Lynn Kinzie	[redacted] 1520 Palomino Dr. SE #218 Olympia, WA 98501
240	Ruth Aetzel	" #319

1520 Palomino Dr SE Olympia

	Name	Address
241	Bill + Joan Quant Bill Quant Joan Quant	1520 Palomino SE #122 Olympia WA 98501
242	Gail O'Grady Gail O'Grady	#304 "
243	LaDonna West LaDonna West	#110 1520 Palomino Dr. S.E. Olympia, Wa. 98501
244	Teresa Dorian	1520 Palomino Drive SE #108 Olympia, WA
245	THOMAS DROZCI Thomas Drozci	1520 PALOMINO DR SE #219 OLYMPIA, WA 98501
246	Frances/John Scott	1520 Palomino Dr SE 201, Oly
247	Janice Welker Janice Welker	" " " #214
248 249	Mike + Jerrie Armstrong Name Armstrong	1520 Palomino DR SE #307 Address Oly.
250	Douglas Ringenbach	1520 Palomino Dr. SE Olympia, WA 98501 #310
251	Barb Dorn Barb Dorn Doug Ringenbach	Address

252 Carol Woodward — Name
774 Calvary Ct SE Tumwater 98501 — Address

253 [signature] — Name NELSON R GOETZE
1520 PALOMINO # 302 — Address

254 Nancy Cordell — Name Nancy Cordell
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 223 — Address

255 Joan Quant — Name Joan Quant
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 122 — Address

256 Cynthia K. Toft — Name Cynthia Toft
1520 Palomino Dr. SE Unit #111
Olympia, WA 98501 — Address

257 Penelope Locke — Name
1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly # 202
98501 — Address

258 Susan DuPon — Name Susan Dupron
1520 Palomino Dr SE Oly
98501 Unit #312 — Address

259 Robert J Colella — Name Robert Colella
1520 Palomino DR SE #211
OLYMPIA, WA 98501 — Address

260 Kelly McLaughlin — Name Kelly McLaughlin
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 111
Olympia WA 98501 — Address

261 ~~285~~	Ben Fall	4460 Village Dr SE, Olym
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
262 ~~284~~	Larry Trout	4440 Orva Ct SE Olym
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
263 ~~285~~	Kris Norelius	4460 Village Dr SE, Olympia
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email
	Signature/Print Name	Address/email

Jackson Ewing

From: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 3:35 PM
To: Aaron Sauerhoff; Daniel Garcia; Gregory Quetin; Raphael Garcia; Tammy Adams; William Hannah; Zainab Nejati; Jackson Ewing; CityCouncil
Subject: Transmission of pdf of the Letter to PCmember, the City Council, Ewing
Attachments: 2.19.25 letter & signatures for Planning Commission, City Council, Jackson Ewing.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

On behalf of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods (the Briggs Community), I am attaching a letter signed by 263 community members over the last two weeks.

This letter reflects the great concern of the Briggs Community about the proposed code amendments that would reduce the commercial space in the Briggs Village. The developer has made clear he intends to use these code amendments to allow him to drastically reduce the size of the required Briggs Village grocery store to the size of a mini-mart.

To date the public has **not** had an opportunity to ask the staff and the developer questions about these complex proposed code amendments and what they would mean for Briggs Village and the promised real grocery store. The Planning Commission has not held any meetings/forums/workshops that would allow for such questions and interchange.

These letters request the Planning Commission to reset the comment deadline and hold at least two meetings where the public can ask the city staff *and* the developer questions about the amendments and the intended outcomes. Those meetings may result in the development of solutions that are a win-win for all interests.

Sincerely,

Betty Bailey

The Village Cooperative of South Sound

1520 Palomino Dr. SE #305

Olympia, WA 98501

PS: A paper copy of the attachment has been hand delivered to the reception desk of Olympia City Hall. Also please note that signatures 195 to 197 are located out of order directly after 108.

Betty Bailey
360-915-7935

Jackson Ewing

From: Nick Faller <nfaller89@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking concerns

Currently with the existing parking infrastructure it can be quite difficult for elderly or disabled people to access the entry of the YMCA. YMCA serves a great deal of elderly clients. Typically there is no parking on the entry side of the building available leaving the side street or street behind the YMCA the only option.

It should be noted that the grade along the side of the building are not ADA compliant and are greater than 2% which is state and national code. This distance is a rather far walk for elderly.

Further parking reductions will have severe impacts to the usability and access to the YMCA. The YMCA is an important community collector and incubator. In anything parking should increase.

Currently there is not enough parking for a building that could hold hundreds of occupants at a time. There is less than 50 parking spots available and those spots are shared with other neighboring buildings.

An urban assessment, including parking and traffic study should be conducted to to justify number of required spaces with future planning.

Best,
Nick Faller

Jackson Ewing

From: laurenmhovey@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:13 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Keep the Urban Village zoning

Keep the Urban Village zoning and do not alter the Briggs Village Master Plan!

Lauren Hovey

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Kris Norelius <krisnorelius@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: COMMENTS RE: 18.05 MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING URBAN VILLAGES

Dear Mr. Ewing, Planning Council Members and City Council Members

I live in Sten Village, a neighborhood approximately 4 blocks from the Briggs Village, which my husband and I see as an extension of our own neighborhood. We utilize the Briggs YMCA on a nearly daily basis, frequent the Fika coffee shop, and enjoy the Humble Cow ice cream and Briggs Taphouse. We go on our nightly walks through Briggs Village, and often marvel at how these new businesses are thriving. When we walk by we often see people we know from our Sten Village or other nearby neighborhoods like The Farm, Orvis Court and The Village Cooperative, enjoying these establishments. And most of the people have walked to enjoy these amenities. The scene emits a true sense of community.

I am writing to for two reasons: First, to ask that the Planning Commission's schedule for reviewing the proposed amendments to the 18.05 Municipal Code related to urban villages be adjusted in order to extend the timeline and provide more opportunity for input. To date, we have had no opportunity to ask the developer and the city staff questions about this complex process. The community needs more time and opportunity to understand the details of these amendments, ask questions to city staff and the applicant, and offer input. It is particularly important that the planning commission hear the wishes of Briggs Village and surrounding areas, regarding downsizing the commercial to allow reducing the size of a grocery store.

Second, I write to tell you we want the grocery store that the city promised when the community went along with the Briggs development over 20 years ago. It is evident to us it will flourish like the existing businesses in Briggs Village. We need a store much bigger than the mini-mart the applicant wants to amend the zoning code to make possible. The proposed Urban Village code amendments are extremely concerning. Decreasing the current required commercial space for the purpose of reducing grocery store footage from 30,000 sf to 2,500 sf and thereby allow the grocery parking and grocery store footprint to be converted into residential units is shocking, given the city's prior commitment to having a grocery store in the village. A real grocery store will thrive like the YMCA, Starbucks, Humble Cow and Briggs Taphouse. Thousands of people live within easy walking distance, and another thousand will be living in the homes and apartments planned to be built in Briggs Village. A REAL grocery store that actually has the range of foods to make a meal will be the go-to shopping location for us and much of our community. And bringing in more retail and services will only increase the utilization of the grocery store with many of the customers arriving on foot or bicycle!

Years ago, when Olympia shared the plan for an Urban Village, I felt a true sense of pride that our city was creating a walkable community where neighbors and friends can eat, shop and recreate. I knew the research showed that an Urban Village is a recipe for physical and mental wellness, a sense of belonging and social connection. The Briggs Urban Village has made strides to be that community. Please provide an opportunity for more input and do NOT move forward on the amendments to 18.05 as is. Doing so will squander the progress that has been made.

Sincerely,

Kris Norelius

Jackson Ewing

From: Denise Garoutte <dgaroutte@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:20 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning

I am writing to request that the current zoning requirements for Briggs Village remain the same.

I am a senior citizen who uses the Briggs Y and it is difficult to find close parking as it is without this change.
If this change requires parking further away I will no longer be able to use the Y.
Thank you for your consideration,
Denise Garoutte
Tumwater, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: carol@reachone.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village - Do Not Amend the Original Briggs Village Master Plan

I am writing to oppose the proposed amendments to the original Briggs Village Master Plan. Please do not decrease the required commercial space in Briggs Village, an urban village. I understand the goal is to increase residential density, which should not come at decreasing the urban village of Briggs. The balance for residential housing and all the amenities of the Briggs urban village were finalized, with input from various stakeholders. The amendments would take away the essence of what makes Briggs Village a pleasant, special space. My husband and I have looked to downsize and move to that area. If these changes occur, then we may not continue to see it as a preferred option.

Parking would be adversely affected by this amendment, which would make it even more difficult to get into the Y, which is an essential community resource. It is now quite nice as it is walker friendly, encouraging some of us elderly to get out there and move to stay healthy.

Please do not alter the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Welch, PhD
Felix D'Allesandro

Jackson Ewing

From: craig burley <craigburley1@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Public Comment on proposed Amendments to Urban Village and Briggs Village

Dear Olympia Planning Commissioners

We attended the January 27, 2025, Planning Commission meeting to listen to the proposed amendments to the city code for definitions of an urban village and changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. We understand that the Planning Commission is addressing the urban village requirements at this time and will focus our comments on those proposed changes.

After listening to the presentation from the developer and reviewing the documents we are concerned and opposed to the proposed changes as they would significantly alter the Briggs Village – the first and only urban village in Olympia. Specifically, We are opposed to the following:

Reducing the minimum amount of commercial space,

A change in the percentage of single-family homes withing the neighborhood from 50% to 15%,

To allow buildings facing the town square to be four stories instead of the maximum of three stories,

rooftop courtyards to count as open spaces, and

Elimination of the maximum housing density requirements.

These proposed changes seem to be designed to maximize profit for the developer and will have a negative and permanent impact on our neighborhood. Our family moved to the Briggs Village in 2010 based on the promises expressed in the Briggs Village Master Plan. To alter the intent of an urban village based on the request of a developer outside the country to maximize the density of housing and profit at the detriment of the families that live in the neighborhood is egregious.

Please don't pass these amendments. They will forever alter the intent of the Briggs Village and will fundamentally change the look and feel of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Craig and Margaret Burley

1544 Bellerive Way, SE

Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Alice H <ahara1618@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 5:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Regards to Parking Situation at Y Brigg Village

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to convey my concerns regarding the potential reduction in required parking spaces at Brigg Village.

In light of the significant residential development in the area, I firmly believe that the existing parking infrastructure is insufficient to meet the needs of residents and businesses. The scarcity of parking options has resulted in residents parking on both sides of the road, causing congestion and safety issues.

I strongly encourage the committee to reassess the proposed decrease and prioritize the creation of a safe and accessible community with adequate parking facilities. Thank you for considering my perspective.

Best regards,
Alice

Jackson Ewing

From: ejacob4 <ejacob4@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns about Briggs YMCA Parking

Hello,

I'm an instructor at both Plum and Briggs YMCA locations. I'm also a parent of a child who regularly utilizes the Y for kid zone, climbing wall, and swim lessons.

I'm regularly at the Y after school hours and on Saturdays. Parking is almost always full. As an employee I try and park over by the coffee shop or even by Briggs Taphouse anyway.

At times I have no other choice. Taking away current Y spots at Briggs will only clog up the residential streets and the small parking lot of the several businesses next to the Y. Please find a different way to support residential housing. Thank you.

Erin Jacobson

Jackson Ewing

From: Anna <ymcanna@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking issues

Please leave the plan intact, as originally planned.

I am opposed to the proposed change!

“Do today; what you want tomorrow to look like…”
Anna

Jackson Ewing

From: Kibbe <lindsey.kibbe@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:40 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns on YMCA parking

Hi,

I live in the neighborhood near Briggs neighborhood. In the summer I can walk to the YMCA but in thr winter it's not safe. Already there is not enough parking spots in the winter during busy YMCA times. Cutting more parking would make it difficult to access the community activities we do at the Y. I'm emailing you to keep in mind parking needs in the dark winter months.

Thank you,
Lindsey Kibbe

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen <bbhalcyon@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: YMCA, Briggs, Parking and potential changes

Parking is already at a premium at the YMCA! Do not do not do not allow changes to further impact the ability to find a parking place here by making changes to the existing agreement.

Karen Maurer 360-790-0566

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Crawford <nancrawf@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 6:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: proposed zoning amendments for Briggs Village Master Plan

Dear Jackson Ewing and Olympia Planning Commission,

I am concerned about the proposed zoning amendments in the Briggs Village Master Plan to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space. The original Urban Village zoning and Briggs Village Master Plan aimed to support a walkable community. The proposed zoning amendments will lead to fewer services in Briggs Village and definitely substantially increase the pressure on parking.
As a frequent, if not daily, user of the Briggs YMCA, I am already aware of the existing traffic and parking difficulties. The parking lot is often full, and it is difficult to find a nearby parking space.
I respectfully ask that you keep the current zoning requirements for the Briggs Village development in order to respect the balance between residential growth and community services.
Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
Nancy Crawford

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Holdgate <nholdgate@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning/parking

Please keep the current zoning in place. Parking is already a challenge.
Thank you,
Nancy Holdgate

Yahoo Mail - Email Simplified

Jackson Ewing

From: Marg We <marg.we52@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village development

I am a senior who uses the Briggs YMCA on a regular basis. Parking can be very challenging at the YMCA and in the surrounding area. I am an advocate for using public transportation, but the bus service to this area is not set up to be convenient for getting from where I live on the westside of Olympia to the Briggs YMCA. Any decrease in parking in the area will be detrimental to those who use the YMCA. Please consider this as you consider changes to the current zoning requirements.

Jackson Ewing

From: Mary Chapman <mmchap99@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:20 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs master plan

Good evening, Mr. Ewing,
My husband and I moved here from University Place last spring because we had heard that Olympia was developing smaller communities through the city. We live less than a mile from the Briggs area, and are members of the YMCA there. Parking is already difficult, and more building without more parking would not be helpful. I encourage you to fully develop the Briggs area with a grocer, as well as provide adequate parking for everyone.
Many thanks in advance—- Mary Miller Chapman

Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Kade Rucker <kader212@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs zoning changes

Hi,

I'm simply a concerned citizen writing to implore you to reconsider making changes to the original zoning plan for the Briggs Village development. My family actively attends the YMCA and a few of the local businesses on a regular basis. Parking is already difficult during afternoon/evening hours at the YMCA and if any changes are made that would further restrict parking availability it would become much less enjoyable for us to utilize the Briggs village community. Please take careful consideration with any plans to ensure that we all still have sufficient access to the amenities we enjoy (and pay for). Thank you.

Jackson Ewing

From: Carol Ridenhour <carolriden@centurylink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking

I am writing as concerned about availability of parking for Briggs YMCA. Currently at peak hours in evening, after work it is already difficult to find a spot. Taking my three grandkids to swim lessons and parking three blocks away one time at six pm unpleasant.

The YMCA is used by multiple people in community with the majority driving vehicles, not walking to facility. It would be a shame to change zoning resulting in less parking available. This would create problem of YMCA customers parking in apartment building lots which already have signage up regarding towing if not resident.

I am requesting zoning not be changed around YMCA as concerned this create inadequate parking. In fact it would be great if more parking slots were made available for the YMCA members.

Sincerely,
Carol Ridenhour

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Meradith Thayer <meradiththayer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Keep Briggs the Way It Is!

Hello,

I am a resident of the Briggs community and request that the proposed changes do not occur.

Briggs currently is a lovely community that would do so well with the promised grocery store and green spaces.

Adding more apartments to this area does not make sense, as all of the apartments are constantly leasing units and are not full. Stores & other restaurants are really what will bring more people to this area.

Thank you,

Meradith

Jackson Ewing

From: Tara Sarsfield <tara.sarsfield@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:25 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Parking

Hello,

I am very concerned to hear about the proposed changes to the zoning of Briggs Village. Our kids do activities at Briggs YMCA and parking is already extremely hard to find. Changes to zoning would have such a negative impact on the community and cause distress to adults and kids. Please keep current zoning requirements for the Briggs Village development.

Thank you,
Tara Sarsfield

Jackson Ewing

From: Jared Mason-Gere <jmasongere@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:37 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed Briggs village masterplan

Greetings- I'm writing with concerns about proposed changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. Olympia is already, in opinion, a very oddly laid out town with a lot of bifurcated and separated neighborhoods without good access to groceries, neighborhood bars, coffee shops, etc. It is largely very car dependent. It strikes me as very shortsighted to exacerbate that and reduce the opportunity to create more mixed use in locations that would support it. I also believe Olympia is a difficult place to navigate and a difficult place to park. It also has a shortage of community gathering spaces, fitness centers, etc, so I have a lot of concern about decisions that could reduce access to those thriving community and fitness centers that do exist. I hope you will work hard to support existing facilities and encourage expansion of more mixed use, walkable neighborhoods with more easily accessible "third places" and start over on the revisions to the Briggs Village plan.

Thank you

Jared Mason-Gere
1918 Mark St., Olympia

Jackson Ewing

From: gailcg@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Planning for the Briggs complex

I am a long time resident of Olympia and a member of the Briggs YMCA. I am not very familiar with the planning process or issues related to the Briggs community, but I do know that the YMCA is a tremendous community asset for community members throughout the region. Reducing parking near the Y will not only cause congestion and potential accidents, but also it will be a disincentive for people to stay healthy and active. I urge you to consider these issues before making changes to the plan.

Gail Gosney Wrede

"There can be no daily democracy without daily citizenship."

February 16, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Olympia Planning Commission
Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Mr. Quetin and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as officers of the Ward Lake Neighborhood Association (WLNA) regarding the amendments to the Briggs Urban Village Ordinance (OMC 18.05) proposed by the developer Gordie Gill.

It is our understanding that these amendments would reduce requirements for a grocery store and other commercial space, increase residential density, and reduce open space.

We believe that these changes are contrary to the initial vision of the "village" and would adversely affect current Briggs residents. We are also concerned that they would worsen congestion in the area. And, finally, we are concerned about potential adverse impacts on Ward Lake.

We ask that the Planning Commission and City strike the February 20, 2025 comment deadline and schedule additional public forums with the City staff, developer, and his architect so the community has the opportunity to learn more about the proposed changes and their potential impacts.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Field, WLNA President,
2000 42nd Ave SE, Olympia 98501

Jane Field

Sandy Nelson Lane, WLNA Treasurer
4125 Ward Lake Court SE, Olympia 98501

Sandy Nelson

John Bauer, WLNA Secretary
4115 Ward Lake Court SE, Olympia 98501

John Bauer

Jackson Ewing

From: Charlene Cruz <charlenebcruz@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 9:00 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Charlene Cruz
Subject: Reconsider Briggs Village

Hello Mr. Ewing,

I am reaching out in OPPOSED to the newly proposed zoning amendments that will affect Briggs Village. When my family and I moved to our single family home almost eight years ago, we were under the impression that Briggs Village will be of mixed use, with both business and residential "shared space." We have seen the rapid growth in our area with several town homes, apartments, and the recently added Olympia Pediatric Dentistry building anchoring Briggs Tapp House and Humble Cow Creamer being built. It was a welcome change and a good balance. But, with the newly proposed zoning of adding "dense" housing ie more apartments in such a small confined space, we feel that it will create heavy traffic, parking issues, and over crowding. This new proposal is misaligned and disproportionate to the original plan of an "urban village." Briggs Village has fostered a community where neighbors treat each other as family and children can walk and play freely on the streets knowing it is safe. Briggs Village is OUR HOME and this is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Charlene and Raul Cruz

Jackson Ewing

From: Sara Baker <saratinabaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 9:14 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello!

My name is Sara, I am an active daily user of the Briggs YMCA location. I am writing to say I would that I feel strongly the Briggs Village zoning should not be changed. The Briggs YMCA was the first place I felt welcome as a new parent and new resident of Olympia after we moved here in 2024. It is one of the only gyms with its vast services that also has on site childcare. Due to how many classes, activities, and the strength of its weight and cardio rooms, the shared parking areas of the Y as well as the Briggs Taphouse area are usually full, especially at peak hours or hours I am able to go with my daughter.

As it is already difficult to park there due to the demand, I feel strongly that it should not be made to be more difficult by changing the zoning of the Briggs Village area. The Briggs Y is impactful in the community. It supports the physical and mental health of all those who frequent it and for me personally, it has created a huge sense of home and community. For there to be an additional barrier to being able to go there each day by making an already tenuous parking situation worse, would be detrimental. Please consider keeping the zoning as it stands and not making any changes that would negatively impact the community.

Thank you for your time. I hope you will consider my perspective!

Sara

Jackson Ewing

From: kelly Allsup <allsupkl22@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 10:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking near Briggs village

is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

As a regular visitor to the ymca, dentist, ice cream shop. If the number of available retail parking spots are reduced it will impact the ability to utilize and support the business in the area

Kelly

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Jill T <jilllynn1984ig@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 10:18 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed changes to the Briggs Village development

To whom it may concern,

I am writing today to voice my concerns about the proposed changes to the Briggs Village development. The proposed changes would greatly impact my mental and physical health. I attend the YMCA as a 40 year old disabled female. I heavily rely on the community programs for social engagement and mental and physical well-being. This YMCA is ten minutes away from me and such a blessing to have for the community.

The current parking lot for the YMCA is already small and can be tricky to find a place to park. Maple lane leading to the YMCA is already narrow and hard to navigate with parking on both sides of the street. There is also no stop sign at Orchard and Maple, and there is usually a car parked right at the corner. If the proposed changes of more residential communities and a grocery store happened I do not see how I would be able to access the YMCA as a driver. At the very least, widen the entirety of Maple lane and adding a stop sign at Orchard and Maple should be considered.

Please include these concerns in the upcoming hearing and notes for the proposed changes.

Thank you.

Jill Taylor

Jackson Ewing

From: Jill T <jilllynn1984ig@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 6:48 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village

I am requesting that the current zoning requirements stay in place for Briggs Village. If not, it will be detrimental for me to access the ymca, which play a vital role in my daily well being.

Jill Taylor

Jackson Ewing

From: PHIL SANDIFER <pmsandifer@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 8:12 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Hi Mr Ewing,
My name is Phil Sandifer and I recently bought Townhouse in Briggs Village November 2023. I wanted to voice my concern with some of the proposed changes for the future development. I invested in my property on the assumption there would be a bigger footprint of commercial and retail space being development and single family homes. I am against the proposal to add mostly 4 story apartment buildings. I certainly don't agree with counting rooftop spaces as the percentage of open public space. Im hoping further opportunities for all the Briggs Village residents to voice their concerns.

Phil Sandifer
1405 Harvest Dr Se
Olympia Wa 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Betty Bailey; Dave Merchant; Andrew Peterson; Kris Norelius; Aaron Sauerhoff; Daniel Garcia; Gregory Quetin; Raphael Garcia; Tammy Adams; William Hannah
Subject: Please reschedule the Feb 24 Hearing—notice confusion
Attachments: 23-0313 Notice of hearing 2-24-2025.pdf

Jackson, after I got an email last night from the YMCA informing us that the OMC amendments hearing is scheduled for this coming Monday, February 24, 2025 at 6:30, I went back and reread the email notice you broadcast on Friday, February 14 (which is below).

I confirmed that your email notice in fact states that the hearing is scheduled for January 27, 2025. At the time I got your email on February 14, I thought you had accidentally resent your old notice, so I ignored your email. But last night when I scrolled down past your email text, I noticed you had attached a formal Notice at the bottom of the email.

Your email of February 14 did not refer to an actual notice that is attached below to your email, so I had not scrolled down to find one.

Under the circumstances, due to this confusion, please reschedule the hearing from February 24 to the next Planning Commission meeting in early March. Please discuss this immediately with the Planning Commission members and let us know the decision so we can plan accordingly. Rescheduling will benefit the process by allowing the Commission Member more time to digest the comments.

If you do reschedule, please also provide notice that the comment period is extended to 5:00 pm on the day of the hearing, as you have done for hearing on Feb. 24.

Thank you, Brian

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
> **Date:** February 14, 2025 at 10:24:05 AM PST
> **Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages**
>
> Good morning,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code

amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:29 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Jackson,
I misread your email below that mistakenly announced the upcoming hearing as January 27th, and marked it in my calendar for February 27th. Now I learn that the hearing is set for February 24th. Given the confusion of dates, what should be done?

Betty Bailey
360-915-7935

On Fri, Feb 14, 2025 at 10:24 AM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Good morning,
>
> You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.
>
> A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.
>
> Best regards,
>
> **Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner**
>
> City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
>
> P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

Jackson Ewing

From: John Montrose <jumontra@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning change

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I'm contacting you because I believe the existing zoning law should remain as is. Allowing for more apartments in Briggs Village will make an already tight parking situation worse. Thanks for your consideration.

John Montrose

Jackson Ewing

From: larry.r.cowan@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed amendments Briggs Village

I am opposed to the proposed amendments that aim to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, including Briggs Village. This change will strain our existing parking infrastructure, which is already under pressure, and impact your daily access to the Y and surrounding businesses.

Please vote no!

Thank you,

Larry Cowan

Jackson Ewing

From: Linda Malanchuk-Finnan <lryh@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:11 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking and changes in requirements

I am opposed to changing parking requirements to reduce those available to business and facilities of public need. I am elderly retired and have been using Briggs to avail myself of the Silver Sneakers and other insurance/healthcare options which cover the cost of gym use. I have fallen twice in the past and am using various exercises and balance training to avoid another. My husband and I drive to Briggs from Castlewood near McKinney school. All my health care providers tell us to exercise. Well we are trying to do that but sometimes the parling lot at Briggs is already very full. We have tried different times of the day. Briggs is very highly used a lot of the time. If there are even fewer parking spaces, we will find it even MORE difficult to get a spot and that will make it harder for us to exercise there with the machines. Don't make a new policy on parking because it sounds good to housing enthusiasts but hurts seniors in a real way.

Linda Malanchuk-Finnan
3122 2^{8t}hAve SE
Olympia, WA 98501
360-357-7272
lryh@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Diane Rosado <dianegetchman@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village - proposed amendments

I am responding to the notice of a proposed amendment to the city code that would reduce the requirements for commercial space.

It's my understanding that the developer of Briggs Village claims there isn't real demand for retail/grocery in Briggs. My experience has been the complete opposite of this claim. The current businesses that are in this space are overflowing with customers of which we are ourselves. The many people who frequent these local businesses are begging for additional local commercial business. We have heard there is high interest for another brew house and a store, to include Spuds Produce.

Using this valuable commercial space for more apartments will not enhance the area, only the developers pocketbook. As a 15 year resident, I would ask that the original agreement for this space is honored and respected. The demand is there.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Respectfully,
Diane Getchman Rosado

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Siminski <777skypilot@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: the YMACA and Brigg master plan

I am a retired CPA. At one point was Briggs accountant when planning the development, and participated in their intentions. And was a contributing founder of the Briggs YMCA. I go way back.

The Y was an early adopter of the Briggs hoped for walking community, with local stores, neighborhood grocery within walking distance, with exercise within walking distance. It was and is a hallmark of more density, affordable housing, and close to work, with bus service. It remains a very valid objective for the future. For the residents and the community at large. It should remain as zoned, remain as intended.

In fact you should allow for entrance from Henderson, (no exit?) to make less congestion within the development and less car traffic, as it was originally planned.

Jackson Ewing

From: Ryan Krapp <crappie77@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Greetings Mr. Ewing,
I know there are and have been many pressures and challenges in the development of Briggs Village. As a frequent (2x weekly) visitor to the YMCA, and at least 1x month to Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow (as well as the Olympia Pediatric Dentist) I implore you to not stray too far from the original vision. It is a great location for us residents within the 2-mi radius to go and enjoy. As things may need to change a bit, please extensively consider the challenges of traffic and parking. Shared spaces near the existing businesses are already needed.

Has there been consideration of something like the Rockwood Market Hall or
I understand this is probably not as profitable as housing would be to a developer, but would be a great addition to the City of Olympia!!

Thanks for your time and your service to Olympia!

Ryan Krapp
2847 45th Loop SE, Olympia, WA 98501
701-471-8788

Jackson Ewing

From: Malynda Murphy <malynda3m@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: P}l to} zoning

Good after noon, Mr. Ewing,

I am writing my express my concern with the parking ordeal at the Briggs YMCA. I have a 4 year old daughter, it is often a challenge to get her to and from the overly packed as it is parking lot with out fear of an accident happening.

I'd really miss out on the development of my daughter's physical activities as well as my own if parking was not available.

Thank you for your time and consideration up front.

Respectfully,

Malynda Murphy

Best,

Malynda Murphy

February 20, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati
Olympia Planning Commission

Dear Commission Members:

My name is Andrew Peterson and my address is 1408 Harvest Avenue SE, in Briggs Village, Olympia, Washington and have a PhD. in Criminology, Law & Society from the University of California, Irvine. I spent five years doing quantitative and qualitative research and data analysis for the federal courts in Washington D.C. I moved to Olympia in 2014 to work for the Washington State Center for Court Research and have been performing, planning, and supervising qualitative and quantitative research projects across the state for the past ten years. I have not conducted a market study, like the one provided to the Planning Commission by the developer, but I am well versed in qualitative and quantitative social science research methods. My research on effects of changes to criminal sentencing practices has been cited by the U.S. Congress and my research on victim compensation has been cited multiple times by the U.S. Supreme Court.
I have reviewed the market study provided to the City of Olympia to support Mr. Gill's request for a zoning change. The market study purports to indicate that a grocery store in Briggs Village would struggle to be viable, but I believe there are analytical and methodological errors that, when corrected, may support the establishment of, at least, a moderate-sized grocery story – as the community

already supports the commercial establishments already established. Moreover, this study has a large accountability issue that puts the entire findings into question.

For the sake of full transparency, I am comfortable with proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 that would increase the number of residential units in Briggs Village. I am ambivalent on the ratio of single-family to multi-family units, but, after reading Jim Lazar's letter to the Planning Commission, I believe that we need to encourage affordable, smaller units, as opposed to more market-rate apartments. I am ambivalent on the story limit of commercial/mixed use buildings in village cores. I am against allowing rooftop courtyards to be counted towards open space requirements, as these spaces do not appear to be open to all residents. I am also against the proposed reduction to commercial space requirements, although, for the remainder of this letter, I am focusing on an objective, professional analysis of the market study provided by the developer.

Analytical and Methodological Errors

Decisions made in the study that I will not address.

As I mentioned above, I have substantial experience in complex social science studies using a mix of quantitative and qualitative data, as this study does. However, I have never performed a market analysis to support the feasibility of a commercial/retail property. Therefore, I do not have the experiential basis to contradict the study author's decision-making around several of the choices made in this study. For example, I cannot tell you if the Briggs Village Trade Area (BTVA) is reasonably calculated. Nor can I tell you if the author should have used current BVTA data, instead of data based on the developer's proposed amendments to OMC 18.05. Likewise, I am also assuming the local market conditions, retail real estate, and grocers and food-related retail data cited in the study (pp. 3-17) are

accurate. Although, I would note that they appear to be using Euclidean distances when describing distances to other stores, rather than the actual road miles between the Briggs Village Community and other existing retail.

Retail gap analysis from Exhibit 12 (p. 20)

The Cleveland Avenue Safeway generates almost all of the grocery sales in the BVTA, and the gap analysis appears to consider all of Safeway's revenue to come from the BVTA.[1] The Tumwater Safeway, however, is on the very edge of the five-minute BVTA and a substantial amount of the Safeway revenue must come from residents in the adjacent South Capitol and Tumwater Hill neighborhoods, both of which are outside the trade area. Conversely, the very southern and eastern areas of the BVTA are much more proximate to non-BVTA grocery stores. One might be tempted to call the transference a "wash". However, this may be the single most important analysis in the study and due diligence should have been done to quantify any differences in affected population and expenditure estimates. Given the other quantity and quality of other data referenced in the study, it seems the author(s) would have been able to identify areas of the BVTA that had other grocery stores more proximate to their locations, look at grocery spending in those other stores and extrapolate the amounts, as well as spending at the Cleveland Safeway from non-BVTA residents.

Non-transference assumption

In addition to the population transference, the market study supposes that none of the money spent at current grocery stores in the BTVA would be transferred to a new grocery store built in Briggs Village. It also ignores the likelihood that

[1] No indication occurs in the Market Study that sales for the Safeway were adjusted downward to account for sales to persons in the South Capitol neighborhood.

individuals visiting the neighborhood for existing commercial (the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, Fit Life Studio, Jaymes Paige Hair Studio, iLash and Esthetics, Fika Café, or Olympia Pediatric Dentistry) or recreational purposes (i.e., Kettleview Park and the Briggs YMCA) would stay and grocery shop here, as well. That seems like an obviously false supposition, and I believe any author that can access the data they claim to have accessed for this study could also access economic activity multiplier data for the existing commercial and recreational options within the Briggs Village development. It seems obvious this could have a substantial impact on consumer expenditure in the BVTA.

Possible methodological error in the discussion of Exhibit 13 (p. 22)

In the second paragraph below Exhibit 13, the author notes that the Briggs Village trade area has a larger population than the Gig Harbor trade area – which supports a Harbor Greens store listed at approximately 11,000 square feet.[2]. The author then diminishes the finding by noting the relative trade areas' average household income.[3] However, this metric is largely irrelevant in comparison to the consumer expenditure figure, which goes unmentioned. I cannot understand how household income or per capita spending are relevant to the analysis, when total consumer expenditure is the most significant metric. If the BVTA has a greater consumer expenditure than a location with an 11,000 square foot grocery store that the author considers analogous, why would the author conclude that the BVTA could only, "…theoretically, support a 9,200 square foot specialty grocery store (p. 20)".

[2] Tacoma News Tribune (2017). Local Grocer Harbor Greens holding its own despite being surrounded by big names. https://www.thenewstribune.com/news/business/article177198906.html

[3] The author(s) also make a claim that the Gig Harbor location "enjoys seasonal incremental lifts in sales due to tourism and its convenient throughfare location (p. 22)". However, this statement is not substantiated by any data or other evidence.

The "Analog (sic) Trade Area Analysis" ignores higher numbers of competing grocery retail

As noted above, the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery store within the BTVA. However, each of the three analogue stores that the author uses have significantly more competing stores.

Harbor Greens, Bridgeport Way, University Place (10,300 sf). Google maps indicates 4 major stores around this store: Fred Meyer at 19th and Mildred (1.1 miles) Whole Foods on Bridgeport (0.7 miles), Trader Joe's (1.0 miles) Safeway on Bridgeport (1.2 miles). Although the population around this Harbor Greens is approximately 2.5 times the BVTA, there are 4 times as many competing grocery stores and the two areas have a similar per capita consumer expenditure for food at home.

Harbor Greens (11,000 sf), Gig Harbor. Google maps indicate the there are three competing grocery stores around this store: Fred Meyer (0.2 miles); Metropolitan Market (0.2 miles), and Safeway (0.5 miles). Further, as discussed above, the BVTA has approximately 20% consumer expenditure for food at home (20.8%).

Trade Joe's, Spokane (13,400 sf). Trader Joe's has two stores in Spokane, but the study fails to identify which one is evaluated in the market study. Based on Google Maps images, the Trader Joe's Lincoln Heights location appears to be more similar to the Briggs Village Master Plan (various types of housing and a centralized mix of commercial/retail). This store has three competitive grocery stores within a short distance: Rosauers (0.4 miles), Natural Grocers (0.5 miles), and Safeway (0.6 miles). The Spokane location does have 2.1 times the population of the BVTA, but has 3 times the number of competitive grocery retail and a smaller per capita consumer expenditure on food at home (83.3%).

Given the additional competition of the analogous stores, it seems that the BVTA, theoretically, could support a substantially larger store than the market study suggests.

The single, anonymous real estate broker

The market study states that a single, licensed real estate broker was contacted (p. 17), but does not identify the person, their qualifications, or their potential biases. Anonymity prevents readers from assessing the broker's knowledge of the market, credibility, or even contacting them to confirm information. Again, anonymity falls below any professional standard for reliable, non-journalistic information. I note that, contrary to the reference to "brokers" in the "Key Findings," the text indicates only one broker was consulted.

There is no expectation that one broker represents the consensus or even a majority of opinions for commercial brokers with knowledge of the area. In addition, the interviewee indicated that, "To the extent that the site could serve and support any food and beverage-related retail…a smaller but established restaurant may be feasible." This point is confusing as the market study claims to have been completed on November 27, 2023, but the Briggs Taphouse and Humble Cow opened in early 2022 and have done brisk business since then. This leads me to believe that either the real estate broker was not familiar with the Briggs Village area, or they were interviewed prior to February 2022 – making this stale information.

The anonymous "stakeholders"

The study mentions a "discussion with stakeholders" (p. 18), but, once again, provides no information on their identity, knowledge, or relevance to this analysis.

There is one-sentence about this discussion and it only includes their subjective conclusions without supporting data. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the commenters. Again, the use of anonymous stakeholders falls below any professional standard for reliable information. Moreover, their unsubstantiated conclusion is clearly contradicted by the thriving businesses of Starbucks, the Briggs Taphouse, Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, Humble Cow, and Fit Life. Further, the comment ignores the considerable appeal that comes from Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for all of Thurston County.

Author Anonymity

The anonymous, market study author(s)

At no place in the study is the person or persons who authored the study identified or their qualifications stated.[4] Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the author(s) to answer questions, correct errors, and supply missing data. Anonymity of the author falls below any professional standard for reliable analysis. In my 16 years of public sector research, I have never seen an anonymous study used to support a proposal.

Conclusion

Given the unusual nature of this study, I see the planning commission as having two options. You assume that the basic data collection regarding the BVTA was

[4] The only clues to its authorship are two references on pages 17 and 18 to the acronym CAI, "CAI interviewed…" and "CAI aggregated…". A Google search of this acronym found that CAI may represent the Community Associations Institute, a Virginia-based, international think tank and lobbyist group, which does not advertise or publicize market studies on their website.

correct, and the author(s) erred on their gap and analogue trade area analyses in a way that contradicts their conclusions, or you discount the whole study.

I would respect either decision from the Planning Commission and would be glad to discuss the above points at greater length, if Commission members or staff have any questions.

Sincerely,
Andrew Peterson, PhD.

Jackson Ewing

From: NAOMI HYLTON <nhylton52@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village parking

Mr. Ewing,

Please do not alter the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan. Over the years, parking at the "Y" has become an increasing challenge and the thought of it becoming more congested is difficult to comprehend.

Again, please do not alter the existing plan.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Naomi Hylton

Jackson Ewing

From: tjburns7@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Jan Black
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Briggs Urban Village

To Whom it may Concern:

My name is Tom Burns and I have lived in Sten Village (several blocks from the Briggs Property) for the better half of fifty years. When the Briggs Urban Village was proposed over 25 years ago the planned development was to create mixed park space, residential and commercial services, including a Market where folks could go to get fresh food. The idea was to develop a sustainable community where folks could live and work within the Village and have access to a bus line to commute to work limiting car traffic and congestion. The idea was a "walkable community".

Having been a member of the Briggs YMCA since it opened close to twenty years ago, I have found an increase in traffic within the network of streets within the Village as well as limited parking for Folks at the YMCA and adjacent businesses. The proposed amendment to the Village will drastically alter the intent of the original plan by increasing vehicle traffic, increase pressure on current parking and decrease access to the current facilities that now exist. In summary, the proposed amendment will simply be an Urban Sprawl compromising the quality of life that we as residents envisioned in the original plan for the Briggs Village and our nearby community.

I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the commercial space within the Village.

Sincerely,

Tom Burns

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Ward, Psy.D. <drcaseyward@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: CORRECTION NOTICE; RE: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Dear Planning Commission c/o Jackson Ewing

I am requesting that the planning commission continue to honor the original Briggs Village commitment to build a grocery store in our community.

My wife and I bought a home 15 years ago in Briggs Village because we wanted to be part of a village, with a grocery store, farmer's market, gathering space, and walkable opportunities to gather, shop, and connect with neighbors.

I cannot even count how many times we talk about a grocery store in our own home, not to mention with neighbors. It's almost daily. We are still holding out hope. It is a significant priority for many of us and one of the main reasons we all bought homes in this community.

We want to walk over and buy groceries for dinners, or grab a coffee, or meet friends on a bench outside the store after a bike ride in our neighborhood.

15 years after purchasing a home in Briggs Village, we now own our home. (Yay!!!) We are nearing retirement and the appeal of a walkable grocery store is on the top of our list of needs/wants.

Please honor the initial city code to build a grocery store in Briggs Village. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Casey Ward, Psy.D. | Washington State Licensed Psychologist
Phone: 360-970-5027
Fax: 360-991-0304
telehealthservices@caseywardpsyd.com

This electronic message transmission, including any attachments, contains information from, Casey Ward, Psy.D., which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by a "reply to sender only" message and destroy all electronic and hard copies of the communication, including attachments.

On Thu, Feb 20, 2025 at 1:47 PM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Good afternoon,

A mistake was made when routing the public notice via email. The body of the email sent 2/14/2025 referenced a planning commission hearing on 1/27/2025 is **INCORRECT**.

The Planning Commission public hearing will be held on 2/24/2025 at 6:30pm

The attached notice provides details on how to register and review applicable staff reports and attachments.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Jackson Ewing
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:24 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Good morning,

You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Bobby Kendall <charleskendall2000@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:56 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

I oppose amending any codes or changes to the master the plan regarding Briggs village retail space. The master plan has been in place for many years and was available when the current owner purchased the land. Many other areas have been developed and are thriving over the course of the last decade. The current owner's inability to develop the land is not the community's issue. If he is unable to develop the land to requirements laid out by the city, then he should consider selling the land as these requirements were readily available at time of purchase.

The density of Briggs community has grown substantially and is capable of supporting a grocery store, businesses and restaurants. Current business occupants are doing well. To change the codes to appease a developer unwilling or incapable of meeting current requirements would be disingenuous to the current residents of the community who purchased homes based on the master plan.

Charles and Megan Kendall (Brigg Residents)
4109 Seneca St. Se
Olympia Wa 98501

From: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:23 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Good morning,

You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

Jackson Ewing

From: Dave Auvinen <daveauvinen@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning

Mr. Ewing:

We purchased our home in Briggs Village in 2007. One of the most significant factors in our decision to move there was the zoning that led to the creation of a master plan urban village type community. To date, this has not fully materialized to the extent of the original plan as we were told.

Despite falling short of that plan so far, we have been happy with our neighborhood. I believe that it would be a tremendous mistake to alter the original zoning requirements to allow a disproportionate amount of residential to commercial development and would not comply with the type of community that the residents of Briggs Village invested in.

I'm afraid that the proposed changes would result in the loss of the healthy, walkable community in which we desire to reside.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Auvinen

Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Ellen Caywood <rmceoc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns with modification of Briggs Village Parking

I want to express my concern with the proposed modification of the Briggs Village Parking plan to reduce the amount of available parking.

I have attended the YMCA for 25 years and there has been an increasing amount of frustration over lack of parking. The lot is often full by early morning and people are parking along the streets.. The way the parking has been laid out currently is pretty limited. To have increased residential and commercial properties developed without adequate parking is only going to intensify the issue.

While having walkable neighborhoods is a noble goal, the reality is many Olympia Area residents do not work in the area near their homes and with limited access to good public transportation most families end up with 2 vehicles. Parking on the street near the apartments and condominiums is already full.

I have known several YMCA members who have given up finding a parking spot and end up just going home. That means they have lost out on their necessary exercise and socialization provided by theYMCA. Some members drive a great distance. Some come fromYelm, Tenino, Dupont and further out Thurston County locations. There is no bus service or walking options for many members.

I feel the Briggs Village Plan was too limited to start with and to think about changing and reducing parking options will be detrimental not only to the YMCA and future businesses.

Please reconsider any changes that would reduce parking options.

Ellen Caywood
3512 48th CT SE
Olympia WA 98501
rmceoc@gmail.com.

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Groenewal <tomgroenewal1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs

Please do not change the parking zoning for Briggs Village. it is already difficult to park for the YMCA. Plus, it would make it more difficult to park when going to Humble Cow ice cream.

Thank you, Tom Groenewal

Jackson Ewing

From: Jason Rolfe <jleerolfe@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Community zoning amendments

Dear Jackson Ewing,

I am writing to express my concern about proposed amendments that would affect the balance of residential and commercial space in urban villages, and specifically Briggs Village, which is important to my family as members of the YMCA there.

Given the strains to parking infrastructure already experienced there, I hope the Olympia planning commission will prioritize maintaining a walkable neighborhood and not alter the Briggs Village Master Plan.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Jason Rolfe
Briggs YMCA Member, along with my wife and 7 year old son.

Jackson Ewing

From: Charlene Didier-Colby <charlenedidiercolby@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: parking at Briggs Y

Hello - I am a member of the Briggs Y and have heard that there is rezoning being considered for Briggs Village that will impact the already lousy parking situation at the Y. I already often have had to walk a couple blocks after parking my car on the street. I am 75 years old and in good health but this really gets old especially on a rainy day. Please reconsider.
Thanks
Charlene Didier-Colby
360-789-4966
5037 Oakmont Place SE
Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Nova Hobbs <novahasemail@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Parking at Briggs Village

Hello,

I'm reaching out to advocate for the original Briggs Village Master Plan. I live less than 5 minutes from briggs village, and regularly use the South Sound YMCA location there. It is already difficult to park when going to the gym. Navigating the parking lot, going in and out, regularly adds 10 or so minutes to my otherwise 5 minute drive. As I drive past the Briggs Villages townhomes regularly, I can confidently say I've NEVER seen all of the street parking full. I regularly find the YMCA parking lot overflowing.

Please, leave the plan as is. We need more business parking, and to keep the neighborhood as walkable as possible.

Thank you for your time,

Nova Hobbs

Jackson Ewing

From: Stephen Gear <stevegear@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:33 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking concerns.

Hello
I am a long time member of the Briggs YMCA in Lacey. I play sports and exercise at this YMCA branch 3 to 4 times every week. I am in my late 60's and the exercise helps with my physical and mental well being. Parking is often congested and I often have to wait until someone departs before I can secure a parking spot. It has recently come to my attention that the adjacent Brigg's village is considering an amendment to increase the number of proposed residential units. The original master plan was designed to accommodate all of the community needs including the YMCA. My concern is related to the already strained parking situation where Y members either have to wait to park and often are forced to park outside of the Y allocated parking in the adjacent streets. I ask that you would record this concern and add it to any other communications you receive that voice similar concerns as mine. Please reject this proposed amendment and maintain the original Briggs village plan.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gear

5744 Red Alder Dr NE
Olympia, WA 98516

Tel 360 561 1089.

Jackson Ewing

From: Jordan Bell <bellja6@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 7:24 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village crowding

hey there.

I am a longtime member at the Briggs Y, and began teaching group classes there years ago. I am also a bicyclist.

I vote NO on additional residential development, as there are already TOO MANY PEOPLE in this area, and they drive WAY TOO FAST.

driving/biking to the Y, as well as parking there, is already complicated by overpopulation & congestion. let's not make it worse.

I request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

cheers,
Jordan

Sent from Samsung Galaxy smartphone.
Get Outlook for Android

Jackson Ewing

From: Carol Tomer <carol.tomer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: carol tomer
Subject: Great concern about impact on parking at the Y

I am writing to express my great concern about any changes in city plans that will impact the available parking at the Y in Briggs Village. Whereas I think the current vision for urban villages needs to be maintained, the most immediate potential impact I'm writing about is the impact on the Y: the available parking.

There have been repeated issues with insufficient parking at the Y. I have experienced this, and I have friends who have experienced this.
In addition, as lead pastor of The Lutheran Church of The Good Shepherd down the street from the Y, I am very aware of the importance of the Y in the community and for the healthy lives of many people.

I strongly encourage you and all of us to make choices to increase the livability of our community, in support of the wholeness of the lives of all citizens.

With gratitude,
Pastor Carol Tomer

Jackson Ewing

From: bruce mcdonald <mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; cronkk@ssymca.net
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan

Hello Jackson Ewing,

We are writing to you about our concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the proposed Briggs Village Master Plan.
It is our understanding that the proposed amendments will increase residential development and reduce planned commercial space and subsequent parking.

We would like to know if there has been data and community involvement that has driven proposed amendments. The background data to help make a decision based on the value and need of an amendment for additional residential development over commercial development would be information such as

1) the existing occupancy rate of the two high density developments at the intersection of Henderson and Yelm Hwy. We are a casual observer, yet it is very apparent that both of these complexes are not to full capacity.

2) an existing travel and parking study of the surrounding commercial businesses. Is there currently adequate parking during busy hours. I can assure that the YMCA currently does not have enough parking during many hours of the day, not just peak use hours.

3) The current existing need for a small commercial grocery store, again a study of the current area residents and how far they have to travel to find food. Will the amendment increase the people density without increasing the ability to live in the area. Are you building a larger food desert for the existing community.

4) Who will benefit from this amendment ?and how ?

5) It is understood that there is a nationwide residential shortage but a few more high-end homes replacing essential services like a grocery store, or pharmacy detracts rather than benefits the existing community.

6) Is this a proposed SEPA Amendment? If so, would it change the prior determination and require mitigation for the proposed amendment? Would the proposal be reviewed again and the public comment period be reopened?

Please share any information with us regarding our questions and add us to communication list on this issue.

We live within 2 miles of the Briggs YMCA and utilize the facility several times a week. We have enjoyed riding our bikes to the businesses of ice cream, and pizza.

Please deny this amendment as it is currently proposed and get more information about what the Briggs Village Area needs to be a thriving community.

Sincerely

Mary and Bruce McDonald
mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Tonya Kehoe <tonyakehoeart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 12:00 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello, I am writing today to leave a comment about something that is really important to me and my family and many of my fellow neighbors here in Briggs Village community.
When we bought our home here last summer, we were told and understood in our paperwork that the center area will be developed with a real, actual grocery store. In addition, some retail and/or places to eat as well. This was a huge factor in buying here in Briggs.
I was given your email to write from a neighbor to declare that as a homeowner, I am adamantly opposed to the developer gaining approval to change the Briggs plans from the full grocery store and retail in the center. I am asking the City of Olympia deciders to not approve this as it is fundamentally the opposite of what we bought into in good faith.
I do not want it full of apartments, or mini mart or whatever shortcuts are being proposed . No, we need the grocery store and other neighbood amenities that were in the original approved plans.

Thank you for recording my comment in the record.

Tonya Kehoe

4302 Magnolia Dr SE
319-400-3297

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Schofield <lschofiel@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 7:20 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Amendments to Briggs Village

Hello,
I cannot make the meeting to discuss plans to amend the current plan of more residential housing in Briggs Village. Originally there was supposed to be a grocery store along with an abundance of shared parking for businesses and residential.
I am against amendments that increase residential use while reducing or not holding to the promise of shared parking for businesses. I will use the Briggs YMCA as my example. I have been going to this business for over 20 years. The current parking has been a disaster for the past few years while making for a dangerous driving condition along the side road leading into the facility. This situation needs to be corrected and this amendment would do nothing but make the situation worse. If an amendment was developed that allowed additional off street parking for the general businesses in the area I could support an amendment. Without corrections to the existing situation, I cannot support amendments.

Larry Schofield
1330 68th Avenue SE, Tumwater
360.628.9592

Jackson Ewing

From: Marge Wieland <wielandmarge@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Development

I am against changing the zoning in Briggs Village. Parking at the Y is very difficult at times now. If the zoning is changed, it will be impossible.
Marge Wieland

Jackson Ewing

From: cathy gilmore <thycamoregil@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Jackson-
I am requesting that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.
The parking situation for the Y is already ridiculous and needs more parking now. We do not need more residential housing! Originally there was to be a Thriftway in this area- all that is there is basically residential housing for seniors. I don't know what happened but I was disappointed not getting the grocery store, and to lose parking, add traffic, lose green space and strain our utilities with more housing is not acceptable.
Thank you
Cathy Gilmore
thycamoregil@msn.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Russ & Mary Pitkin <russandmarypitkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Amendments

Please do not make any changes to the Briggs Village Zoning Plan. What may seem like a good idea to solve one problem ends up creating additional unforeseen problems. Making room for additional housing by increasing residential density will result in a decrease of currently planned commercial space which will increase demand for other infrastructure which then would not be accommodated from within the village area. The imbalance due to the zoning change will cause strain in the surrounding area.

I've seen these planning mistakes take place in other cities and once the damage is done it is irreversible and makes these areas less desirable to live in, not to mention the additional strain on all sorts of surrounding community infrastructure and the tremendous inconvenience to everyone when infrastructure capacity is exceeded and needs to be enlarged just because there was no planning consideration in advance.

Just a few examples: Has the impact of this change been reviewed with the school district for the potential increase to their school populations and do they currently have capacity? This is the responsibility of good community planning. What impact will the increase have on utilities? Is there adequate PSE infrastructure? Is there adequate sewer infrastructure? How will the increased number of personal vehicles impact the existing traffic circulation not to mention the overcrowding of parking that will occur. Is there adequate nearby open space for residents? We are after all animals and we do need outdoor space for ourselves and our pets.

The last place I lived, Portland, Oregon, the planners really messed up badly. They wanted to increase housing density to meet demand. They figured they would develop around existing neighborhoods taking up commercial space with five over one buildings (five stories of apartments over one level of commercial) which surrounded the neighborhoods. Developers talked them into building these 5 over 1 structures without parking so they could minimize costs and save time in construction. The city allowed this because their transit system was large enough to handle the additional load and people living in these structures would not need cars because transit was convenient. People still owned cars to get off for the weekend and on vacations so they totally maximize all curb side street parking in the neighborhoods causing some of the streets to be one directional at a times which really congested traffic at major intersections in the vicinity of these neighbors. This transition total change the character of the neighborhoods. These structures lined both sides of the major thoroughfares creating a canyon-like atmosphere keeping sunlight out at street level for a majority of the day and the old commercial enterprises either relocated or did not reopen destroying the small business community used by residents and the new commercial spaces are mainly vacant. Many of the old always crowded restaurants were on large plots with plenty of parking now under a 5 over one structure. They are gone and what is left is not anywhere as nice or convenient.

February 21, 2025

City of Olympia
ATTN: Jackson Ewing

RE: Comments about Zoning Code Amendments related to Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing:

I am a member of the YMCA and have been a frequent user of the Briggs Village location. My children have also participated in YMCA sporting events that take place at this location.

The Briggs Village YMCA is very popular, and quite busy, particularly at certain times of day and especially on weekends. It is very difficult to find parking near the building during sporting events, outside of just a regular day and I have to park in the overflow area.

My understanding of Briggs Village was that it was conceived as a walkable mixed commercial and residential community with a grocery store and other amenities and that there would be ample parking which could be utilized for all of these purposes.

My understanding is that the amendments you are considering would result in the grocery store being eliminated and instead there would be more units of housing and that the net result of that would be less parking spaces. That result would certainly negatively impact the YMCA and frankly in my opinion, all of Briggs Village.

Finally, before supporting any such amendments to OMC 18.05I'd want to know the following:

1. Clarification on how parking is calculated in the core areas of Briggs Village, inclusive of any shared parking formats;

2. Clarification on how modifications to zoning or the Master Site Plan will not make parking on other underdeveloped sites impossible; and,

3. Clarification on how overflow parking will be addressed in light of the proposed changes to zoning and the Master Site Plan.

Sincerely,

Rozanne Garman

February 21, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

This letter is to explain our reasons for submitting substitute amendments to OMC 18.05, that relate to urban villages. The substitute amendments are contained in both PDF and WORD files attached to the email that transmits this letter.

The substitute amendments were drafted by four of us, Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, and Dave Merchant, who respectively live in Sten Village (adjacent to Briggs Village), the Village Cooperative (kitty corner to the Briggs YMCA), and Briggs Village.

As you know, Briggs Village was created over 20 years ago as the only urban village in Olympia. The key feature of an urban village is that it has a concentration of housing within walkable distance of a village commercial center that offers the basic amenities people need in everyday life. The critical amenity is, of course, a sizable grocery store. Other amenities typically include restaurants, a bakery, first aid, health care, clothing, housewares, hardware, a small post office (some of which might be contained within the grocery store). The current 2014 Master Plan in fact requires the developer to provide an anchoring grocery store between 30,000 – 35,000 square feet (sf). A local grocery chain (Stormans Inc.) had initially agreed to operate an approximately 25,000 sf Thriftway, but its deal with the prior owner fell apart before 2015.

The current owner Gordie Gill, who acquired the property in 2015, says that there isn't sufficient market demand for a grocery bigger than a mini-mart to locate in Briggs Village. To support that idea he hired an anonymous consultant (really, the consultant's name is nowhere in the study) to produce a market demand study with a gap analysis and analogue study. We took a hard look at that gap analysis and found that it too has gaps.

For example, the demand study assumed that NONE of the sales at the Tumwater Safeway would transfer to a grocery store in Briggs Village. That assumption is clearly false. Several thousand people live within an easy walk from Briggs Village,

the YMCA draws more than 1,000 users every weekday, and the Starbucks business has been phenomenal especially from walkers. The few businesses the developer has allowed at Briggs Village (the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, Fit Life, and Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, etc.) are thriving no thanks to the developer who only begrudgingly sold that land at exorbitant prices.[1] The anonymous author never bothered to contact those business owners, and relied on unsubstantiated opinions of an anonymous broker and anonymous "stakeholders" whose stake in Briggs Village was never revealed.

We found that once you correct the errors in the demand study, the demand would comfortably support a grocery store over 10,000 sf in Briggs Village. In looking at all of the analogue stores that the demand study used for comparison, we found that all of them in fact had 2 to 4 competing sizable grocery stores within a short distance, whereas the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery within a five-minute drive of Briggs Village.

The question remains why there isn't a grocery store now, if this site is favorable. The truth is that from all appearances, the developer Gordie Gill has done nothing over the last 10 years to seek out and attract a sizable grocery store, despite the requirements in the Master Plan. We checked with a commercial realtor and found out no commercial parcels in Briggs Village have been listed for sale in the last 10 years. We spoke with Greg Stormans, of Stormans Inc., and found Gill has not contacted him to see if Stormans Inc. might be interested in pursuing a grocery store of any size. We asked the planner Jackson Ewing directly whether Gill has provided the city any evidence he has sought out a grocery store provider, and we filed a PRA request with the city for records of any effort by Gill to obtain a

[1] According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, property # 37030000020 contains the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, etc. It was purchased from Gill on March 1, 2018 for $1,000,000, but was then assessed for $412,000, and is now assessed at $331,600. Similarly, property # 37030000021 just to the north of the property above was purchased from Gill on February 10, 2022 for $1,445,000. The property was then assessed at $332,500, and is now assessed at $484,200.

grocer. In both cases, we found Gill has provided the city NO evidence of any efforts to attract a grocery store.

A quick internet search will show you that there are at least one or two dozen grocery store companies operating in Puget Sound with multiple locations. They can be quickly spotted on Google Maps. They and local stores should be approached with some incentive to open a store over 10,000 sf at Briggs Village.

A word about incentive. Greg Stormans informed Brian Faller that the prior Briggs Village owner had given Stormans a initial good incentive package to operate the Briggs grocery store. The owner agreed to front the entire costs of building and equipping a 25,000- 30,000 sf store, which Greg thought may be in the ballpark of $8 -10 million. Under the deal, the owner would pay Stormans for operating the store for the first two years. After two years, if things went well, Stormans would buy the store. That deal fell apart when the owner refused Stormans' request to sweeten the terms after the Walmart went in on Yelm Highway in Lacey.

Here Mr. Gill in fact is creating disincentives, not incentives, for retail and office development. As discussed above, he had to be badgered to sell the two lots he sold in Briggs Village and charged well over market value for the parcels.[2] This seems to us clear bad faith on Mr. Gill's part given that the Master Plan and the OMC zoning commits him to develop the grocery store and commercial business in the village.

This brings us back to our substitute amendments. They were written to give Gill a financial incentive (1) to actually deliver a grocery store and a couple of restaurants and/or a bakery to Briggs Village , and (2) to commit to build some smaller studio apartments, which are more affordable. With this incentive, Gill will have a financial reason to offer good terms to a prospective grocery store as well as restaurants and a bakery, and to commit to build more affordable housing.

Here's how our incentive would work: Gill believes he will maximize his profits by building more residential in place of retail and office, and has proposed code amendments to do that. Our substitute amendments, say yes, you can get most

[2] Proof of the overcharging is in footnote 1.

of the key changes you asked for, but *only if* you have first actually deliver the grocery store and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery, and commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less.

We really want a grocery store soon, so in our substitute amendments, we agreed that the grocery store could be a minimum of 10,000 sf rather than the 30,000 sf minimum in the current Master Plan. A 10,000 sf grocery store (not including the space for selling beer, wine and hard liquor) can still provide a relatively wide assortment of items and choices.[3] This lower minimum would allow stores such as Aldi, Trader Joe's, Harbor Greens, Tacoma Boys, a small Town and Country, an enlarged Co-op or Spuds, etc. to fill the niche. The smaller store would be much faster to permit and build, require less investment, and present less risk.

As to the affordable housing component of our incentive, the smallest apartments in Briggs Village are over 700 sf, few in number, and typically cost in excess of $1,700 a month. Studio apartments at 500 sf or smaller rent for less, providing a more affordable housing option.[4]

You might say, the city can still protect a larger grocery store in the Master Plan, but unfortunately that will not get one built. The grocery store requirement has been in the Master Plan for over 20 years, but none has materialized. If the city now gives Gill the flexibility he wants without any conditions to motivate him, it loses all leverage to get him to deliver. **Our substitute amendments aim to provide the incentive to finally get the anchor grocery store and other businesses at Briggs Village that we have waiting for over twenty years. If there is a better way to create an effective incentive, we would welcome that too, but clearly one is necessary.**

Respectfully,

Brian Faller Betty Bailey Andrew Peterson Dave Merchant

---

[3] We learned that under Washington law a grocery store that sell spirits has to be at least 10,000 sf. However, it appears that the store need stock $3,000 of grocery items. Thus, it appears possible to have a 10,000 sf grocery that really functions as a liquor store. To exclude that, our amendments does not all the space allocated to spirits, beer and wine, to count toward the 10,000 sf.

[4] Apartments.com reports that studio apartments in Olympia on average rent for $1,327 per month and are 471 square feet. Average Rent in Olympia, WA - Latest Rent Prices by Neighborhood

Substitute Amendments to OMC 18.02 and 18.05

Submitted by Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, Dave Merchant

Residents of Briggs Village and Adjacent Neighborhoods

Applicant's proposed changes are shown in track changes. City Staff responses and recommendations are shown in commentary / revisions. Brigg's Community proposed changes are shown in red and flagged by a comment.

Definitions: 18.02.180.M

Mixed Use Building: A building comprised of ground floor commercial uses with upper story residential units. The ground floor is primarily comprised of commercial use(s), such as retail, office, and personal services. Lobbies and private amenity space serving the upper story apartments (gyms, community space, etc.) can be located on the ground floor of a mixed use building, but such space would not constitute a commercial use as it would be an accessory to the residential use rather than an independent commercial use. The ground floor commercial space associated with a live/work unit would constitute commercial use.

Commented [NF1]: City Staff recommend this new definition to help define what a mixed use building includes/does not include.

18.05.040 TABLES: Permitted, Conditional and Required Uses

TABLE 5.01

PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL AND REQUIRED USES

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
District-Wide Regulations					18.05.050
1. RESIDENTIAL USES					
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(A)
Apartments	C	R	R	R	18.05A.150-.240, 18.05.050(E)
Boarding Homes	C	P	P	P	
Congregate Care Facilities		P	P	P	18.05.050(E)(1)(c)(i)
Cottage Housing		P	P	P	18.05A.330, 18.04.060(H)
Duplexes		P	P	P	18.05A.250-.290
Duplexes on Corner Lots	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(HH)
Group Homes with 6 or Fewer Clients (up to 8 if approved by DSHS)		P	P	P	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Group Homes with 7 or More Clients		C	C	C	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(O)
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		P	P	P	18.04.060(S)
Residences Above Commercial Uses	P	P	P	P	
Short-Term Rental – Vacation Rentals	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(JJ)
Single-Family Residences	P	R	R	R	18.05A.250-.290
Single Room Occupancy Units					
Townhouses	P	P	P	P	18.05A.150-.240 or 18.05A.250-.290, 18.64

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	
2. OFFICES					
Banks	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(A)
Offices – Business	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Government	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Medical	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary Offices and Clinics	C	C	C	C	
3. RETAIL SALES					
Apparel and Accessory Stores	P	P	P	P	
Building Materials, Garden Supplies, and Farm Supplies	P	P	P	P	
Food Stores	R	R	P	P	
Furniture, Home Furnishings, and Appliances					
General Merchandise Stores	P	P	P	P	
Grocery Stores	P	P	R	R	18.05.060(C)
Office Supplies and Equipment					
Pharmacies and Medical Supply Stores	P	P	P	P	
Restaurants			P		18.05.060(A) & 18.05A.095
Restaurants, Without Drive-In or Drive-Through Service	P	P	P	P	
Specialty Stores	P	P	P	P	
4. SERVICES					
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios	P	P	P	P	
Hotels/Motels					

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Laundry and Laundry Pick-up Agency	P	P	P	P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	
Printing, Commercial			P	P	
Radio/TV Studios					
Recycling Facility - Type I	P	P	P	P	
Servicing of Personal Apparel and Equipment	P	P	P	P	
5. ACCESSORY USES					
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(B)
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(GG)
Garage/Yard/Rummage or Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P	5.24
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P	18.44.100
Residences Rented for Social Event, 7 times or more per year	C	C	C	C	18.04.060.DD
6. RECREATIONAL USES					
Auditoriums and Places of Assembly					
Art Galleries					
Commercial Recreation					
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	
Community Parks & Playgrounds	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(T)
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios					
Libraries					
Museums					
Neighborhood Parks/Village Green/Plaza	R	R	R	R	18.04.060(T), 18.05.080(N)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Open Space – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
Theaters (no Drive-Ins)					
Trails – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
7. TEMPORARY USES					
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P	
Mobile Vendors			P	P	
Model Homes	P	P	P	P	
Parking Lot Sales			P	P	18.06.060(Z)
8. OTHER USES					
Agricultural Uses, Existing	P	P	P	P	
Animals/Pets	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(C)
Child Day Care Centers	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(B), 18.04.060(D)
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P	
Conference Centers					
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(I)
Home Occupations (including adult day care, bed and breakfast houses, short-term rental – homestays, elder care homes, and family child care homes)	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(L), 18.04.060(JJ)
Hospice Care	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(M)
Non-Profit Physical Education Facilities	C	C	C	C	
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(U)
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(V)
Radio, Television, and other Communication Towers & Antennas	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(W), 18.44.100

Commented [NF2]: City Staff support requested change to allow but not require a day care center.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Schools	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(CC)
Sheltered Transit Stops	R	R	R	R	18.05.050(C)(4)
Social Organizations					
Utility Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(X)
Wireless Communications Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.44

LEGEND

P = Permitted C = Conditional R = Required

18.05.050 General standards

A. Project Approval or Redesignation.

1. Approval. Developments in the Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood Village, Urban Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts shall be reviewed according to the requirements of Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments.

2. Rezoning. Land in a NC, NV, UV, COSC, or district may be rezoned to a residential district (see Chapter 18.58, Rezones and Text Amendments) upon demonstration that the site is not viable for the designated uses due to site conditions, infrastructure or street capacity or--in the case of multiple ownerships--land assembly problems.

3. Interim Uses. The following requirements shall apply prior to approval of a Master Planned Development pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments:

a. Subdivision shall not be allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

b. One single-family home is allowed per existing lot of record prior to approval of a Master Plan.

c. Construction of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure which is in conjunction with neighboring or abutting projects is allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

4. Pre-existing uses.

a. Any use which was legally constructed prior to August 21, 1995, but which is not a permitted or conditional use under this Chapter, is allowed to continue under the zoning requirements in effect for that use prior to August 21, 1995, (e.g., as a permitted use, conditional use, limited use, special use, non-conforming use, or any other such zoning status, as may be applicable).

b. Any such zoning requirements applicable to said use (e.g., conditions attached to a conditional use permit), which were in effect on August 21, 1995, shall remain in effect for said use until such time as it is discontinued.

B. Project Size.


1. Villages. Urban villages and neighborhood villages shall be no less than 40 acres and no more than 200 acres in size, provided that at least 90 percent of all residences shall be within one-fourth of a mile of the perimeter of the village center. The perimeter of the village center means the boundary of the center identified on an approved Master Plan, consistent with Section 18.05.050(D)(2), Commercial Building--Location.

2. Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood center developments shall be no less than two acres and no more than ten acres in size.

3. Community Oriented Shopping Centers. Community oriented shopping center developments shall be no less than seventeen (17) acres and no more than 40 acres in size.

C. Village Center.

1. Required Center. Each village and each neighborhood center shall contain a village center with a village green or park (see Section 18.05.080(N), Private and Common Open Space), a sheltered transit stop and, as market conditions permit, businesses, services, and civic uses listed in Table 5.01. (See also Section 18.05.050(D)(2) Commercial Building--Location, and Chapter 18.05A, Design Guidelines for Villages and Centers.)



Village Center

FIGURE 5-1

2. Mixed Use. At least ten percent of the gross floor area of village centers in villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be occupied by residential units contained in mixed residential/commercial buildings. Exceptions to this requirement shall be granted if the applicant demonstrates that compliance is not economically feasible (based upon an independent market study accepted by the City).

3. Buildings Fronting on a Village or Center Green. At least sixty (60) percent of the total ground floor street frontage of the non-residential buildings fronting on a village or center green, park, or plaza shall be occupied by retail uses or professional or personal services. (Also see Section 18.05.080(M)(1) Height--Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens.)

4. Transit Stop. The sheltered transit stop required in 18.05.050(C)(1), Required Center, shall be located and designed in accordance with specifications provided by the City and approved by Intercity Transit.

5. Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction.

6. Location.

a. Separation.

i. Neighborhood village centers and neighborhood centers shall be separated from one another and from urban villages and community oriented shopping centers by at least one half mile.

ii. Urban village centers and community oriented shopping centers shall be separated from one another by at least one mile.

iii. The Hearing Examiner may allow closer spacing if the applicant demonstrates that the trade areas for the centers are distinct (e.g., segregated by physical barriers) or contain sufficient population (based on existing or planned density) to enable the affected centers to be economically viable.

b. Relationship to major streets.

i. Centers in established neighborhoods and neighborhood villages shall be located along collector streets to make them readily accessible for mass transit and motorists and to enable them to be a neighborhood focal point.

ii. Urban villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be located on sites abutting an arterial street. Such sites must have potential for accommodating moderate density residential development (e.g., 7 to 13 or 14 units per acre for COSC or UV districts respectively) and commercial uses scaled to serve households within a one and one-half (11/2) mile radius with frequently needed consumer goods and services.

D. Commercial Building Size, Location, and Type.

1. Size. The total gross floor area of all commercial uses (i.e., those uses specified in Table 5.01 under the general categories "Offices," "Retail Sales," and "Services") in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, community oriented shopping centers shall not exceed the maximum amounts specified in Table 5.02.

TABLE 5.02

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Min.94,985 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store. ~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	Office and Services Min. 5,000 sq. ft. ~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ ~~Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

Commented [BC3]: We rejected most of the proposed changes to Table 5.02. However, in Alternative Table 5.02 we accept in substantial part those changes, provided in order for the Alternative Table to apply, the developer must first satisfy the conditions OMC 18.05.055 below. Those conditions are designed to incentivize the developer to provide the grocery store, some restaurants, or a restaurant and bakery, and some studio apartments, which will be more affordable.

Commented [BC4]: Per the City's proposal, we accepted deletion of the maximum 175,000 sf limit for commercial square feet. We added the minimum 94,985 sf since this is the existing commercial minimum contained in the 2014 Master Plan. The proposed 52,500 sf minimum for all commercial is likely too low to support a village that provides necessary goods to surrounding residents within a short distance, including a reasonable sized grocery, shops, and restaurants, as well as offices. However, the developer and the city's replacement minimum of 52,500 sf is set forth in Alternative Table 5.02, and can be made applicable under the terms of proposed OMC 18.05.055 (below).

Commented [NF5]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC6]: We restored the existing text of Table 5.02 to provide a minimum value for retail exclusive of grocery. Assuming 810 units, the minimum floor space for retail (excl. grocery) is 60,750 sf (810 x 75 = 60,750).

Commented [BC7]: No minimum was stated in the original table entry. We added the 5,000 sq. ft. minimum for office/services which is the figure in the 2014 Master Plan. The developer's proposed minimum of 52,500 sf for office/services would leave NO sf minimum for retail or grocery under the developer's proposed commercial including retail minimum of 52,500 sf. In keeping with the City's proposed deletion of a maximum limit, we did not restore the proposed deletion of a maximum based on 200 sq. ft. per the authorized units/dwellings (810 units x 200sf = 162,000 total sq. ft.)

Commented [NF8]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.02 if applicable per 18.05.055

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq..ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: ~~50,000 sq. ft.~~ 52,500 sq. ft.	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: Min. 52,500 sq. ft. ~~Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

2. Location.

a. Commercial uses in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, and community oriented shopping centers shall meet the following location requirements. Commercial uses in urban centers shall be exempt from these requirements. (Staff note: these requirements have to do with placing all commercial uses within a block or so of the village green in villages and neighborhood centers. In an urban center, this would be impractical.)

b. Commercial uses shall be contiguous with or across a street from the village or center green/park.

c. Commercial uses shall not extend more than one block or 350 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in neighborhood villages and neighborhood centers.

d. Commercial uses shall not extend more than three blocks or 1,100 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in urban villages and community oriented shopping centers.

e. In an urban village or community oriented shopping center, the Hearing Examiner may allow buildings comprising up to 20 percent of the authorized commercial floor area to extend up to four blocks or 1,500 feet from the perimeter of the village green under the following conditions:

Commented [BC9]: The alternative table is in substantial part what the developer and the city have proposed. We are willing to have most of these values apply provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in proposed OMC 18.05.055 below.

Commented [BC10]: 52,500 is a very low amount of minimum space to provide for commercial covering retail (including a grocery) and office/services in a viable village center that supports the surrounding residents. This is borne out by the 2014 Master Plan which provides a minimum 30,000 sf for a grocery store and 94,985 sf for commercial. We are willing to accept this minimum provided it does not include the grocery store space.

Commented [NF11]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC12]: We increased the minimum to 52,500 sf to be consistent with the Combined Office & Services row below.

Commented [BC13]: For this to make sense, the minimum must be stated as Retail/Office combined, otherwise, there would be no minimum amount of commercial retail space necessary to provide for a grocery and basic retail stores and restaurants. In keeping with the City's proposal, we deleted the maximum.

Commented [NF14]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

i. The site's configuration or physical constraints (e.g., critical areas or steep topography) necessitate the location of commercial uses beyond the three block limit; or

ii. The proposed location of commercial uses would improve the project design, for example, by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the development (e.g., allowing buildings to screen parking lots from public rights-of-way), by increasing pedestrian accessibility, by allowing shared use of parking lots, or by allowing better integration of uses.

E. Mix and Location of Residential Uses.

1. Mix of Dwelling Types--General. Developments in the Urban Village, Neighborhood Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts must attain a mix of residential uses consistent with Tables 5.03A and 5.03B. Table 5.03A addresses the relationship between single-family and multifamily dwellings in general. Table 5.03B addresses the requirement for a variety of multifamily housing types, based on overall size of the project.

a. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Single-family detached residences, including designated manufactured homes

ii. Group homes with six (6) or fewer clients

iii. Single family residences above commercial uses (e.g., a single residence above a convenience store)

iv. Townhouses

v. Cottage housing

b. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Apartments with five (5) or more units per structure

ii. Boarding homes

iii. Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes

iv. Group homes with seven (7) or more clients

v. Multifamily residences above commercial uses (e.g., multiple apartments above retail or office uses)

c. Other residences.

i. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, the following uses are classified as "other" (i.e., neither "single-family and similar", nor "multifamily and similar"):

(a) Accessory dwelling units

(b) Nursing/convalescent homes and congregate care facilities

(c) Multifamily units in an urban village on the blocks contiguous to the town square.

ii. Such "other" uses are not counted in determining the required proportions of single-family and multifamily dwellings in Table 5.03A. However, such uses shall be counted in the calculation of total dwellings for purposes of Sections 18.05.080(B) Maximum Housing Densities and 18.05.080(C) Minimum Housing Densities, in the manner provided in those sections.

TABLE 5.03A

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	50% ~~50%~~ ~~15%~~	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75% ~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	25%~~25%~~ ~~65%~~	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	50%~~50%~~ ~~85%~~	50%

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.03A if applicable per 18.05.055

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	~~50%~~ 15%	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75%~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	~~25%~~ 65%	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	~~50%~~ 85%	50%

2. Mix of Dwelling Types--Requirement for Variety.

a. Urban villages, neighborhood villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall achieve a variety of dwelling unit types as specified in Table 5.03B.

b. For purposes of meeting the requirements of Table 5.03B, dwellings shall include the following four types:

i. Single-family detached dwellings (including manufactured housing);

ii. Townhouses;

iii. Duplexes; and

iv. Triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five (5) or more units per structure.

Commented [BC15]: We restored the original percentages used in Table 5.03A. However, we are willing to accept the proposed percentages (with the City's change) under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [NF16]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

Commented [BC17]: We are willing to accept the proposed percentages under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [BC18]: Per the city's comment below, we have restored 75% for the maximum percentage of total housing units of single family and similar dwelling types.

Commented [NF19]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

TABLE 5.03B

REQUIRED VARIETY OF DWELLING UNIT TYPES IN NV, UV, AND COSC

Number of Dwellings in Project	Minimum Number of Dwelling Types	Minimum Percent of Any Dwelling Type used in the Project (See also Table 5.03A)
1-70	2	25%
71-299	3	10%
300+	4	5%

c. Once the requirements of Table 5.03B have been met, other housing types--whether or not specified in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above--may be developed in any proportions within the requirements of Table 5.03A.

Example: Assume a neighborhood village with 400 dwelling units. According to Table 5.03A, at least 240 units (60% of the 400 total), and not more than 300 units (75%) must be single-family and similar dwelling types. At least 100 units (25%), and not more than 160 units (40%) must be multifamily and similar dwelling types.

According to Table 5.03B, the project must include four of the specified dwelling types. The developer chooses to build 240 single-family detached dwellings, meeting the requirement of 60% set in Table 5.03A. The developer also chooses to build 40 townhouse units (10% of the 400 total), 20 duplex units (5%--i.e., the minimum), and 80 units (20%) in triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five or more units. For the final five percent, the developer chooses to build 20 units of cottage housing, an optional housing type not required in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above.

3. Intensity of Development. The density of residential uses shall be highest around the village/community center and lowest adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:

i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and

ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.

b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:

i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and

ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

18.05.055 Incentives applicable to an urban village for completion of a village grocery store and other food amenities and construction of studio apartments.

Commented [BC20]: This section is the incentive section we propose.

A. Alternative Table 5.02, Alternative Table 5.03A, and the items identified in Table 5.05 shall apply and replace the corresponding tables and table provisions with respect to urban villages upon joint satisfaction of the conditions contained in subsections 1 -3, as determined by the city in a public notice of approval issued under subsection 4.

1. A grocery store of at least 10,000 square feet floor space is operational in the mixed-use district that (i) has a proven history of successful operation elsewhere, (ii) states its intent (which need not be legally binding) to operate at the site for at least 10 years, and (iii) sells the common items, including fresh produce, needed for meal preparation that are commonly stocked in grocery stores of comparable size. Any floor space that the grocery store allocates to spirits, wine, and beer shall not count toward the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet minimum, and during it operation the grocery store

shall maintain at least 10,000 square feet devoted to groceries, not including spirits, wine, or beer.

2. **At least three restaurants are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district or alternatively, at least two restaurants and a bakery are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district.**

3. **The urban village has given the city notice that (i) it wishes to proceed under this code section, (ii) subsections 1 and 2 above have been are currently met, and (iii) the urban village agrees to the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

4. **Upon receipt of notice under subsection 3 from a urban village, the city shall issue a notice of approval if it independently finds that subsections 1 -3 have been and are currently met consistent with the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

5. **The minimum floor space requirements for a grocery store contained in Table 5.02 and/or the master plan for the urban village shall not apply to a grocery store to be constructed pursuant to this subsection A.1.**

B. Every four years after the city has issued the notice of approval provided for under subsection A above, at least 15 percent of the apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued shall be no larger than 500 square feet of floor space. If this requirement is not met at a four-year interval, the city shall not issue any building permits for apartment units and/or dwellings over 500 square feet in the mixed-use area until this requirement is met. Any apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy was issued prior to the notice of approval shall not be counted in determining compliance with the 15% requirement.

A. Drive-through facilities.

18.05.060 Use standards

A. Drive-through facilities.

1. Banks, restaurants, pharmacies, and other businesses that primarily cater to pedestrians or walk-in customers are permitted to have a single drive-through lane.

2. Driveway access for a permitted single drive-through lane shall be allowed only through a common parking lot area in a Village Center, shall not impede direct pedestrian access to the building entry, and shall not be allowed on streets abutting a village green or park in a village center.

C. Grocery Stores. Urban Village (UV) and Community Oriented Shopping Center (COSC) District requirements: The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Commented [NF21]: City Staff recommend this change provided the applicant is supported in their request to allow instead of require this use in the village.

18.05.080 TABLES: Commercial Development Standards

TABLE 5.04

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (including mixed commercial/residential buildings)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	None.	None.	
FRONT YARD SETBACK	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(I)(1) 4. 18.05.080(K) 5. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. 18.05.080(K) 3. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking streets; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(K) 4. 18.05.080(L)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	30 feet for commercial structures; or	30 feet for commercial structures; or	45 feet;	3 stories, up to 45 feet;	18.05.080(M)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
(Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures.	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures; EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories 3 stories	2 stories 3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district. 4 Stories for mixed-use buildings facing the town square. 3 Stories elsewhere in the mixed-use district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	18.05.080(M)(10)
MAXIMUM BUSINESS OCCUPANCY SIZE (GROSS FLOOR AREA)	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one grocery store may be up to 50,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one building may be 50,000 sq. ft.	Residential floor area in a mixed-use building shall not be counted in determining the maximum building size.
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	85%	85%	85%	85%	
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS			For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	

(Ord. 6517 §16, 2007).

18.05.080 Development standards

A. General. Table 5.04 identifies the basic standards for commercial development (i.e., offices, retail sales, and services uses identified in Table 5.01) in the NC, NV, UV, COSC and districts. Table 5.05 identifies the basic development standards for residential uses in these districts. The reference numbers listed in these tables refer to the list of additional development standards below.

B. Maximum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Maximum Density. The maximum densities and average maximum densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations:

a. The area within streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" shall not be counted.

b. The area of the required minimum open space for the village or center (see Table 5.05) shall not be counted.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The density of a village center (as delineated in a master plan approved pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) and the density of the remainder of the project shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. The village center and the remainder of the project shall each comply with the maximum average density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Maximum Densities. The maximum housing densities shown in the top row of Table 5.05 refer to the maximum density of individual project components. The housing density for the overall project, however (i.e., all of the property subject to an approved Master Plan), shall not exceed the maximum average density for the district specified in the second row of Table 5.05. For example, a neighborhood village may contain an apartment complex with 24 dwelling units per acre provided that the average density for the entire development does not exceed 13 units per acre.

3. Convalescent Homes. Convalescent homes and nursing homes containing dwelling units which rely on shared cooking/dining facilities shall count as one dwelling unit for purposes of the maximum density calculation. Independent dwelling units (i.e., containing a bed, bathroom and a kitchen with a sink, stove, and refrigerator) in such facilities, however, shall be counted as individual housing units in the density calculation. The site containing a nursing/convalescent home depending on shared kitchen facilities shall be deducted from the land available for residential development when calculating the maximum density for the village or center. (The excess density shall not be transferred to other portions of the site.)

4. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory dwelling units built subsequent to the initial sale of the primary residence on a lot are not subject to the maximum density limits specified in Table 5.05. In addition, accessory units built on a maximum of 20 percent of a development's lots are not subject to the maximum density requirements, provided they are built prior to the time the primary unit on the lot is initially sold or receives occupancy approval (if built by the owner).

5. Density Bonuses. The maximum housing densities identified in Table 5.05 may be increased as follows:

a. Bonus for restoring degraded sites.

i. At the request of the applicant, the Hearing Examiner may grant a density bonus of up to 20 percent for sites on which damaged or degraded wetlands or stream corridors (e.g., streams and stream banks within the outer limits of the buffer required by OMC 18.32.435) will be restored and maintained according to specifications approved by the City.

ii. Sites proposed for this density bonus shall be posted with a notice describing the proposal and opportunities to comment. Property owners within 300 feet of the site shall be given notice of the

proposal and 15 days to comment. Such notice may be done concurrently with any other notice required by this Code.

iii. Prior to taking action on a request for a density bonus, the Hearing Examiner shall consider:

(a) the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies,

(b) the public's comments,

(c) the expected public benefit that would be derived from such restoration,

(d) the net effect of the restoration and the increased density on the site,

(e) the relative cost of the restoration and the value of the increased density, and

(f) the potential impact of increased density on surrounding land uses, traffic, infrastructure, schools, and parks.

iv. The City may require the developer to provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed restoration and other information as necessary to make a decision on the request.

b. Bonus for low income housing.

i. A density bonus shall be granted for low income housing (see Section 18.02.180, Definitions) at the rate of one additional housing unit allowed for each unit of low income housing provided, up to a maximum of a 20 percent density bonus.

ii. The applicant shall submit to the Department a document approved by the City Attorney stating that the low income housing which is the basis for the density bonus shall remain as part of the development for at least 20 years. This time period shall begin on the date that final inspection of all of the low income housing has been performed. This document shall be recorded, at the applicant's expense, at the Thurston County Auditor's Office as part of the chain of title of the affected parcels.

C. Minimum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Minimum Density. The minimum average densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations: [Note: Table 5.05 in Section 18.05]

a. The entire site shall be included in the minimum density calculation except streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, floodplains, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" and their associated buffers; tracts accommodating stormwater facilities required in compliance with the Drainage Design Manual; existing, opened street rights-of-way; and land to be sold or dedicated to the public, other than street rights-of-way (e.g., school sites and parks, but not street rights-of-way to be dedicated as part of the proposed development).

b. All dwelling units in convalescent homes/nursing homes and accessory units count toward the minimum density required for the site by Table 5.05, in the same manner as provided above in Section 18.05.080(B)(3) Maximum Housing Densities -- Convalescent Homes and 18.05.080(B)(4) Maximum Housing Densities -- Accessory Dwelling Units.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The minimum residential density of a village center and that of the remainder of a village or center shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. There shall be no minimum density requirement for a village center other than the requirement for mixed use buildings specified in Section 18.05.050(C)(2) Village/Community Center--Mixed Use

above. The procedures for calculating the required number of units are as provided in Sections 18.05.080(3)(1)(a), (2), and (3) above.

iii. The remainder of a village shall comply with the minimum density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Average Density. A housing project may contain a variety of housing densities provided that the average density for the entire development (i.e., all of the property subject to a single Master Planned Development approval) is neither less than the minimum density nor more than the maximum density established for the district in Table 5.05. No part of the development, however, may exceed the maximum density established in row one of Table 5.05 (see Section 18.05.080(B)(2) Maximum Densities).

3. Density Allowance for Site Constraints. At the request of the applicant, the Director or Hearing Examiner may reduce the minimum density required in Table 5.05, to the extent the Director or Hearing Examiner deems warranted, in order to accommodate site constraints which make development at the required minimum density impractical or inconsistent with the purposes of this Article (e.g., poor soil drainage, the presence of springs, steep topography (e.g., over 20 percent), rock outcrops, or wellhead protection areas). As a condition of granting a density reduction, the applicant must demonstrate that the minimum density cannot be achieved by clustering the housing on the buildable portions of the site (see Section 18.05.080(F) Clustered Housing).

4. Density Allowance for Natural Features/Habitat Protection. At the request of the applicant, the Director may reduce the minimum densities to the extent necessary to accommodate trees to be retained consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement. (Also see Section 18.05.080(F)(1), Mandatory Clustering.) At the request of the applicant, the Director may also authorize a reduction in the minimum density requirements in order to enable retention of Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Nonresidential Uses. The minimum lot size for non-residential uses (e.g., churches and schools) may be larger than the minimum lot size identified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05. Refer to Table 4.01 Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Districts, and Section 18.04.060 Residential Districts Use Standards for regulations pertaining to non-residential uses in residential areas. Also see Section 18.04.060(K) Group Homes for the lot size requirements for group homes.

2. Clustered Lots. Lot sizes may be reduced by up to 20 percent consistent with Section 18.05.080(F), Clustered Housing.

E. Transitional Lots.

1. Lot Size. The square footage and width of those residential lots in developments located in the NC, NV, UV, COSC, and districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than 85 percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.

2. Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the NC, NV, UV, and COSC and districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be the same as the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.

F. Clustered Housing.

1. Mandatory Clustering.

a. Criteria for clustering. The Hearing Examiner may require that the housing units allowed for a site be clustered on a portion of the site to:

i. Protect groundwater used as a public water source (e.g., wellhead protection areas); or

ii. Enable retention of trees (based upon a recommendation by the City's Urban Forester, consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement, Olympia Municipal Code); or

iii. Preserve Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

iv. Accommodate urban trails identified on Map 7-1 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

v. Preserve scenic vistas pursuant to Sections 18.20.070 View Preservation and 18.50.100 Scenic Vistas; or

vi. Enable creation of buffers between incompatible uses (see Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

b. Degree of clustering.

i. The approval authority may allow up to a 20 percent reduction in lot dimensions, sizes and setback requirements, consistent with the Uniform Building Code, to facilitate the clustering of the permitted number of dwelling units on the site.

ii. The required clustering shall not result in fewer lots than would otherwise be permitted on the site (at the minimum density specified in Table 5.05), without the written authorization of the applicant.

2. Optional Clustering.

a. Applicants for housing projects may request up to 20 percent reduction in lot sizes, dimensions, and building setback requirements in order to cluster housing and retain land for the following purposes:

i. To meet the criteria listed in Section 18.05.080(F)(1) Mandatory Clustering above; or

ii. To avoid development on slopes steeper than 20 percent; or

iii. To preserve natural site features such as rock outcrops or topographical features; or

iv. To otherwise enable land to be made available for public or private open space.

b. The approval authority may grant such requests if the approval authority determines that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.

G. Lot Width.

1. Measurement. The minimum lot width required by Table 5.05 shall be measured between the side lot lines at the point of intersection with the minimum front setback line established in Table 5.05.

2. Varied Lot Widths. The width of residential lots in the NC, NV, UV and COSC districts shall be varied to avoid monotonous development patterns.

a. No more than three (3) consecutive lots, uninterrupted by a street, shall be of the same width. This requirement does not apply to townhouses.

b. Lot widths shall be varied by a minimum of six (6) foot increments.

c. The minimum lot widths specified in Table 5.05 may be reduced by six (6) feet for individual lots to provide variety, provided that the average lot width for the project is no less than the minimum lot width required by Table 5.05.

3. Minimum Street Frontage.

a. Each residential lot, other than for townhouse and cottage housing, shall have a minimum of thirty (30) feet of frontage on a public street.




FIGURE 5-2

b. EXCEPTION: the City may allow the street frontage to be reduced (creating a flag lot) to the minimum extent necessary to enable access to property where public street access is not feasible (e.g., due to physical site conditions or preexisting development) or to protect environmentally Critical Areas (see Chapter 18.32 OMC).

c. Subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, and lot line adjustments creating flag lots (with street frontages of less than thirty (30) feet) are subject to the following conditions:

i. The project shall be designed to minimize the creation of flag lots; and

ii. Adjoining flag lots shall share a common driveway wherever possible; and

iii. All driveways accessing flag lots shall be designed to allow fire truck access to within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the residence(s) on the lot(s), unless alternate forms of fire protection approved by the Fire Department are provided (e.g., sprinkler systems); and

iv. The area of a flag lot which is less than thirty (30) feet in width shall not be considered part of the minimum lot area required in Table 5.05.

H. Front Yard Setbacks.

1. In the NV, NC, UV, and COSC districts, front yard setbacks for residential uses may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet under the following conditions:

a. When the garage or parking lot access is from the rear of the lot; or

b. When the garage is located at least ten (10) feet behind the front facade of the primary structure on the lot; or

c. When the driveway will be aligned to provide at least a twenty (20) foot long parking space between the sidewalk edge (closest to lot) and the garage.

2. Such setback reductions shall not be allowed where they would result in a setback of fifty (50) percent or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an abutting lot fronting on the same street. (See Design Guidelines, 18.05A.280, Garage Design.)

I. Maximum Front Yard Setbacks.

1. Proportion of Structure to be Built Within Setback.

a. At least thirty (30) percent of the front facade of the primary residential structure on the lot must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Table 5.05.

b. At least seventy (70) percent of the front facade of buildings fronting on a village or center green, park or plaza must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

2. Exceptions to the Maximum Front Yard Setback Standard. The following are exempt from the maximum front yard setbacks specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

a. Parcels with physical site constraints. The approval authority may allow larger setbacks than required by Tables 5.04 and 5.05 to accommodate steep or difficult topography, views, rock out-crops, environmentally Critical Areas, or trees designated for preservation.

b. Sensitive and high impact uses. The approval authority may allow greater front yard setbacks for nonresidential uses such as schools, nursing homes, public facilities, or utilities which may be sensitive to traffic noise or emissions, or warrant greater separation from adjoining property due to their potential impacts on adjoining land uses.

c. Flag lots, (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

d. Wedge-shape lots. (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

e. Dwellings which front on an arterial street or arterial boulevard.


J. Side Yard Setbacks.

1. Reduced Side Yard Setbacks. A side yard building setback shall not be required for one (1) side of a residential lot provided that it meets the following conditions:

a. If the distance between the proposed dwelling and property line is less than three (3) feet, the applicant shall provide evidence of at least a three (3) foot wide maintenance easement recorded with the deed of the applicable adjoining lot. Such easements shall provide access for the owner of the applicable lot (with a side yard setback of less than three (3) feet) to maintain the exterior of the wall and roof within three (3) feet of the side property line.

b. Side yard setbacks shall not be less than five (5) feet along a property line adjoining a lot which is not approved for reduced setbacks (e.g., a conventional lot with two (2) five (5) foot wide side yard setbacks) or less than ten (10) feet along property lines which abut a public rights-of-way.

2. Setbacks from Trails and Bike Paths. The minimum side yard setback adjoining a public bike path or walkway shall be ten (10) feet.



Zero Lot Line Housing
FIGURE 5-3

K. Measurement of Setbacks. Setback width shall be measured from the outermost edge of the building foundation to the closest point of the applicable lot line.

L. Encroachment into Setbacks.

1. Required setback areas shall be kept free of any building or structure higher than thirty (30) inches.

2. EXCEPTIONS: The buildings and projections listed below shall be allowed in the portion of the setback not contained in a utility, access, or other easement:

a. Accessory structures, including accessory dwelling units, may be located in a required rear yard and/or in the rear thirty (30) feet of a required interior side yard; however, if a garage entrance faces the rear or side property line, it shall be setback at least ten (10) feet from that property line.

b. Cornices, window sills, bay windows, flues and chimneys, planters, and roof eaves may project two (2) feet into the required yard area.

c. Marquees and awnings for commercial uses.

d. Fences in compliance with the fence height requirements specified in OMC 18.40.060.D Fences.

e. Swimming pools, hot tubs and satellite dish antennas may be placed in the rear or interior side yard setback area.

f. Up to fifty percent (50%) of a rear yards width may be occupied by a dwelling (primary residence or ADU) provided that the structure (foundation) is located at least ten (10) feet from the rear property line. For purposes of this Section, the rear yards width shall be measured in a straight line between the side property lines at the point of intersection with the rear property line.

g. Signs in compliance with OMC 18.43.




FIGURE 5-4

M. Height.

1. Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens or Plazas. Buildings in villages and community oriented shopping centers which front onto the required park, green or plaza (see 18.05.080(N)(2) Private and Common Open Space--Villages, and Community Oriented Shopping Centers) shall be at least two (2) stories in height. This requirement does not apply to food or grocery stores.

2. Commercial/Residential Transitions. Commercial buildings abutting lots designated for single family residential use shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height, whichever is less.

3. Roof Projections. The following structures may exceed the height limits specified for the district in Table 5.05 by eighteen (18) feet, provided that such structures do not contain floor space:

a. roof structures housing elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building;

b. fire or parapet walls;

c. skylights;

d. clock towers;

e. flagpoles;

f. chimneys;

g. smoke stacks;

h. wireless masts;

i. T.V. antennas;

j. steeples; and

k. similar structures.

4. Tall Buildings. In the NC, NV, UV, and COCS districts, buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height must comply with the following requirements:

a. The proposed building shall not be located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center. Public rights-of-way adjoining the village or center property boundary shall count toward this separation requirement. Exceptions to this provision shall be granted where topography, stands of trees (designated for retention and approved by the City's Urban Forester), or other site features block the visibility of the section of the building above thirty-five (35) feet in height from existing or potential residential areas (zoned and available for residential use) adjoining the site; and

b. Existing evergreen trees, which the City's Urban Forester determines do not pose undue risks for proposed site improvements or public safety and are appropriate for their location at their mature size, are retained where possible to help screen the building from the view of residents of dwellings abutting the property.

5. Places of Worship. The height of churches and other places of worship may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05 provided that the side yard width equals at least fifty (50) percent of the proposed height of the place of worship (including spires and towers).

6. Free-Standing Ornamental Structures. Free-standing ornamental structures such as clock towers, sculptures, monuments or other similar features approved as part of a master plan (see Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) shall not exceed 60 feet in height. These structures shall be located in the village center (see Section 18.05.050(C), Village/Community Center) and shall not contain signage.

7. Radio and Television Transmitting and Receiving Towers. The height of radio and television transmitting and receiving towers may exceed the maximum building height allowed in the district, subject to approval of the Hearing Examiner consistent with Section 18.04.060(Z).

8. Water Towers. Water towers may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05.

9. Perimeter Buildings. Except as otherwise provided in Section 18.05.080(M), Height, buildings located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty five (35) feet, whichever is less. This requirement shall not apply to the UV mixed-use district.

10. A building height waiver may be granted at project entries and along arterial or major collector streets within a Master Planned Community (NV, UV, and COSC) where slopes exist that would cause less than desirable height of building to width of street ratio (a ratio less than 1:4 building height to street width) not to exceed the permitted building height as measured from the fronting street edge.

N. Private and Common Open Space.

1. Development of Open Space.

a. Open space required by Table 5.05 shall be devoted to undisturbed native vegetation, landscaping, and/or outdoor recreational facilities. Driveways, loading areas, maneuvering space and parking lots shall not be considered part of this required space.

b. Required open space shall not be covered with impervious surfaces, except for walkways, tennis and basketball courts, swimming pools, or similar recreational uses which require an impervious surface.

c. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase the impervious surface coverage limits specified in Table 5.05 by up to five (5) percent to accommodate the walkways and recreational uses listed above (see also Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

2. Villages and Community Oriented Shopping Centers.

a. Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas

and type of access will be determined during the Master Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers (see Chapter 18.32, OMC).

b. Neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers must contain a neighborhood park or "green" between one (1) and four (4) acres in size located in the village or community center. This park, green, or plaza shall have an average slope no greater than five (5) percent; adequate drainage to allow active use in summer; and a width and length of no less than one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

3. Cottage Housing Developments.

a. A minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of private, contiguous, usable, open space shall be provided adjacent to each dwelling unit. No dimension of this open space area shall be less than ten (10) feet.

b. A minimum of fifteen hundred (1500) square feet or two hundred (200) square feet per unit, whichever is more, shall be provided in common open space (e.g., available for the use of all residents of the cottage housing development). This open space shall be contained in a contiguous area with no dimension less than thirty (30) feet. Such open space shall be sufficiently level (e.g., less than five (5) percent slope) and well drained to enable active use in summer.

4. Multifamily Housing.

a. In neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers, parcels or sites accommodating multifamily housing (e.g., triplexes, fourplexes, and larger apartment buildings) shall contain at least thirty (30) percent open space. However, such multifamily housing within one hundred (100) feet of a neighborhood park, green, or public or common open space, which is at least ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, shall only be required to retain fifteen (15) percent of the site in open space. Impervious surface coverage requirements shall be adjusted accordingly~~. Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.~~

Commented [BC22]: Rooftop courtyards are not open or visible to the public so should not count as open space.

b. At least fifty (50) percent of the open space required in 18.05.080(N)(4)(a) above shall be available for the common use of all residents of the multifamily housing.

c. Common open space shall be contiguous with the housing site (e.g., not separated from the dwellings by streets or barriers that impede pedestrian access) and shall be sufficiently level (e.g., five (5) percent average slope) and well drained to allow active use in summer. No dimension shall be less than fifteen (15) feet.

18.05.080 TABLES: Residential Development Standards

TABLE 5.05

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	24	24 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	24	18.05.080(B)
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	13	14 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	13	18.05.080(B)

Commented [NF23]: City Staff support. No other commercial zone has a maximum density, and this incentivizes increased units, however it is inconsistent in context of the remainder of the chart.

Commented [BC24]: These changes should apply only if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	7	7	7	7	18.05.080(C)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	3,500 sq. ft. = zero lots Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard. 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 5,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	18.05.080(D) 18.05.080(E) 18.05.080(F) 18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 80’ = duplex	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	18.05.080(G)
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	18.05.080(H) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK	25’	25’	25’	25’	18.05.080(I) 18.05.080(K)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	20’	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	15’ EXCEPT: 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots; 20’ with alley access.	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots.	18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.05.080(E)(2)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	18.05.080(J) 18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35’ EXCEPT: 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	18.05.080(M)
MAXIMUM ABOVE GRADE STORIES	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	50%	50%	50%	50%	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%	70%	18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	1 acre	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	18.05.080(N)

Commented [NF25]: City Staff does not support these changes. Mixed use buildings would be treated as commercial. This amendment would incentivize apartment only (no mix) in the commercial core.

Commented [NF26]: City Staff supports the concept, but a mixed use building is treated as commercial and must comply with commercial height standards. This section only applies to residential only buildings which should be required to include ground floor retail for additional height.

Commented [NF27]: City Staff does not support this change because it does not incentivize mixed use. Mixed use buildings are allowed additional height/stories.

Commented [NF28]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use. A mixed use building would be allowed additional coverage.

Commented [NF29]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use buildings. A mixed use building would already be exempt from open space requirements.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

February 21, 2025

City of Olympia
ATTN: Jackson Ewing

RE: Comments about Zoning Code Amendments related to Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing:

I am a member of the YMCA and have been a frequent user of the Briggs Village location. My children have also participated in YMCA sporting events that take place at this location.

The Briggs Village YMCA is very popular, and quite busy, particularly at certain times of day and especially on weekends. It is very difficult to find parking near the building during sporting events, outside of just a regular day and I have to park in the overflow area.

My understanding of Briggs Village was that it was conceived as a walkable mixed commercial and residential community with a grocery store and other amenities and that there would be ample parking which could be utilized for all of these purposes.

My understanding is that the amendments you are considering would result in the grocery store being eliminated and instead there would be more units of housing and that the net result of that would be less parking spaces. That result would certainly negatively impact the YMCA and frankly in my opinion, all of Briggs Village.

Finally, before supporting any such amendments to OMC 18.05I'd want to know the following:

1. Clarification on how parking is calculated in the core areas of Briggs Village, inclusive of any shared parking formats;

2. Clarification on how modifications to zoning or the Master Site Plan will not make parking on other underdeveloped sites impossible; and,

3. Clarification on how overflow parking will be addressed in light of the proposed changes to zoning and the Master Site Plan.

Sincerely,

Rozanne Garman

February 21, 2025

Dear Planning Commission members, City Council Members, and Jackson Ewing:

This letter is to explain our reasons for submitting substitute amendments to OMC 18.05, that relate to urban villages. The substitute amendments are contained in both PDF and WORD files attached to the email that transmits this letter.

The substitute amendments were drafted by four of us, Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, and Dave Merchant, who respectively live in Sten Village (adjacent to Briggs Village), the Village Cooperative (kitty corner to the Briggs YMCA), and Briggs Village.

As you know, Briggs Village was created over 20 years ago as the only urban village in Olympia. The key feature of an urban village is that it has a concentration of housing within walkable distance of a village commercial center that offers the basic amenities people need in everyday life. The critical amenity is, of course, a sizable grocery store. Other amenities typically include restaurants, a bakery, first aid, health care, clothing, housewares, hardware, a small post office (some of which might be contained within the grocery store). The current 2014 Master Plan in fact requires the developer to provide an anchoring grocery store between 30,000 – 35,000 square feet (sf). A local grocery chain (Stormans Inc.) had initially agreed to operate an approximately 25,000 sf Thriftway, but its deal with the prior owner fell apart before 2015.

The current owner Gordie Gill, who acquired the property in 2015, says that there isn't sufficient market demand for a grocery bigger than a mini-mart to locate in Briggs Village. To support that idea he hired an anonymous consultant (really, the consultant's name is nowhere in the study) to produce a market demand study with a gap analysis and analogue study. We took a hard look at that gap analysis and found that it too has gaps.

For example, the demand study assumed that NONE of the sales at the Tumwater Safeway would transfer to a grocery store in Briggs Village. That assumption is clearly false. Several thousand people live within an easy walk from Briggs Village,

the YMCA draws more than 1,000 users every weekday, and the Starbucks business has been phenomenal especially from walkers. The few businesses the developer has allowed at Briggs Village (the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, Fit Life, and Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, etc.) are thriving no thanks to the developer who only begrudgingly sold that land at exorbitant prices.[1] The anonymous author never bothered to contact those business owners, and relied on unsubstantiated opinions of an anonymous broker and anonymous "stakeholders" whose stake in Briggs Village was never revealed.

We found that once you correct the errors in the demand study, the demand would comfortably support a grocery store over 10,000 sf in Briggs Village. In looking at all of the analogue stores that the demand study used for comparison, we found that all of them in fact had 2 to 4 competing sizable grocery stores within a short distance, whereas the Tumwater Safeway is the only sizable grocery within a five-minute drive of Briggs Village.

The question remains why there isn't a grocery store now, if this site is favorable. The truth is that from all appearances, the developer Gordie Gill has done nothing over the last 10 years to seek out and attract a sizable grocery store, despite the requirements in the Master Plan. We checked with a commercial realtor and found out no commercial parcels in Briggs Village have been listed for sale in the last 10 years. We spoke with Greg Stormans, of Stormans Inc., and found Gill has not contacted him to see if Stormans Inc. might be interested in pursuing a grocery store of any size. We asked the planner Jackson Ewing directly whether Gill has provided the city any evidence he has sought out a grocery store provider, and we filed a PRA request with the city for records of any effort by Gill to obtain a

[1] According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, property # 37030000020 contains the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, Humble Cow, etc. It was purchased from Gill on March 1, 2018 for $1,000,000, but was then assessed for $412,000, and is now assessed at $331,600. Similarly, property # 37030000021 just to the north of the property above was purchased from Gill on February 10, 2022 for $1,445,000. The property was then assessed at $332,500, and is now assessed at $484,200.

grocer. In both cases, we found Gill has provided the city NO evidence of any efforts to attract a grocery store.

A quick internet search will show you that there are at least one or two dozen grocery store companies operating in Puget Sound with multiple locations. They can be quickly spotted on Google Maps. They and local stores should be approached with some incentive to open a store over 10,000 sf at Briggs Village.

A word about incentive. Greg Stormans informed Brian Faller that the prior Briggs Village owner had given Stormans a initial good incentive package to operate the Briggs grocery store. The owner agreed to front the entire costs of building and equipping a 25,000- 30,000 sf store, which Greg thought may be in the ballpark of $8 -10 million. Under the deal, the owner would pay Stormans for operating the store for the first two years. After two years, if things went well, Stormans would buy the store. That deal fell apart when the owner refused Stormans' request to sweeten the terms after the Walmart went in on Yelm Highway in Lacey.

Here Mr. Gill in fact is creating disincentives, not incentives, for retail and office development. As discussed above, he had to be badgered to sell the two lots he sold in Briggs Village and charged well over market value for the parcels.[2] This seems to us clear bad faith on Mr. Gill's part given that the Master Plan and the OMC zoning commits him to develop the grocery store and commercial business in the village.

This brings us back to our substitute amendments. They were written to give Gill a financial incentive (1) to actually deliver a grocery store and a couple of restaurants and/or a bakery to Briggs Village , and (2) to commit to build some smaller studio apartments, which are more affordable. With this incentive, Gill will have a financial reason to offer good terms to a prospective grocery store as well as restaurants and a bakery, and to commit to build more affordable housing.

Here's how our incentive would work: Gill believes he will maximize his profits by building more residential in place of retail and office, and has proposed code amendments to do that. Our substitute amendments, say yes, you can get most

[2] Proof of the overcharging is in footnote 1.

of the key changes you asked for, but *only if* you have first actually deliver the grocery store and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery, and commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less.

We really want a grocery store soon, so in our substitute amendments, we agreed that the grocery store could be a minimum of 10,000 sf rather than the 30,000 sf minimum in the current Master Plan. A 10,000 sf grocery store (not including the space for selling beer, wine and hard liquor) can still provide a relatively wide assortment of items and choices.[3] This lower minimum would allow stores such as Aldi, Trader Joe's, Harbor Greens, Tacoma Boys, a small Town and Country, an enlarged Co-op or Spuds, etc. to fill the niche. The smaller store would be much faster to permit and build, require less investment, and present less risk.

As to the affordable housing component of our incentive, the smallest apartments in Briggs Village are over 700 sf, few in number, and typically cost in excess of $1,700 a month. Studio apartments at 500 sf or smaller rent for less, providing a more affordable housing option.[4]

You might say, the city can still protect a larger grocery store in the Master Plan, but unfortunately that will not get one built. The grocery store requirement has been in the Master Plan for over 20 years, but none has materialized. If the city now gives Gill the flexibility he wants without any conditions to motivate him, it loses all leverage to get him to deliver. **Our substitute amendments aim to provide the incentive to finally get the anchor grocery store and other businesses at Briggs Village that we have waiting for over twenty years. If there is a better way to create an effective incentive, we would welcome that too, but clearly one is necessary.**

Respectfully,

Brian Faller Betty Bailey Andrew Peterson Dave Merchant

---

[3] We learned that under Washington law a grocery store that sell spirits has to be at least 10,000 sf. However, it appears that the store need stock $3,000 of grocery items. Thus, it appears possible to have a 10,000 sf grocery that really functions as a liquor store. To exclude that, our amendments does not all the space allocated to spirits, beer and wine, to count toward the 10,000 sf.

[4] Apartments.com reports that studio apartments in Olympia on average rent for $1,327 per month and are 471 square feet. Average Rent in Olympia, WA - Latest Rent Prices by Neighborhood

Substitute Amendments to OMC 18.02 and 18.05

Submitted by Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, Dave Merchant

Residents of Briggs Village and Adjacent Neighborhoods

Applicant's proposed changes are shown in track changes. City Staff responses and recommendations are shown in commentary / revisions. Brigg's Community proposed changes are shown in red and flagged by a comment.

Definitions: 18.02.180.M

Mixed Use Building: A building comprised of ground floor commercial uses with upper story residential units. The ground floor is primarily comprised of commercial use(s), such as retail, office, and personal services. Lobbies and private amenity space serving the upper story apartments (gyms, community space, etc.) can be located on the ground floor of a mixed use building, but such space would not constitute a commercial use as it would be an accessory to the residential use rather than an independent commercial use. The ground floor commercial space associated with a live/work unit would constitute commercial use.

Commented [NF1]: City Staff recommend this new definition to help define what a mixed use building includes/does not include.

18.05.040 TABLES: Permitted, Conditional and Required Uses

TABLE 5.01

PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL AND REQUIRED USES

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
District-Wide Regulations					18.05.050
1. RESIDENTIAL USES					
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(A)
Apartments	C	R	R	R	18.05A.150-.240, 18.05.050(E)
Boarding Homes	C	P	P	P	
Congregate Care Facilities		P	P	P	18.05.050(E)(1)(c)(i)
Cottage Housing		P	P	P	18.05A.330, 18.04.060(H)
Duplexes		P	P	P	18.05A.250-.290
Duplexes on Corner Lots	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(HH)
Group Homes with 6 or Fewer Clients (up to 8 if approved by DSHS)		P	P	P	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Group Homes with 7 or More Clients		C	C	C	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(O)
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		P	P	P	18.04.060(S)
Residences Above Commercial Uses	P	P	P	P	
Short-Term Rental – Vacation Rentals	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(JJ)
Single-Family Residences	P	R	R	R	18.05A.250-.290
Single Room Occupancy Units					
Townhouses	P	P	P	P	18.05A.150-.240 or 18.05A.250-.290, 18.64

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	
2. OFFICES					
Banks	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(A)
Offices – Business	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Government	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Medical	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary Offices and Clinics	C	C	C	C	
3. RETAIL SALES					
Apparel and Accessory Stores	P	P	P	P	
Building Materials, Garden Supplies, and Farm Supplies	P	P	P	P	
Food Stores	R	R	P	P	
Furniture, Home Furnishings, and Appliances					
General Merchandise Stores	P	P	P	P	
Grocery Stores	P	P	R	R	18.05.060(C)
Office Supplies and Equipment					
Pharmacies and Medical Supply Stores	P	P	P	P	
Restaurants			P		18.05.060(A) & 18.05A.095
Restaurants, Without Drive-In or Drive-Through Service	P	P	P	P	
Specialty Stores	P	P	P	P	
4. SERVICES					
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios	P	P	P	P	
Hotels/Motels					

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Laundry and Laundry Pick-up Agency	P	P	P	P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	
Printing, Commercial			P	P	
Radio/TV Studios					
Recycling Facility - Type I	P	P	P	P	
Servicing of Personal Apparel and Equipment	P	P	P	P	
5. ACCESSORY USES					
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(B)
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(GG)
Garage/Yard/Rummage or Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P	5.24
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P	18.44.100
Residences Rented for Social Event, 7 times or more per year	C	C	C	C	18.04.060.DD
6. RECREATIONAL USES					
Auditoriums and Places of Assembly					
Art Galleries					
Commercial Recreation					
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	
Community Parks & Playgrounds	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(T)
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios					
Libraries					
Museums					
Neighborhood Parks/Village Green/Plaza	R	R	R	R	18.04.060(T), 18.05.080(N)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Open Space – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
Theaters (no Drive-Ins)					
Trails – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
7. TEMPORARY USES					
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P	
Mobile Vendors			P	P	
Model Homes	P	P	P	P	
Parking Lot Sales			P	P	18.06.060(Z)
8. OTHER USES					
Agricultural Uses, Existing	P	P	P	P	
Animals/Pets	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(C)
Child Day Care Centers	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(B), 18.04.060(D)
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P	
Conference Centers					
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(I)
Home Occupations (including adult day care, bed and breakfast houses, short-term rental – homestays, elder care homes, and family child care homes)	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(L), 18.04.060(JJ)
Hospice Care	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(M)
Non-Profit Physical Education Facilities	C	C	C	C	
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(U)
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(V)
Radio, Television, and other Communication Towers & Antennas	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(W), 18.44.100

Commented [NF2]: City Staff support requested change to allow but not require a day care center.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Schools	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(CC)
Sheltered Transit Stops	R	R	R	R	18.05.050(C)(4)
Social Organizations					
Utility Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(X)
Wireless Communications Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.44

LEGEND

P = Permitted C = Conditional R = Required

18.05.050 General standards

A. Project Approval or Redesignation.

1. Approval. Developments in the Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood Village, Urban Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts shall be reviewed according to the requirements of Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments.

2. Rezoning. Land in a NC, NV, UV, COSC, or district may be rezoned to a residential district (see Chapter 18.58, Rezones and Text Amendments) upon demonstration that the site is not viable for the designated uses due to site conditions, infrastructure or street capacity or--in the case of multiple ownerships--land assembly problems.

3. Interim Uses. The following requirements shall apply prior to approval of a Master Planned Development pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments:

a. Subdivision shall not be allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

b. One single-family home is allowed per existing lot of record prior to approval of a Master Plan.

c. Construction of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure which is in conjunction with neighboring or abutting projects is allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

4. Pre-existing uses.

a. Any use which was legally constructed prior to August 21, 1995, but which is not a permitted or conditional use under this Chapter, is allowed to continue under the zoning requirements in effect for that use prior to August 21, 1995, (e.g., as a permitted use, conditional use, limited use, special use, non-conforming use, or any other such zoning status, as may be applicable).

b. Any such zoning requirements applicable to said use (e.g., conditions attached to a conditional use permit), which were in effect on August 21, 1995, shall remain in effect for said use until such time as it is discontinued.

B. Project Size.


1. Villages. Urban villages and neighborhood villages shall be no less than 40 acres and no more than 200 acres in size, provided that at least 90 percent of all residences shall be within one-fourth of a mile of the perimeter of the village center. The perimeter of the village center means the boundary of the center identified on an approved Master Plan, consistent with Section 18.05.050(D)(2), Commercial Building--Location.

2. Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood center developments shall be no less than two acres and no more than ten acres in size.

3. Community Oriented Shopping Centers. Community oriented shopping center developments shall be no less than seventeen (17) acres and no more than 40 acres in size.

C. Village Center.

1. Required Center. Each village and each neighborhood center shall contain a village center with a village green or park (see Section 18.05.080(N), Private and Common Open Space), a sheltered transit stop and, as market conditions permit, businesses, services, and civic uses listed in Table 5.01. (See also Section 18.05.050(D)(2) Commercial Building--Location, and Chapter 18.05A, Design Guidelines for Villages and Centers.)



Village Center

FIGURE 5-1

2. Mixed Use. At least ten percent of the gross floor area of village centers in villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be occupied by residential units contained in mixed residential/commercial buildings. Exceptions to this requirement shall be granted if the applicant demonstrates that compliance is not economically feasible (based upon an independent market study accepted by the City).

3. Buildings Fronting on a Village or Center Green. At least sixty (60) percent of the total ground floor street frontage of the non-residential buildings fronting on a village or center green, park, or plaza shall be occupied by retail uses or professional or personal services. (Also see Section 18.05.080(M)(1) Height--Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens.)

4. Transit Stop. The sheltered transit stop required in 18.05.050(C)(1), Required Center, shall be located and designed in accordance with specifications provided by the City and approved by Intercity Transit.

5. Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction.

6. Location.

a. Separation.

i. Neighborhood village centers and neighborhood centers shall be separated from one another and from urban villages and community oriented shopping centers by at least one half mile.

ii. Urban village centers and community oriented shopping centers shall be separated from one another by at least one mile.

iii. The Hearing Examiner may allow closer spacing if the applicant demonstrates that the trade areas for the centers are distinct (e.g., segregated by physical barriers) or contain sufficient population (based on existing or planned density) to enable the affected centers to be economically viable.

b. Relationship to major streets.

i. Centers in established neighborhoods and neighborhood villages shall be located along collector streets to make them readily accessible for mass transit and motorists and to enable them to be a neighborhood focal point.

ii. Urban villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be located on sites abutting an arterial street. Such sites must have potential for accommodating moderate density residential development (e.g., 7 to 13 or 14 units per acre for COSC or UV districts respectively) and commercial uses scaled to serve households within a one and one-half (11/2) mile radius with frequently needed consumer goods and services.

D. Commercial Building Size, Location, and Type.

1. Size. The total gross floor area of all commercial uses (i.e., those uses specified in Table 5.01 under the general categories "Offices," "Retail Sales," and "Services") in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, community oriented shopping centers shall not exceed the maximum amounts specified in Table 5.02.

TABLE 5.02

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Min.94,985 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store. ~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	Office and Services Min. 5,000 sq. ft. ~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ ~~Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

Commented [BC3]: We rejected most of the proposed changes to Table 5.02. However, in Alternative Table 5.02 we accept in substantial part those changes, provided in order for the Alternative Table to apply, the developer must first satisfy the conditions OMC 18.05.055 below. Those conditions are designed to incentivize the developer to provide the grocery store, some restaurants, or a restaurant and bakery, and some studio apartments, which will be more affordable.

Commented [BC4]: Per the City's proposal, we accepted deletion of the maximum 175,000 sf limit for commercial square feet. We added the minimum 94,985 sf since this is the existing commercial minimum contained in the 2014 Master Plan. The proposed 52,500 sf minimum for all commercial is likely too low to support a village that provides necessary goods to surrounding residents within a short distance, including a reasonable sized grocery, shops, and restaurants, as well as offices. However, the developer and the city's replacement minimum of 52,500 sf is set forth in Alternative Table 5.02, and can be made applicable under the terms of proposed OMC 18.05.055 (below).

Commented [NF5]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC6]: We restored the existing text of Table 5.02 to provide a minimum value for retail exclusive of grocery. Assuming 810 units, the minimum floor space for retail (excl. grocery) is 60,750 sf (810 x 75 = 60,750).

Commented [BC7]: No minimum was stated in the original table entry. We added the 5,000 sq. ft. minimum for office/services which is the figure in the 2014 Master Plan. The developer's proposed minimum of 52,500 sf for office/services would leave NO sf minimum for retail or grocery under the developer's proposed commercial including retail minimum of 52,500 sf. In keeping with the City's proposed deletion of a maximum limit, we did not restore the proposed deletion of a maximum based on 200 sq. ft. per the authorized units/dwellings (810 units x 200sf = 162,000 total sq. ft.)

Commented [NF8]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.02 if applicable per 18.05.055

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq..ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: ~~50,000 sq. ft.~~ 52,500 sq. ft.	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: Min. 52,500 sq. ft. ~~Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

2. Location.

a. Commercial uses in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, and community oriented shopping centers shall meet the following location requirements. Commercial uses in urban centers shall be exempt from these requirements. (Staff note: these requirements have to do with placing all commercial uses within a block or so of the village green in villages and neighborhood centers. In an urban center, this would be impractical.)

b. Commercial uses shall be contiguous with or across a street from the village or center green/park.

c. Commercial uses shall not extend more than one block or 350 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in neighborhood villages and neighborhood centers.

d. Commercial uses shall not extend more than three blocks or 1,100 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in urban villages and community oriented shopping centers.

e. In an urban village or community oriented shopping center, the Hearing Examiner may allow buildings comprising up to 20 percent of the authorized commercial floor area to extend up to four blocks or 1,500 feet from the perimeter of the village green under the following conditions:

Commented [BC9]: The alternative table is in substantial part what the developer and the city have proposed. We are willing to have most of these values apply provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in proposed OMC 18.05.055 below.

Commented [BC10]: 52,500 is a very low amount of minimum space to provide for commercial covering retail (including a grocery) and office/services in a viable village center that supports the surrounding residents. This is borne out by the 2014 Master Plan which provides a minimum 30,000 sf for a grocery store and 94,985 sf for commercial. We are willing to accept this minimum provided it does not include the grocery store space.

Commented [NF11]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC12]: We increased the minimum to 52,500 sf to be consistent with the Combined Office & Services row below.

Commented [BC13]: For this to make sense, the minimum must be stated as Retail/Office combined, otherwise, there would be no minimum amount of commercial retail space necessary to provide for a grocery and basic retail stores and restaurants. In keeping with the City's proposal, we deleted the maximum.

Commented [NF14]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

i. The site's configuration or physical constraints (e.g., critical areas or steep topography) necessitate the location of commercial uses beyond the three block limit; or

ii. The proposed location of commercial uses would improve the project design, for example, by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the development (e.g., allowing buildings to screen parking lots from public rights-of-way), by increasing pedestrian accessibility, by allowing shared use of parking lots, or by allowing better integration of uses.

E. Mix and Location of Residential Uses.

1. Mix of Dwelling Types--General. Developments in the Urban Village, Neighborhood Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts must attain a mix of residential uses consistent with Tables 5.03A and 5.03B. Table 5.03A addresses the relationship between single-family and multifamily dwellings in general. Table 5.03B addresses the requirement for a variety of multifamily housing types, based on overall size of the project.

a. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Single-family detached residences, including designated manufactured homes

ii. Group homes with six (6) or fewer clients

iii. Single family residences above commercial uses (e.g., a single residence above a convenience store)

iv. Townhouses

v. Cottage housing

b. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Apartments with five (5) or more units per structure

ii. Boarding homes

iii. Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes

iv. Group homes with seven (7) or more clients

v. Multifamily residences above commercial uses (e.g., multiple apartments above retail or office uses)

c. Other residences.

i. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, the following uses are classified as "other" (i.e., neither "single-family and similar", nor "multifamily and similar"):

(a) Accessory dwelling units

(b) Nursing/convalescent homes and congregate care facilities

(c) Multifamily units in an urban village on the blocks contiguous to the town square.

ii. Such "other" uses are not counted in determining the required proportions of single-family and multifamily dwellings in Table 5.03A. However, such uses shall be counted in the calculation of total dwellings for purposes of Sections 18.05.080(B) Maximum Housing Densities and 18.05.080(C) Minimum Housing Densities, in the manner provided in those sections.

TABLE 5.03A

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	50% ~~50%~~ ~~15%~~	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75% ~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	25%~~25%~~ ~~65%~~	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	50%~~50%~~ ~~85%~~	50%

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.03A if applicable per 18.05.055

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	~~50%~~ 15%	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75%~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	~~25%~~ 65%	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	~~50%~~ 85%	50%

2. Mix of Dwelling Types--Requirement for Variety.

a. Urban villages, neighborhood villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall achieve a variety of dwelling unit types as specified in Table 5.03B.

b. For purposes of meeting the requirements of Table 5.03B, dwellings shall include the following four types:

i. Single-family detached dwellings (including manufactured housing);

ii. Townhouses;

iii. Duplexes; and

iv. Triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five (5) or more units per structure.

Commented [BC15]: We restored the original percentages used in Table 5.03A. However, we are willing to accept the proposed percentages (with the City's change) under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [NF16]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

Commented [BC17]: We are willing to accept the proposed percentages under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [BC18]: Per the city's comment below, we have restored 75% for the maximum percentage of total housing units of single family and similar dwelling types.

Commented [NF19]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

TABLE 5.03B

REQUIRED VARIETY OF DWELLING UNIT TYPES IN NV, UV, AND COSC

Number of Dwellings in Project	Minimum Number of Dwelling Types	Minimum Percent of Any Dwelling Type used in the Project (See also Table 5.03A)
1-70	2	25%
71-299	3	10%
300+	4	5%

c. Once the requirements of Table 5.03B have been met, other housing types--whether or not specified in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above--may be developed in any proportions within the requirements of Table 5.03A.

Example: Assume a neighborhood village with 400 dwelling units. According to Table 5.03A, at least 240 units (60% of the 400 total), and not more than 300 units (75%) must be single-family and similar dwelling types. At least 100 units (25%), and not more than 160 units (40%) must be multifamily and similar dwelling types.

According to Table 5.03B, the project must include four of the specified dwelling types. The developer chooses to build 240 single-family detached dwellings, meeting the requirement of 60% set in Table 5.03A. The developer also chooses to build 40 townhouse units (10% of the 400 total), 20 duplex units (5%--i.e., the minimum), and 80 units (20%) in triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five or more units. For the final five percent, the developer chooses to build 20 units of cottage housing, an optional housing type not required in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above.

3. Intensity of Development. The density of residential uses shall be highest around the village/community center and lowest adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:

i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and

ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.

b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:

i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and

ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

18.05.055 Incentives applicable to an urban village for completion of a village grocery store and other food amenities and construction of studio apartments.

Commented [BC20]: This section is the incentive section we propose.

A. Alternative Table 5.02, Alternative Table 5.03A, and the items identified in Table 5.05 shall apply and replace the corresponding tables and table provisions with respect to urban villages upon joint satisfaction of the conditions contained in subsections 1 -3, as determined by the city in a public notice of approval issued under subsection 4.

1. A grocery store of at least 10,000 square feet floor space is operational in the mixed-use district that (i) has a proven history of successful operation elsewhere, (ii) states its intent (which need not be legally binding) to operate at the site for at least 10 years, and (iii) sells the common items, including fresh produce, needed for meal preparation that are commonly stocked in grocery stores of comparable size. Any floor space that the grocery store allocates to spirits, wine, and beer shall not count toward the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet minimum, and during it operation the grocery store

shall maintain at least 10,000 square feet devoted to groceries, not including spirits, wine, or beer.

2. **At least three restaurants are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district or alternatively, at least two restaurants and a bakery are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district.**

3. **The urban village has given the city notice that (i) it wishes to proceed under this code section, (ii) subsections 1 and 2 above have been are currently met, and (iii) the urban village agrees to the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

4. **Upon receipt of notice under subsection 3 from a urban village, the city shall issue a notice of approval if it independently finds that subsections 1 -3 have been and are currently met consistent with the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

5. **The minimum floor space requirements for a grocery store contained in Table 5.02 and/or the master plan for the urban village shall not apply to a grocery store to be constructed pursuant to this subsection A.1.**

B. Every four years after the city has issued the notice of approval provided for under subsection A above, at least 15 percent of the apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued shall be no larger than 500 square feet of floor space. If this requirement is not met at a four-year interval, the city shall not issue any building permits for apartment units and/or dwellings over 500 square feet in the mixed-use area until this requirement is met. Any apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy was issued prior to the notice of approval shall not be counted in determining compliance with the 15% requirement.

A. Drive-through facilities.

18.05.060 Use standards

A. Drive-through facilities.

1. Banks, restaurants, pharmacies, and other businesses that primarily cater to pedestrians or walk-in customers are permitted to have a single drive-through lane.

2. Driveway access for a permitted single drive-through lane shall be allowed only through a common parking lot area in a Village Center, shall not impede direct pedestrian access to the building entry, and shall not be allowed on streets abutting a village green or park in a village center.

C. Grocery Stores. Urban Village (UV) and Community Oriented Shopping Center (COSC) District requirements: The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Commented [NF21]: City Staff recommend this change provided the applicant is supported in their request to allow instead of require this use in the village.

18.05.080 TABLES: Commercial Development Standards

TABLE 5.04

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (including mixed commercial/residential buildings)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	None.	None.	
FRONT YARD SETBACK	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(I)(1) 4. 18.05.080(K) 5. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. 18.05.080(K) 3. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking streets; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(K) 4. 18.05.080(L)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	30 feet for commercial structures; or	30 feet for commercial structures; or	45 feet;	3 stories, up to 45 feet;	18.05.080(M)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
(Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures.	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures; EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories 3 stories	2 stories 3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district. 4 Stories for mixed-use buildings facing the town square. 3 Stories elsewhere in the mixed-use district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	18.05.080(M)(10)
MAXIMUM BUSINESS OCCUPANCY SIZE (GROSS FLOOR AREA)	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one grocery store may be up to 50,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one building may be 50,000 sq. ft.	Residential floor area in a mixed-use building shall not be counted in determining the maximum building size.
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	85%	85%	85%	85%	
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS			For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	

(Ord. 6517 §16, 2007).

18.05.080 Development standards

A. General. Table 5.04 identifies the basic standards for commercial development (i.e., offices, retail sales, and services uses identified in Table 5.01) in the NC, NV, UV, COSC and districts. Table 5.05 identifies the basic development standards for residential uses in these districts. The reference numbers listed in these tables refer to the list of additional development standards below.

B. Maximum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Maximum Density. The maximum densities and average maximum densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations:

a. The area within streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" shall not be counted.

b. The area of the required minimum open space for the village or center (see Table 5.05) shall not be counted.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The density of a village center (as delineated in a master plan approved pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) and the density of the remainder of the project shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. The village center and the remainder of the project shall each comply with the maximum average density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Maximum Densities. The maximum housing densities shown in the top row of Table 5.05 refer to the maximum density of individual project components. The housing density for the overall project, however (i.e., all of the property subject to an approved Master Plan), shall not exceed the maximum average density for the district specified in the second row of Table 5.05. For example, a neighborhood village may contain an apartment complex with 24 dwelling units per acre provided that the average density for the entire development does not exceed 13 units per acre.

3. Convalescent Homes. Convalescent homes and nursing homes containing dwelling units which rely on shared cooking/dining facilities shall count as one dwelling unit for purposes of the maximum density calculation. Independent dwelling units (i.e., containing a bed, bathroom and a kitchen with a sink, stove, and refrigerator) in such facilities, however, shall be counted as individual housing units in the density calculation. The site containing a nursing/convalescent home depending on shared kitchen facilities shall be deducted from the land available for residential development when calculating the maximum density for the village or center. (The excess density shall not be transferred to other portions of the site.)

4. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory dwelling units built subsequent to the initial sale of the primary residence on a lot are not subject to the maximum density limits specified in Table 5.05. In addition, accessory units built on a maximum of 20 percent of a development's lots are not subject to the maximum density requirements, provided they are built prior to the time the primary unit on the lot is initially sold or receives occupancy approval (if built by the owner).

5. Density Bonuses. The maximum housing densities identified in Table 5.05 may be increased as follows:

a. Bonus for restoring degraded sites.

i. At the request of the applicant, the Hearing Examiner may grant a density bonus of up to 20 percent for sites on which damaged or degraded wetlands or stream corridors (e.g., streams and stream banks within the outer limits of the buffer required by OMC 18.32.435) will be restored and maintained according to specifications approved by the City.

ii. Sites proposed for this density bonus shall be posted with a notice describing the proposal and opportunities to comment. Property owners within 300 feet of the site shall be given notice of the

proposal and 15 days to comment. Such notice may be done concurrently with any other notice required by this Code.

iii. Prior to taking action on a request for a density bonus, the Hearing Examiner shall consider:

(a) the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies,

(b) the public's comments,

(c) the expected public benefit that would be derived from such restoration,

(d) the net effect of the restoration and the increased density on the site,

(e) the relative cost of the restoration and the value of the increased density, and

(f) the potential impact of increased density on surrounding land uses, traffic, infrastructure, schools, and parks.

iv. The City may require the developer to provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed restoration and other information as necessary to make a decision on the request.

b. Bonus for low income housing.

i. A density bonus shall be granted for low income housing (see Section 18.02.180, Definitions) at the rate of one additional housing unit allowed for each unit of low income housing provided, up to a maximum of a 20 percent density bonus.

ii. The applicant shall submit to the Department a document approved by the City Attorney stating that the low income housing which is the basis for the density bonus shall remain as part of the development for at least 20 years. This time period shall begin on the date that final inspection of all of the low income housing has been performed. This document shall be recorded, at the applicant's expense, at the Thurston County Auditor's Office as part of the chain of title of the affected parcels.

C. Minimum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Minimum Density. The minimum average densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations: [Note: Table 5.05 in Section 18.05]

a. The entire site shall be included in the minimum density calculation except streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, floodplains, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" and their associated buffers; tracts accommodating stormwater facilities required in compliance with the Drainage Design Manual; existing, opened street rights-of-way; and land to be sold or dedicated to the public, other than street rights-of-way (e.g., school sites and parks, but not street rights-of-way to be dedicated as part of the proposed development).

b. All dwelling units in convalescent homes/nursing homes and accessory units count toward the minimum density required for the site by Table 5.05, in the same manner as provided above in Section 18.05.080(B)(3) Maximum Housing Densities -- Convalescent Homes and 18.05.080(B)(4) Maximum Housing Densities -- Accessory Dwelling Units.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The minimum residential density of a village center and that of the remainder of a village or center shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. There shall be no minimum density requirement for a village center other than the requirement for mixed use buildings specified in Section 18.05.050(C)(2) Village/Community Center--Mixed Use

above. The procedures for calculating the required number of units are as provided in Sections 18.05.080(3)(1)(a), (2), and (3) above.

iii. The remainder of a village shall comply with the minimum density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Average Density. A housing project may contain a variety of housing densities provided that the average density for the entire development (i.e., all of the property subject to a single Master Planned Development approval) is neither less than the minimum density nor more than the maximum density established for the district in Table 5.05. No part of the development, however, may exceed the maximum density established in row one of Table 5.05 (see Section 18.05.080(B)(2) Maximum Densities).

3. Density Allowance for Site Constraints. At the request of the applicant, the Director or Hearing Examiner may reduce the minimum density required in Table 5.05, to the extent the Director or Hearing Examiner deems warranted, in order to accommodate site constraints which make development at the required minimum density impractical or inconsistent with the purposes of this Article (e.g., poor soil drainage, the presence of springs, steep topography (e.g., over 20 percent), rock outcrops, or wellhead protection areas). As a condition of granting a density reduction, the applicant must demonstrate that the minimum density cannot be achieved by clustering the housing on the buildable portions of the site (see Section 18.05.080(F) Clustered Housing).

4. Density Allowance for Natural Features/Habitat Protection. At the request of the applicant, the Director may reduce the minimum densities to the extent necessary to accommodate trees to be retained consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement. (Also see Section 18.05.080(F)(1), Mandatory Clustering.) At the request of the applicant, the Director may also authorize a reduction in the minimum density requirements in order to enable retention of Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Nonresidential Uses. The minimum lot size for non-residential uses (e.g., churches and schools) may be larger than the minimum lot size identified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05. Refer to Table 4.01 Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Districts, and Section 18.04.060 Residential Districts Use Standards for regulations pertaining to non-residential uses in residential areas. Also see Section 18.04.060(K) Group Homes for the lot size requirements for group homes.

2. Clustered Lots. Lot sizes may be reduced by up to 20 percent consistent with Section 18.05.080(F), Clustered Housing.

E. Transitional Lots.

1. Lot Size. The square footage and width of those residential lots in developments located in the NC, NV, UV, COSC, and districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than 85 percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.

2. Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the NC, NV, UV, and COSC and districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be the same as the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.

F. Clustered Housing.

1. Mandatory Clustering.

a. Criteria for clustering. The Hearing Examiner may require that the housing units allowed for a site be clustered on a portion of the site to:

i. Protect groundwater used as a public water source (e.g., wellhead protection areas); or

ii. Enable retention of trees (based upon a recommendation by the City's Urban Forester, consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement, Olympia Municipal Code); or

iii. Preserve Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

iv. Accommodate urban trails identified on Map 7-1 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

v. Preserve scenic vistas pursuant to Sections 18.20.070 View Preservation and 18.50.100 Scenic Vistas; or

vi. Enable creation of buffers between incompatible uses (see Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

b. Degree of clustering.

i. The approval authority may allow up to a 20 percent reduction in lot dimensions, sizes and setback requirements, consistent with the Uniform Building Code, to facilitate the clustering of the permitted number of dwelling units on the site.

ii. The required clustering shall not result in fewer lots than would otherwise be permitted on the site (at the minimum density specified in Table 5.05), without the written authorization of the applicant.

2. Optional Clustering.

a. Applicants for housing projects may request up to 20 percent reduction in lot sizes, dimensions, and building setback requirements in order to cluster housing and retain land for the following purposes:

i. To meet the criteria listed in Section 18.05.080(F)(1) Mandatory Clustering above; or

ii. To avoid development on slopes steeper than 20 percent; or

iii. To preserve natural site features such as rock outcrops or topographical features; or

iv. To otherwise enable land to be made available for public or private open space.

b. The approval authority may grant such requests if the approval authority determines that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.

G. Lot Width.

1. Measurement. The minimum lot width required by Table 5.05 shall be measured between the side lot lines at the point of intersection with the minimum front setback line established in Table 5.05.

2. Varied Lot Widths. The width of residential lots in the NC, NV, UV and COSC districts shall be varied to avoid monotonous development patterns.

a. No more than three (3) consecutive lots, uninterrupted by a street, shall be of the same width. This requirement does not apply to townhouses.

b. Lot widths shall be varied by a minimum of six (6) foot increments.

c. The minimum lot widths specified in Table 5.05 may be reduced by six (6) feet for individual lots to provide variety, provided that the average lot width for the project is no less than the minimum lot width required by Table 5.05.

3. Minimum Street Frontage.

a. Each residential lot, other than for townhouse and cottage housing, shall have a minimum of thirty (30) feet of frontage on a public street.




FIGURE 5-2

b. EXCEPTION: the City may allow the street frontage to be reduced (creating a flag lot) to the minimum extent necessary to enable access to property where public street access is not feasible (e.g., due to physical site conditions or preexisting development) or to protect environmentally Critical Areas (see Chapter 18.32 OMC).

c. Subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, and lot line adjustments creating flag lots (with street frontages of less than thirty (30) feet) are subject to the following conditions:

i. The project shall be designed to minimize the creation of flag lots; and

ii. Adjoining flag lots shall share a common driveway wherever possible; and

iii. All driveways accessing flag lots shall be designed to allow fire truck access to within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the residence(s) on the lot(s), unless alternate forms of fire protection approved by the Fire Department are provided (e.g., sprinkler systems); and

iv. The area of a flag lot which is less than thirty (30) feet in width shall not be considered part of the minimum lot area required in Table 5.05.

H. Front Yard Setbacks.

1. In the NV, NC, UV, and COSC districts, front yard setbacks for residential uses may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet under the following conditions:

a. When the garage or parking lot access is from the rear of the lot; or

b. When the garage is located at least ten (10) feet behind the front facade of the primary structure on the lot; or

c. When the driveway will be aligned to provide at least a twenty (20) foot long parking space between the sidewalk edge (closest to lot) and the garage.

2. Such setback reductions shall not be allowed where they would result in a setback of fifty (50) percent or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an abutting lot fronting on the same street. (See Design Guidelines, 18.05A.280, Garage Design.)

I. Maximum Front Yard Setbacks.

1. Proportion of Structure to be Built Within Setback.

a. At least thirty (30) percent of the front facade of the primary residential structure on the lot must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Table 5.05.

b. At least seventy (70) percent of the front facade of buildings fronting on a village or center green, park or plaza must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

2. Exceptions to the Maximum Front Yard Setback Standard. The following are exempt from the maximum front yard setbacks specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

a. Parcels with physical site constraints. The approval authority may allow larger setbacks than required by Tables 5.04 and 5.05 to accommodate steep or difficult topography, views, rock out-crops, environmentally Critical Areas, or trees designated for preservation.

b. Sensitive and high impact uses. The approval authority may allow greater front yard setbacks for nonresidential uses such as schools, nursing homes, public facilities, or utilities which may be sensitive to traffic noise or emissions, or warrant greater separation from adjoining property due to their potential impacts on adjoining land uses.

c. Flag lots, (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

d. Wedge-shape lots. (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

e. Dwellings which front on an arterial street or arterial boulevard.


J. Side Yard Setbacks.

1. Reduced Side Yard Setbacks. A side yard building setback shall not be required for one (1) side of a residential lot provided that it meets the following conditions:

a. If the distance between the proposed dwelling and property line is less than three (3) feet, the applicant shall provide evidence of at least a three (3) foot wide maintenance easement recorded with the deed of the applicable adjoining lot. Such easements shall provide access for the owner of the applicable lot (with a side yard setback of less than three (3) feet) to maintain the exterior of the wall and roof within three (3) feet of the side property line.

b. Side yard setbacks shall not be less than five (5) feet along a property line adjoining a lot which is not approved for reduced setbacks (e.g., a conventional lot with two (2) five (5) foot wide side yard setbacks) or less than ten (10) feet along property lines which abut a public rights-of-way.

2. Setbacks from Trails and Bike Paths. The minimum side yard setback adjoining a public bike path or walkway shall be ten (10) feet.



Zero Lot Line Housing
FIGURE 5-3

K. Measurement of Setbacks. Setback width shall be measured from the outermost edge of the building foundation to the closest point of the applicable lot line.

L. Encroachment into Setbacks.

1. Required setback areas shall be kept free of any building or structure higher than thirty (30) inches.

2. EXCEPTIONS: The buildings and projections listed below shall be allowed in the portion of the setback not contained in a utility, access, or other easement:

a. Accessory structures, including accessory dwelling units, may be located in a required rear yard and/or in the rear thirty (30) feet of a required interior side yard; however, if a garage entrance faces the rear or side property line, it shall be setback at least ten (10) feet from that property line.

b. Cornices, window sills, bay windows, flues and chimneys, planters, and roof eaves may project two (2) feet into the required yard area.

c. Marquees and awnings for commercial uses.

d. Fences in compliance with the fence height requirements specified in OMC 18.40.060.D Fences.

e. Swimming pools, hot tubs and satellite dish antennas may be placed in the rear or interior side yard setback area.

f. Up to fifty percent (50%) of a rear yards width may be occupied by a dwelling (primary residence or ADU) provided that the structure (foundation) is located at least ten (10) feet from the rear property line. For purposes of this Section, the rear yards width shall be measured in a straight line between the side property lines at the point of intersection with the rear property line.

g. Signs in compliance with OMC 18.43.




FIGURE 5-4

M. Height.

1. Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens or Plazas. Buildings in villages and community oriented shopping centers which front onto the required park, green or plaza (see 18.05.080(N)(2) Private and Common Open Space--Villages, and Community Oriented Shopping Centers) shall be at least two (2) stories in height. This requirement does not apply to food or grocery stores.

2. Commercial/Residential Transitions. Commercial buildings abutting lots designated for single family residential use shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height, whichever is less.

3. Roof Projections. The following structures may exceed the height limits specified for the district in Table 5.05 by eighteen (18) feet, provided that such structures do not contain floor space:

a. roof structures housing elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building;

b. fire or parapet walls;

c. skylights;

d. clock towers;

e. flagpoles;

f. chimneys;

g. smoke stacks;

h. wireless masts;

i. T.V. antennas;

j. steeples; and

k. similar structures.

4. Tall Buildings. In the NC, NV, UV, and COCS districts, buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height must comply with the following requirements:

a. The proposed building shall not be located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center. Public rights-of-way adjoining the village or center property boundary shall count toward this separation requirement. Exceptions to this provision shall be granted where topography, stands of trees (designated for retention and approved by the City's Urban Forester), or other site features block the visibility of the section of the building above thirty-five (35) feet in height from existing or potential residential areas (zoned and available for residential use) adjoining the site; and

b. Existing evergreen trees, which the City's Urban Forester determines do not pose undue risks for proposed site improvements or public safety and are appropriate for their location at their mature size, are retained where possible to help screen the building from the view of residents of dwellings abutting the property.

5. Places of Worship. The height of churches and other places of worship may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05 provided that the side yard width equals at least fifty (50) percent of the proposed height of the place of worship (including spires and towers).

6. Free-Standing Ornamental Structures. Free-standing ornamental structures such as clock towers, sculptures, monuments or other similar features approved as part of a master plan (see Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) shall not exceed 60 feet in height. These structures shall be located in the village center (see Section 18.05.050(C), Village/Community Center) and shall not contain signage.

7. Radio and Television Transmitting and Receiving Towers. The height of radio and television transmitting and receiving towers may exceed the maximum building height allowed in the district, subject to approval of the Hearing Examiner consistent with Section 18.04.060(Z).

8. Water Towers. Water towers may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05.

9. Perimeter Buildings. Except as otherwise provided in Section 18.05.080(M), Height, buildings located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty five (35) feet, whichever is less. This requirement shall not apply to the UV mixed-use district.

10. A building height waiver may be granted at project entries and along arterial or major collector streets within a Master Planned Community (NV, UV, and COSC) where slopes exist that would cause less than desirable height of building to width of street ratio (a ratio less than 1:4 building height to street width) not to exceed the permitted building height as measured from the fronting street edge.

N. Private and Common Open Space.

1. Development of Open Space.

a. Open space required by Table 5.05 shall be devoted to undisturbed native vegetation, landscaping, and/or outdoor recreational facilities. Driveways, loading areas, maneuvering space and parking lots shall not be considered part of this required space.

b. Required open space shall not be covered with impervious surfaces, except for walkways, tennis and basketball courts, swimming pools, or similar recreational uses which require an impervious surface.

c. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase the impervious surface coverage limits specified in Table 5.05 by up to five (5) percent to accommodate the walkways and recreational uses listed above (see also Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

2. Villages and Community Oriented Shopping Centers.

a. Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas

and type of access will be determined during the Master Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers (see Chapter 18.32, OMC).

b. Neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers must contain a neighborhood park or "green" between one (1) and four (4) acres in size located in the village or community center. This park, green, or plaza shall have an average slope no greater than five (5) percent; adequate drainage to allow active use in summer; and a width and length of no less than one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

3. Cottage Housing Developments.

a. A minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of private, contiguous, usable, open space shall be provided adjacent to each dwelling unit. No dimension of this open space area shall be less than ten (10) feet.

b. A minimum of fifteen hundred (1500) square feet or two hundred (200) square feet per unit, whichever is more, shall be provided in common open space (e.g., available for the use of all residents of the cottage housing development). This open space shall be contained in a contiguous area with no dimension less than thirty (30) feet. Such open space shall be sufficiently level (e.g., less than five (5) percent slope) and well drained to enable active use in summer.

4. Multifamily Housing.

a. In neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers, parcels or sites accommodating multifamily housing (e.g., triplexes, fourplexes, and larger apartment buildings) shall contain at least thirty (30) percent open space. However, such multifamily housing within one hundred (100) feet of a neighborhood park, green, or public or common open space, which is at least ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, shall only be required to retain fifteen (15) percent of the site in open space. Impervious surface coverage requirements shall be adjusted accordingly~~. Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.~~

Commented [BC22]: Rooftop courtyards are not open or visible to the public so should not count as open space.

b. At least fifty (50) percent of the open space required in 18.05.080(N)(4)(a) above shall be available for the common use of all residents of the multifamily housing.

c. Common open space shall be contiguous with the housing site (e.g., not separated from the dwellings by streets or barriers that impede pedestrian access) and shall be sufficiently level (e.g., five (5) percent average slope) and well drained to allow active use in summer. No dimension shall be less than fifteen (15) feet.

18.05.080 TABLES: Residential Development Standards

TABLE 5.05

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	24	24 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	24	18.05.080(B)
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	13	14 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	13	18.05.080(B)

Commented [NF23]: City Staff support. No other commercial zone has a maximum density, and this incentivizes increased units, however it is inconsistent in context of the remainder of the chart.

Commented [BC24]: These changes should apply only if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	7	7	7	7	18.05.080(C)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	3,500 sq. ft. = zero lots Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard. 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 5,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	18.05.080(D) 18.05.080(E) 18.05.080(F) 18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 80’ = duplex	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	18.05.080(G)
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	18.05.080(H) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK	25’	25’	25’	25’	18.05.080(I) 18.05.080(K)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	20’	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	15’ EXCEPT: 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots; 20’ with alley access.	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots.	18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.05.080(E)(2)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	18.05.080(J) 18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35’ EXCEPT: 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	18.05.080(M)
MAXIMUM ABOVE GRADE STORIES	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	50%	50%	50%	50%	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%	70%	18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	1 acre	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	18.05.080(N)

Commented [NF25]: City Staff does not support these changes. Mixed use buildings would be treated as commercial. This amendment would incentivize apartment only (no mix) in the commercial core.

Commented [NF26]: City Staff supports the concept, but a mixed use building is treated as commercial and must comply with commercial height standards. This section only applies to residential only buildings which should be required to include ground floor retail for additional height.

Commented [NF27]: City Staff does not support this change because it does not incentivize mixed use. Mixed use buildings are allowed additional height/stories.

Commented [NF28]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use. A mixed use building would be allowed additional coverage.

Commented [NF29]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use buildings. A mixed use building would already be exempt from open space requirements.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

Jackson Ewing

From: bruce mcdonald <mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; cronkk@ssymca.net
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan

Hello Jackson Ewing,

We are writing to you about our concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the proposed Briggs Village Master Plan.
It is our understanding that the proposed amendments will increase residential development and reduce planned commercial space and subsequent parking.

We would like to know if there has been data and community involvement that has driven proposed amendments. The background data to help make a decision based on the value and need of an amendment for additional residential development over commercial development would be information such as

1) the existing occupancy rate of the two high density developments at the intersection of Henderson and Yelm Hwy. We are a casual observer, yet it is very apparent that both of these complexes are not to full capacity.

2) an existing travel and parking study of the surrounding commercial businesses. Is there currently adequate parking during busy hours. I can assure that the YMCA currently does not have enough parking during many hours of the day, not just peak use hours.

3) The current existing need for a small commercial grocery store, again a study of the current area residents and how far they have to travel to find food. Will the amendment increase the people density without increasing the ability to live in the area. Are you building a larger food desert for the existing community.

4) Who will benefit from this amendment ?and how ?

5) It is understood that there is a nationwide residential shortage but a few more high-end homes replacing essential services like a grocery store, or pharmacy detracts rather than benefits the existing community.

6) Is this a proposed SEPA Amendment? If so, would it change the prior determination and require mitigation for the proposed amendment? Would the proposal be reviewed again and the public comment period be reopened?

Please share any information with us regarding our questions and add us to communication list on this issue.

We live within 2 miles of the Briggs YMCA and utilize the facility several times a week. We have enjoyed riding our bikes to the businesses of ice cream, and pizza.

Please deny this amendment as it is currently proposed and get more information about what the Briggs Village Area needs to be a thriving community.

Sincerely

Mary and Bruce McDonald
mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: cathy gilmore <thycamoregil@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Jackson-
I am requesting that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.
The parking situation for the Y is already ridiculous and needs more parking now. We do not need more residential housing! Originally there was to be a Thriftway in this area- all that is there is basically residential housing for seniors. I don't know what happened but I was disappointed not getting the grocery store, and to lose parking, add traffic, lose green space and strain our utilities with more housing is not acceptable.
Thank you
Cathy Gilmore
thycamoregil@msn.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Lawrence Schofield <lschofiel@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 7:20 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Amendments to Briggs Village

Hello,
I cannot make the meeting to discuss plans to amend the current plan of more residential housing in Briggs Village. Originally there was supposed to be a grocery store along with an abundance of shared parking for businesses and residential.
I am against amendments that increase residential use while reducing or not holding to the promise of shared parking for businesses. I will use the Briggs YMCA as my example. I have been going to this business for over 20 years. The current parking has been a disaster for the past few years while making for a dangerous driving condition along the side road leading into the facility. This situation needs to be corrected and this amendment would do nothing but make the situation worse. If an amendment was developed that allowed additional off street parking for the general businesses in the area I could support an amendment. Without corrections to the existing situation, I cannot support amendments.

Larry Schofield
1330 68th Avenue SE, Tumwater
360.628.9592

Jackson Ewing

From: Marge Wieland <wielandmarge@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Development

I am against changing the zoning in Briggs Village. Parking at the Y is very difficult at times now. If the zoning is changed, it will be impossible.
Marge Wieland

Jackson Ewing

From: Russ & Mary Pitkin <russandmarypitkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 1:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Amendments

Please do not make any changes to the Briggs Village Zoning Plan. What may seem like a good idea to solve one problem ends up creating additional unforeseen problems. Making room for additional housing by increasing residential density will result in a decrease of currently planned commercial space which will increase demand for other infrastructure which then would not be accommodated from within the village area. The imbalance due to the zoning change will cause strain in the surrounding area.

I've seen these planning mistakes take place in other cities and once the damage is done it is irreversible and makes these areas less desirable to live in, not to mention the additional strain on all sorts of surrounding community infrastructure and the tremendous inconvenience to everyone when infrastructure capacity is exceeded and needs to be enlarged just because there was no planning consideration in advance.

Just a few examples: Has the impact of this change been reviewed with the school district for the potential increase to their school populations and do they currently have capacity? This is the responsibility of good community planning. What impact will the increase have on utilities? Is there adequate PSE infrastructure? Is there adequate sewer infrastructure? How will the increased number of personal vehicles impact the existing traffic circulation not to mention the overcrowding of parking that will occur. Is there adequate nearby open space for residents? We are after all animals and we do need outdoor space for ourselves and our pets.

The last place I lived, Portland, Oregon, the planners really messed up badly. They wanted to increase housing density to meet demand. They figured they would develop around existing neighborhoods taking up commercial space with five over one buildings (five stories of apartments over one level of commercial) which surrounded the neighborhoods. Developers talked them into building these 5 over 1 structures without parking so they could minimize costs and save time in construction. The city allowed this because their transit system was large enough to handle the additional load and people living in these structures would not need cars because transit was convenient. People still owned cars to get off for the weekend and on vacations so they totally maximize all curb side street parking in the neighborhoods causing some of the streets to be one directional at a times which really congested traffic at major intersections in the vicinity of these neighbors. This transition total change the character of the neighborhoods. These structures lined both sides of the major thoroughfares creating a canyon-like atmosphere keeping sunlight out at street level for a majority of the day and the old commercial enterprises either relocated or did not reopen destroying the small business community used by residents and the new commercial spaces are mainly vacant. Many of the old always crowded restaurants were on large plots with plenty of parking now under a 5 over one structure. They are gone and what is left is not anywhere as nice or convenient.

Jackson Ewing

From: Tonya Kehoe <tonyakehoeart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 12:00 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello, I am writing today to leave a comment about something that is really important to me and my family and many of my fellow neighbors here in Briggs Village community.
When we bought our home here last summer, we were told and understood in our paperwork that the center area will be developed with a real, actual grocery store. In addition, some retail and/or places to eat as well. This was a huge factor in buying here in Briggs.
I was given your email to write from a neighbor to declare that as a homeowner, I am adamantly opposed to the developer gaining approval to change the Briggs plans from the full grocery store and retail in the center. I am asking the City of Olympia deciders to not approve this as it is fundamentally the opposite of what we bought into in good faith.
I do not want it full of apartments, or mini mart or whatever shortcuts are being proposed . No, we need the grocery store and other neighbood amenities that were in the original approved plans.

Thank you for recording my comment in the record.

Tonya Kehoe

4302 Magnolia Dr SE
319-400-3297

Jackson Ewing

From: Rene Toolson <rene.toolson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Rezoning/Overall Planning Concerns

Dear Mr. Ewing-
I respectfully request the City of Olympia sustain its current zoning designation for the Briggs Village in order to preserve the original intent of the village concept. I have been a resident of Olympia for 17 years and utilize both the Plum St and Briggs Y. I also regularly visit the businesses in the Village. It is very typical that parking at the Y overflows into the surrounding area; additional pressures on parking would make the Y inaccessible to the majority of its users. I'm certain that within the main goal of the City is to support a healthy population, and the Y is a mainstay towards achieving that goal. Please add my voice to the upcoming hearing to occur on Monday 2/24/25 as opposing any zoning change.

I am continuously dismayed by the planning direction of the City, as it does not take into account current residents' experience, sufficient parking for new development, quality open space, yards, space between houses, or design standards that preserve historic integrity of neighborhoods. As a long term resident, it feels like the City is catering to developers under the fallacy of addressing the "missing middle" rather than leveraging our limited space using strong development standards. All of the most recent housing development in my neighborhood is not serving lower or middle class consumers, but has created oppressive, looming, large square-foot multi-housing units completely out of character with the surrounding homes and affordable only by upper and upper middle class consumers. The quality of life in our city is quickly declining as neighborhoods fill each empty lot with high density, large multi-units (both large individually and as a total unit) that leave no room for open space, yards/gardens, trees; most of this housing looms over nearby houses and pushes parking outward in front of those neighbors, and we see no improvement in the quality road and sidewalk infrastructure. I hope this direction does not continue in the Briggs Village community.

Thank you.

Rene Toolson
1600 Pine Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Jackson Ewing

From: Randy Person <rmperson@q.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 6:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Feb. 24, 2025 Urban Village Zoning hearing

Mr. Ewing:

The planning commission notice of public hearing for the Feb. 24, 2025 Urban Village Zone amendment discussion arrived in our mail on Feb. 20, leaving us precious little time to thoroughly review the extensive material. As referenced material notes, while the zoning applies to "all urban villages," since there is currently only one, the discussion has its bulls-eye directly centered on Briggs Village. We have been able to note the requested changes, and have reviewed the city staff's remarks, market information provided, as well as the thoughtful comments you have received so far. We have been nearby neighbors since the Yelm Highway was a 2-lane road that ended at a 4-way stop, and Briggs was a wonderful nursery.

Good arguments are made that there is a need for housing. Our quiet dead-end street has been transformed over the last few years by development of dozens of multi-family units on the Hansen St. extension. It seems the paint is hardly dry before someone is moving in as each unit is finished. However, it is critical that the base concept of the urban village not be lost. Find ways to add families if possible, but not at the cost of the vibrant town center that was presented at its inception.

It should be obvious that no business in Briggs Village would be viable if they depended on customers from only within the village itself. The design must accommodate those from the surrounding area who will access and patronize new establishments. Important for all, it is especially vital for regional services like the YMCA. We see that the area around the Y is often crowded today, and much is yet to be developed. If you do find a way to increase the village population, please be sure that it does not impact the ability of current and future businesses to be a successful part of the overall development. Any new residential units permitted must include off-street parking, so as to not impact the current design. As well, this provides the opportunity to provide protected EV charging, which many will agree will become more in demand as time passes.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Randy and Marise Person

801 South St. SE

Tumwater, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: JnL Ward <jkllw@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:36 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Master Plan changes

As a member of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned over the proposed changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. First, the plan included a grocery store to service the neighborhood. Then requested changes downsized the foot print for a grocery store. As a result there are apparently no grocers who would move in.

Even though I am not a resident of the community, I looked forward to a grocery store in the neighborhood that provided convenience near the Y.

Now the developers want to abandon the master plan in order to build apartments instead of retail designed to support a walkable neighborhood. Not only does this abandon the original plan but also creates a parking nightmare for the YMCA which was an anchor for the neighborhood.

Changes to the master plan have already ruined a great concept, why consider additional changes that would completely destroy the master plan? If anything, go back to the original plan or consider something that would include parking overflow for the Y.

It feels as if the YMCA is being ignored as part of the community and the needs of the community are being ignored for corporate gain.

Thank you for your consideration
Laura W.

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen Nicholas <karennicholasrn@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 9:59 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I am opposed to changing the original plan for Briggs. I live in one of the neighborhoods east of Henderson off Yelm Highway. I have been waiting for this development to come to fruition for a very long time. Please stay with the original plan. We who live in the surrounding area need businesses within walking distance. The ability to walk to a community shopping and entertainment area is good for our health and good for the environment.
More housing area will increase traffic and make walking on Yelm Highway even more challenging.
Thank you.
Karen Nicholas
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: GREG SAUL <gwsaul@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Community

Hello,

I'm an Olympia resident and Briggs YMCA member. I'm very concerned about the proposed changes to the Briggs Village Community zoning with respect to future congestion and parking challenges for the existing businesses.

I request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

Thank you,
Greg Saul
3103 31st Ct SE
Olympia

Jackson Ewing

From: Dan Zimmer <dzsz321@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 10:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

My spouse is handicapped - and we really need accessible parking at the YMCA. Parking is already a challenge! The strength and balance classes have really helped us both!! He has had multiple falls - and my back hurts from helping him up. With the class, he has had far fewer falls and it has been a huge help! He had recent heart valve replacement - and is working to recover his strength, stamina, and balance. Thank you for helping us in this effort to be able to find parking and participate in the wonderful, inclusive, and helpful YMCA program(s)!

Jackson Ewing

From: Gene Cinkovich <gcinkovich@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 11:47 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs urban development and Y

To whom it may concern.
I am a senior who used the Y three times a week for exercise and swimming. The parking as it stands now is difficult to find a spot at peak hours and especially during the spring and summer months when swim lessons are going on. It is too difficult for us seniors to park down the road and walk in as I have back and heart issues making it difficult and dangerous for me. Please take us into consideration when increasing your master plan to add more housing which decreases parking for the Y and surrounding businesses.

Thank you
Marlene Cinkovich

Jackson Ewing

From: CHARLES JOHNSON <chuckj4565@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 5:42 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs development

Dear Jackson Ewing: I am writing with the understanding that the original development plans are changing within the Briggs development property. The original plan was to establish a community friendly neighborhood with options for walking and retail space. Why would that plan be scrapped to increase the number of reidential units while decreasing the required commercial space valued in urban villages.

This not only defeats the original purpose of the Briggs property but puts a strain on existing parking infrastructure, which is already under pressure. This plan will greatly impact daily access to existing businesses and the well used YMCA.

Please look at the historical master plan, which gives value to the people of the community and not just the bottom dollar line of revenue. If people of Tumwater and Olympia wanted to live in total mass housing, lack of green spaces and sidewalks , they would have chosen to move elsewhere with a city atmosphere.

Please reevaluate your plan and think PEOPLE first. It is totally vital that current zoning stay in effect for the Briggs Village development and DO NOT turn our towns into a Seattle want-to-be.

Thank you for your time.

Jackson Ewing

From: Julie Groff <groffjuliec@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2025 9:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Development

Dear Jackson,

Thank you for considering public feedback regarding the proposed Briggs Village development.

I am a member at the Briggs YMCA and use the facilities multiple times a week. Each time I visit, it is difficult to find parking. I, and other community members, often have to circle the parking lot a few times until a spot opens. On many occasions, we have had to park on the street by nearby businesses. I am concerned that with further development of the Briggs Village, parking will be become much more difficult or even impossible.

Please consider this burden in the planning of the Briggs Village and ensure that adequate parking and access to the Briggs YMCA and local businesses is readily available.

Thank you,

Julie Groff
Groffjuliec@gmail.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Dave & Cheryle <dcbroom@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 10:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Proposed Change

As a member of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned about any proposal to increase residential housing while decreasing commercial space. The Briggs Master Plan needs to continue to be implemented as envisioned rather than modified as suggested. Otherwise there will be a negative impact on our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryle and Dave Broom

Jackson Ewing

From: karen karenmessmer.com <karen@karenmessmer.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Gregory Quetin; Daniel Garcia; William Hannah; Tammy Adams; Aaron Sauerhoff; Raphael Garcia; Zainab Nejati
Cc: Jackson Ewing; Nicole Floyd
Subject: Urban Village proposed master plan changes

Members of the Planning Commission,

I have lived near the Briggs site since it was proposed as an urban village. The current concept of the urban village is a good one and fits with our Comprehensive Plan. I walk in this area regularly and would patronize businesses in the village.

The proposed changes to the urban village uses and proportions go too far in reducing the amount of commercial/retail within the development. The current residents of the village and the surrounding residential areas outside the village need to have access to services, retail and commercial in order to create a walkable neighborhood. As currently planned, the full development of the mix of uses could result in reduced car trips. As proposed, that would not be possible for this area. While one can walk in this area, there will not be enough destinations to actually reduce car trips.

There are enough people living near to this village center that the businesses will have nearby customers. And with Yelm Highway and Henderson nearby, they will also be able to attract some customers from outside the immediate area.

This large change to the urban village concept should precipitate an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. An urban village, by definition, has a mix of uses within walking distance of the residents. If these changes are made, this area should not be called an urban village anymore. It will simply be a large residential development with a few small businesses located in it. That change requires much more outreach and analysis than a simple text amendment.

The goals and policies of the Transportation and Land Use chapters of the Comprehensive Plan speak to a more walkable city and the concept of an urban village. I have copied a small selection of those below.

Karen Messmer

> Land Use Chapter Vision: Our Vision for the Future: A walkable, accessible, vibrant city.
>
> Goal 1. Land use patterns, densities and site designs are sustainable and support decreasing automobile reliance.
>
> Goal 24. Mixed use developments, also known as "villages," are planned with a pedestrian orientation and a coordinated and balanced mix of land uses.
>
> PL24.11 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 only 50% of the housing be single-family.

Jackson Ewing

From: Sharonne O'shea <sharonneoshea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hello,
I understand the need for additional, affordable housing in our community and I do support that. Not, however, with the expense of creating food deserts (Mini marts do not alleviate that) and car dependent living situations, which means additional expenses for people to live there not just additional pollution for our community. Please support ALL residents of our community by making accessible fresh food available in ways that do not require vehicle use in areas of high density. I think people who need access to housing also need access to food. Have YOU ever been dependent on a bike and/or bus to get groceries? I have. It's not easy even when fully able bodied.

Sharonne

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

Jackson Ewing

From: Jason Roberts <jroberts432@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 4:03 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (File 24-0313)

Lead Planner Jackson Ewing:
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed amendments in zoning for the Briggs Urban Village (File 24-0313). I am against this property being used to increase the multifamily housing units allowance and reducing the required commercial square footage. I am also against the increased building height being proposed. The original plan took into account the needs of both businesses and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. This corner of Olympia and Tumwater needs greater access to stores and businesses that are walkable and add to the sense of community. My wife and I purchased our home in 2007 looking forward to the promised benefit of a village of small commercial occupancies, restaurants and grocery store. In short, areas for people to gather and enjoy. This proposed change would create inadequate green spaces for this change in population density. Our local parks and dog parks already lack adequate parking to accommodate the demand. Building additional apartments will completely change the feel and character of the neighborhoods that surround the area. More housing here will only make traffic and parking around the existing businesses more challenging. Increasing the housing density here will also strain the resources of the public schools and emergency response services.

I ask that this proposal is not approved. Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Roberts

Jackson Ewing

From: STEVE HALL <merlin13@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 4:48 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Urban Village Master Plan

Hi Jackson ,
Thanks for taking input on behalf of the Planning Commission on the proposed changes to the Briggs Master Plan.

I rarely weigh in on city issues since my retirement from the City five years ago.

However, I feel strongly about these proposed changes and believe I can provide a unique perspective.

In short I served with the city as the Assistant City Manger during the development of the concepts and excruciating details for Briggs. To say the least, it was a difficult and prolonged process.

While I understand the market dynamics and the severe need for housing that make land use changes seem reasonable for the Master Plan, the reduction of shared parking for the overall development does not make sense.

Parking was big issue during the development of the master plan and any causal observation of the existing area demonstrates that even now parking is a scarce commodity.
The shared parking of the planned commercial center, which is now being severely reduced, was critical to the success of the concept. The previous owners of the village sold the plan on being able to meet the parking needs of the entire urban village. In short, you can't change part of the plan without impacting the other elements.

I'd urge the Planning Commission and the City Council to not approve any land use changes unless the amendments require substantial additional shared parking.

Thanks you for your consideration

Steve Hall

Jackson Ewing

From: Esther Adams <922esther@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village--No Zoning Changes

I understand that the Olympia Planning Commission is considering zoning changes, potentially impacting the Briggs YMCA and surrounding development.
I feel strongly that the Briggs Village Master Plan and Urban Village zoning should not be altered. The original concept must be allowed to prevail as intended and as promised to our community.
Sincerely,
Esther Adams

To Whom it May Concern,
I am writing as a concerned neighbor that lives close to Briggs Village. My house is on the corner of Ross Circle and Middle Street and I have lived here since 2000. Briggs Village was “marketed” by the city to the surrounding neighborhood as an urban village that would contain a mix of single family homes, multi family dwellings, commercial space and open community green space. It was a hard sell at the time but the surrounding community accepted it because with the mix of commercial space, living space and ample green space it was felt that there would not be as much car traffic as in a traditional neighborhood. This has been true, however with every apartment unit that is built car traffic has increased. It is especially felt on Middle Street in the mornings and afternoons as cars cut through Middle Street to get to the high school and avoid the bottle neck of the traffic light at Henderson and North Street.

It appears that the developer now wants to change the zoning so that they can increase the amount of apartments in the development thereby decreasing the undeveloped commercial space and also decreasing future green space requirements. We’ve been told that if they build more apartments they will count rooftop courtyards as open/green space. That is ridiculous as the entire neighborhood would not have access to them. Rooftop courtyards are fine to have but they should in no way, shape or form count as open space or green space for the neighborhood. The existing parks in Briggs are heavily used by the neighborhood and they add to the appeal of the urban village.

We as the surrounding neighbors were promised more commercial space in this urban village. For example a grocery store which has never materialized. The current commercial businesses appear to be popular and are frequented by many of the surrounding neighbors that walk or bike vs using cars to patronize the businesses. In my opinion the developer has not made good faith efforts over the years to attract more commercial businesses and wants to take the easy way out by getting the zoning changed so they can throw up more apartment buildings. This would skew the original design of Briggs Village and for the current residents and existing homeowners of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhood it would be a slap in the face and a decision made in bad faith.

By allowing the developer to substantially change the use and esthetics of the existing Briggs Urban Village plan it will negatively impact surrounding property values. Families currently owning properties in Briggs Village purchased based on the Urban Village plan…defined, designated use areas within the development. By bowing to the developers request to substantially alter the existing plan, the City will be negatively impacting current owners as well as existing businesses. The developer does not live in Briggs Village…do any of you?

Please do not allow the requested zoning changes. Leave the zoning as-is.
Thank you for considering my opinion.

Lori Collet

Jackson Ewing

From: C. Stanley <calstan7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Casey Schaufler
Subject: Comment on File #24-0313

Good evening - I received a notice of public hearing on this matter and regret that I am unable to attend. I'd like to submit my public comment and to have it considered by the Planning Commission. This message isn't part of a coordinated campaign, just my personal comments.

I am a resident of Briggs Village - I rent one of the townhomes along the back by Kettle View Park. I agree that more housing is needed in our area. However, I disagree with the type of housing that this zoning proposes. This proposal would allow for an increase to four stories, which would do two things: decimate the value of the surrounding properties by eliminating any sort of views that they currently have; and continue to perpetuate the growth of a style of living that no one wants, but is forced to endure.

Local developers, to their credit, have been creating new opportunities for housing. Unfortunately, they are only interested in maximizing profit rather than provide useful housing for families. Too often, they are building 1-2 bedroom/1 bathroom apartments with "open concept" living areas that combine kitchens, living rooms, and dining areas in one tiny space. Families need more space. A typical renting family is 1 parent, maybe two, with 2 kids. While those kids can share a room as kids - they become teenagers, and the style of housing this proposal suggests is not conducive to families. It just makes them suffer for being too poor to buy a house by confining them to a tiny space in the name of "additional housing".

I agree that the area should have reduced commercial zoning. We don't need more businesses in the Briggs Village area, but we do need a convenience store like the Frog Pond or the Pit Stop - local community stores that are easy to access by walking.

In short, I am in favor of changing the zoning to create more residential housing and reducing commercial zoning, but I am adamantly opposed to the type of housing this proposal contains. If the planning commission cannot amend the proposal to require legitimate housing, then it should reject the proposal altogether.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Stanley
Resident of Briggs Village
360-701-5692

Jackson Ewing

From: Rachel Smith <rackelberry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:14 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Sten village zoning

Hello! I'm unable to attend the meeting tonight and would like to submit written comments instead. I am opposed to increasing the number of apartments and decreasing the commercial component of Briggs Village.

This would be a step backward and a retreat from the city of Olympia's goals of walkable neighborhoods. This area is desperately in need of services. The few businesses that are established here are booming. I live nearby and have no choice but to drive for almost every service. We've been eagerly awaiting the arrival of a grocery store for years. If you change the zoning now, it will be an enormous lost opportunity.
Rachel Smith
4610 Village Dr SE
Olympia 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Schaufler
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:48 AM
To: TOM-CORY PLANTENBERG
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Meeting tonight

Good morning, Cory –
I have forwarded your message to my colleague, Jackson Ewing, who is the planner processing the application for the code amendment. He is tracking all written feedback and is consolidating it for the record. If you would like to testify on this topic during the public hearing, you may do so by attending in person at Olympia City Hall or by signing up to testify via Zoom (link to registration). Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Kind regards,
Casey Schaufler (he/him)
Associate Planner
City of Olympia | Community Planning & Economic Development
601 4th Avenue East | PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967
360.753.8254 | cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us

Please note all correspondence is subject to public disclosure.

From: TOM-CORY PLANTENBERG <tomandcory@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:42 AM
To: Casey Schaufler <cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting tonight

I would like to comment on the planned changes to the Briggs area plan.

I am a resident of Olympia and a member of the South Sound YMCA. I workout and swim at both the Briggs YMCA and the Plum Street YMCA. I wish Plum Street had a pool. It has become increasing difficult to park at the Briggs Y. As they have grown their membership the current parking is not adequate. As I live on the westside public transportation is not an option. The area needs more parking not less. Please do not change anything to reduce the parking at the Briggs area. If anything it needs to be increased. I read the analysis and I could not see where any of the information would support reducing the additional parking currently needed much less in the future.

Cory Plantenberg

Jackson Ewing

From: Dawn Utter <dutter1111@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs parking concerns.

To whom it may concern
I am a member of the Briggs YMCA. I and my granddaughters enjoy the many programs and classes they offer. I've had only one complaint since we became members. Finding a parking spot. I would hope that this would be a concern of anyone in the community. The Y offers many learning opportunities for the youth in our area. Many seniors get much needed exercise and knowledge from programs and classes. If more businesses or housing go into the immediate area of Briggs YMCA then the Parking issue will become worse. This could result in lower memberships and opportunities for continued or new classes being offered.
Thank you for your time.
Dawn Utter

Jackson Ewing

From: Doug Spohn <douglasspohn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: Doug Spohn
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Changes

Hello Jackson —

I am writing to you in reference to proposed zoning changes by the City of Olympia.

Specifically, I want to support the decision to NOT change the current zoning within the Briggs Village community.

It is my understanding that proposed zoning changes will reduce the availability of commercial space and within the Village. A nice blend of residential, commercial, and parks was the original design of the Briggs Village plan — to make Briggs Village an attractive walkable community. A change of zoning will forever ruin the “vision” of the Briggs Village community. It was destined to become a jewel of the city.

I don’t want to see the original plan go away. It’s been hard enough living with multi-year delays and the ongoing barriers that have prevented the original Briggs Village plan from being fully realized.

Thank you for seriously considering my concerns.

Doug Spohn
120 State Ave NE #168
Olympia, WA
360-888-3455

Jackson Ewing

From: melissa Palmer <melipalmer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:26 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA Parking

The development that is occuring in the Briggs area is impressive, however there are significant challenges on parking as it currently stands. Given that the Briggs YMCA serves residents in surrounding areas that have no choice but to drive in, any changes to parking that impacts the commercial entities will only exacerbate the challenge.
My family has elementary age kids and the Briggs is a place we frequent and hope to be able to without the concern of driving 15 minutes there (not on a bus line nor in a neighborhood with sidewalks) to not be able to park. We ask that changes to parking in that area balance all needs of the development in the area and address avoid contributing to access challenges for those who have not choice but to drive in to use the services at the Briggs YMCA.

Thank you
Melissa Palmer
6033 Hansen St SE, Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Celeste <celeste.papier@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:29 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking Reduction

I am unable to attend the hearing this evening. Please count my voice expressing concerns over reduced parking for the Y. It is quite frequently difficult, especially for the senior citizens, to find adequate parking currently. Any additional pressure on parking will create an untenable situation. Some of us drive quite a distance and it would be very unfortunate and unsustainable to arrive and have to turn around because no easily walkable parking is available. Especially for those of us with mobility issues who depend on the pool for exercise.
Thank you,
Celeste

Jackson Ewing

From: Carole Cropley <cyelporc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:41 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: parking at the YMCA

The Y serves manny people who need to park close to the facility -- children, older people, people with physical limitations. While they might not require "handcapped parking permits", they still need to be able to be close to the building in order to use it. Please protect our precious parking!
Carole Cropley
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: Alexandra <alexandra.kasuske@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:43 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA Parking

I am opposed to the property proposal. Currently, there is not enough parking for the businesses and the YMCA.

The proposed changes will lead to a less user friendly community.

A Kasuske

Jackson Ewing

From: Jessica Shabatura <jessicashabatura@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:02 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Master Plan

Hello and thanks for the opportunity to voice my concerns. My family and I live near the Briggs center and often utilize the restaurants and Y community center. We were thrilled with how well this urban development had been planned to integrate high density, housing and attractive services that build community.

I am writing to encourage you to adhere to the original Briggs Master plan that will continue to keep a balance between commercial offerings, housing, and parking for those of us who wish to patronize the businesses but live offsite. If parking became a greater challenge than it is currently, I could see my family opting to drive a few more miles into town rather than soar for a place to park.

Thanks for your concern and consideration.

Jessica

Cell: 479.790.6433

Jackson Ewing

From: Gordie Gill <Gordie@glenlyon.ca>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:13 AM
To: Jackson Ewing; Nicole Floyd; Tim Smith
Cc: Glenn Wells; Heather Burgess
Subject: Re: Briggs planning commission meeting

Jackson:

RE: Public hearing to today

I believe the City should address some of the misrepresentations made by YMCA or would I say a lack proper disclosure in particular with regard to parking. As you are aware, the City allowed the YMCA to expand without the YMCA first securing adequate parking for this expansion. Now the YMCA is impling in their email to the public that this zoning change will result in lack of parking for Briggs Village.

Furthermore, I believe the city should address the city's current parking policy of parking for new residential units being that the developer does not have to provide any parking for residential units and it will be left to the developers discretion on how many parking spots to provide for these new residential units.

I believe the YMCA in its own interest by sending out this email has tried to turn the public against this development.

I believe the change in the zoning code tries to balance the interest of not only the residents in Briggs Village, market conditions and need for the housing in Olympia.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Gordie Gill
Nextgen Offices Inc.
604-728-2948
gordie@glenlyon.ca

On Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 10:43 AM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Glenn and Gordie,
>
> The public hearing for the proposed amendments is this evening. There has been intensive public interest, and I expect it to be well attended.
>
> We will be the first item on the agenda. The city will present first then you will have an opportunity to provide any additional comments. Please only focus on the zoning code changes, not on the Briggs Master Plan. We need to make it clear to the public these are two separate applications and processes.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner
City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3776
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

*All correspondence to and from this address is a public record

-----Original Message-----
From: Glenn Wells <glennwellsarchitect@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Gordie Gill <gordie@glenlyon.ca>
Subject: Briggs planning commission meeting

Hi Jackson,
Do we have a planning commission meeting this evening? I don't believe I have an invite. If we do, maybe you could tell me when we'll be on the agenda and what the format will be.
Thanks
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Antonio M Ginatta <giant@hey.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:17 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: please don't prioritize parking over housing at Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Jackson,

Good morning. I received an email from the YMCA asking me to share my concerns about changes to zoning at Briggs Village that could reduce the number of parking spots, and that this could put a strain on parking infrastructure.

I wish I heard more from the YMCA on how to engage with the city on how to push for more housing for people who are unsheltered. That seems more like a YMCA priority. To prioritize parking spaces for cars over housing density is wrong-headed and not in tune with pressing Olympia housing priorities.

I'd urge the city to continue with its plan to prioritize denser neighborhood villages that will lead to greater use of public transportation. Olympia should stop prioritizing where cars sleep over where people sleep.

Best,

Antonio Ginatta
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: Heidi Hague <haguehc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to you concerning the proposed zoning changes in the Briggs Village area. As a frequent patron of the Briggs YMCA, I am concerned that said changes will negatively affect not only my ability to use the YMCA in the evening because of further limited parking, but also affect the walkability of the neighborhood, and negatively affect the environment by forcing neighborhood residents to drive further for services that had been previously planned for the neighborhood. I respectfully request that the proposed changes be denied and that the Briggs neighborhood remains the wonderful environment it has been since inception.
Sincerely,
Heidi C. Hague
Briggs YMCA Patron

Jackson Ewing

From: Ken Smith <hiredhands@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:30 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Change to Briggs urban village plan

I strongly oppose any change to the original plan And urge others to do so. Bringing residential and commercial units together in urban villages is what this area needs more of. The original plan was sound and is still viable even now. The city needs to help businesses to make this successful and sustainable.
Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Karen Sweeney <klangsweeney@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:39 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Urban Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a frequent user of the YMCA and am concerned about the developer who has proposed more residential housing which decreases the available commercial space. The original plans called for shared commercial parking space. The parking at the YMCA has become increasingly difficult for the numerous members of this Y community. The original plans also included a grocery store, walkable areas and increased green space. We have been waiting for a grocery store (not a small AM/PM) for a long time. I would certainly use this grocery store when visiting the Y, as would many other people. The retail stores that are there already are doing very well. They are often packed with people, which increases parking pressures more.
The City continues to talk about neighborhood centers or urban villages as great ideas, but this idea is going in the opposite direction. Until the developer meets the original obligation of providing a grocery store, other retail establishments and shared commercial parking space, they should not be allowed to change the original plans and zoning.
Thank you!
Karen Sweeney

Jackson Ewing

From: Molly Hoghaug <mollol44@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Parking

Hi there,
I'm not able to attend the seminar, but I am a member at the Briggs YMCA and I wanted to email my concerns about the possibility of re-zoning some land in Briggs Village. As it is, I often have to park down the street from The Y when I come from classes. I oppose anything that will put even more strain on the parking availability and walkability of the neighborhood Thank you.
Molly Hoghaug
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Abbo Peterson <abbopeterson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: My public input for the amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jackson Ewing,

This is my public input for the amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages.

My wife and I have lived in Briggs Village since November 2020. We love living here and it's a wonderful planned neighborhood. We live on Briggs Drive SE and face the undeveloped portion of the neighborhood and will be directly impacted by the additional development.

My input is about the 12 amendments marked in red in the City document "Attachment 1. Draft amendments (includes city commentary)" and the 6 items in the bullet list on page 2 in the City document "PC staff report Amendments to the OMC 18.05".

SUMMARY
I **support** the amendments, with one exception and a couple concerns.

I support the amendments because they add needed flexibility for development while maintaining the value and benefits of an "urban village."

My support is also based on considering the multiple needs and stakeholders related to the amendments and continued development of Briggs Village. That broader view can results in better decisions, even when that means not everyone gets exactly what they want.

Finally, I know there are vocal opponents to the amendments. Some are going to great lengths with outreach to the community, detailed letters, signatures and broader topics. I also know the views of vocal opponents don't always match the views of people who don't speak up or get involved.

I urge the Planning Commission to objectively hear all input, be mindful of those who don't speak up, focus on the multiple needs and stakeholders and make their decision based on the broad view and not just the vocal opponents.

ADDITIONAL POINTS
The amendments provide much better flexibility for inevitable changing market and other conditions
Things change. Sometimes dramatically and often unexpectedly. Plans we make sometimes work and sometimes don't. When they do, it's usually because we can be flexible. In the case of Briggs Village, completing the original plan is not working, in part, because the City code is not flexible enough. The

market and other conditions are different now and the amendments are providing flexibility so the neighborhood development can continue.

The amendments and OMC 10.05 are accounting for a wide variety of different needs and stakeholders
Neighbors who live in Briggs Village. People having a hard time finding a new place to live in the Olympia area. Developers, architects, builders and construction workers. Business and store owners. City planners. Balancing all those needs is hard. I think the amendments are a small step to help balance those needs.

The original Briggs Village plan was a vision, not a promise
It was a fantastic vision. I understand why so many neighbors want it completed as planned. Being able to walk to a big grocery store and other shops is an incredible idea. I want that too. However, the Briggs Village vision was not a promise. Many things changed since the original plan and those changes make it impractical and unwise to complete Briggs Village exactly as it was planned. However, that doesn't mean the remaining development will be bad. It will be different, but it will still be a fantastic neighborhood we should all be proud to live in.

I do not support the following amendment:
From page 25 of "Attachment 1 - Draft amendments…":
"Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.

Commented [JE8]: Including rooftop court yards as open space is consistent with how open space is calculated for multifamily residential uses throughout the city."

I would support that amendment only if the rooftop courtyard area is easily accessible to all residents of the neighborhood. If it's not open space for the entire neighborhood (the urban village), it should not be included in the open space calculation for the entire neighborhood.

Regarding the JE8 comment, while it may be "consistent with how open space is calculated for multifamily residential uses throughout the city," urban villages are more than just "multifamily" residential developments.

Two areas of concern for me
Item from the bullet list in the "PC staff report…" document:
"Increasing the allowed percentage of multifamily housing in urban villages from 50% to 85%. Retaining a max of 75% of single family and setting a minimum single family of 15%"

An urban village of 85% multifamily and 15% single family home doesn't feel like a village to me. However, I can accept that as long as the other required elements of an urban village are completed, e.g., retail shops, public spaces, walking paths and trails.

From page 13 of "Attachment 1 - Draft amendments…":
"The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area."

I'm very happy a grocery store remains a required element in an urban village. While I support the maximum size of 50,000 square feet, I'm concerned there is no minimum size or details about types of smaller grocery stores.

I highly recommend:

1. Adding a minimum size
2. Adding examples of groceries store sizes for reference. List examples of stores that are about 50K, 25K, 10K, 5K, 2K square feet.

In conclusion…

I'm passionate about solutions that best meet the needs of multiple stakeholders, even when that means not everyone gets exactly what they want. I also think solutions that can be flexible and adapt to change have much better results than those that don't.

Please consider my input as a balanced view of the proposed amendments. Please also be mindful of balancing vocal opposition with alternate perspectives, including those who are not speaking out.

Thank you,
Abbo Peterson

Jackson Ewing

From: Mail.comcast.net <eydie.vargas@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:39 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning changes at Briggs Village

I live at Silverleaf & see how many cars do park near YMCA & other nearby businesses. Also my concern as a pedestrian, I walk to the YMCA 5 days a week, and often walk in that area on weekend, as there will be more traffic , Pedestrian crossing for Henderson may need to be addressed. I prefer to cross At the crosswalk across from Humblecow & not at the Yelm highway/henderson crossing to avoid cars turning on to Henderson at red light.
Thank you,
Edith Vargas
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Alan Hardcastle <alanhardcastle1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Concerns regarding proposed amendments to the zoning code (OMC 18.05)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am a long-time member of the Board of Trustees for the South Sound YMCA, which includes the facility at Briggs Village. I am also a user of this facility, as are hundreds of other YMCA members.

I have concerns regarding proposed changes to the zoning code that would increase the number of multifamily housing units, while reducing the required commercial space available to businesses that would support residents in and around the Village community.

While I strongly support the need for additional housing in our region, in this case I am concerned that the proposed changes to the zoning code could cause or exacerbate challenges such as parking, and/or compromise the potential of the original Briggs Village design and intent (greater walkability, local open/green spaces, limited auto use and emissions, related positive health impacts, and the provision of essential local services and amenities that support healthy community living). A true Urban Village concept supports these and other benefits, but I am concerned that the proposed changes will create an imbalance that severely limits its intended effectiveness.

The Briggs YMCA already faces significant parking challenges, and a considerable expansion of additional housing units is likely to increase parking demand, traffic congestion and auto emissions throughout the Village. Before the Planning Commission rules on the proposed zoning code changes, I urge the Commission to conduct traffic and parking impact studies to determine the likely effects on local residents, visitors and customers of current and potential future businesses and service providers, including the YMCA. I believe we need to better understand the likely impacts the proposed changes will have before a decision is made.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Alan Hardcastle
Olympia
360-485-8844

Jackson Ewing

From: Adrienne Touart <aptouart@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Potential Briggs Village rezone

Thank you for including my comments. Pandora Touart, Briggs member for 7.5 years

Briggs YMCA is the only affordable family athletic/recreation center between here and Shelton or Lakewood. It is heavily used, more now with much increased population density. We can barely imagine the future...

Parking has been poor to severely inadequate for several years. Note: there is no parking available on Henderson or Yelm Hwy. Pioneer Park lots are too far away and therefore, useless for seniors, small children and the rest of us.
Briggs users and staff are currently parking on future driveway aprons, in the pediatric DDS office and coffee lot as well as all along what is planned for a residential street in the development. Briggs is short at least 35-40 parking spaces right now. If you drive up the west street that fronts the existing residential homes in the daytime the street is full of occupant cars, precisely what will happen on the no./so. roadway closer to Henderson immediately north of Briggs Y.

Rezoning for fewer parking spaces (to the benefit of the developers) leaves Briggs users with NO place to park. I and many others who now circle the Briggs lot and then opt for whatever space we can find outside that lot will no longer be able to attend classes with a specific time (i.e. not flexible attendance).

Please DO NOT change the existing zoning requirements for Briggs Village. If changed, the health and well-being of a lot of people will be impacted. We rely on the Y.

OR, if developers want increased density, then Quid pro quo: Briggs is given a small strip to accommodate 40 cars.

February 10, 2025
Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati

Olympia Planning Commission

Jackson Ewing
Community Planning and Economic Development

Dear Commission Members and Mr. Ewing:

We are writing as business owners in Briggs Village to provide our perspective regarding the proposed zoning change that would reduce the amount of commercial space in the Briggs Village urban core. It is our understanding that the owner of the remaining undeveloped land in Briggs Village, Mr. Gordie Gill, has asked the City of Olympia to amend the urban village zoning code to allow him to reduce the amount of commercial space and increase the amount of residential space. It is also our understanding that Mr. Gill has commissioned a market study that provides an opinion that commercial development, in particular a grocery store, is not viable in the Briggs Village urban core both because of insufficient nearby population and because the surrounding neighborhoods do not want a store or more commercial options.

We each own a business on the property located at 4528 Maple Lane SE, Olympia, owned by Dr. Andrea Mason. The main building houses Olympia Pediatric Dentistry (Dr. Mason), Humble Cow Ice Cream, Briggs Taphouse, Fit Life Studio, iLash & Esthetics, Amber & Aloe Spray Tan Studio, and Jaymes Paige Hair Studio. Fika Coffee is located in a neighboring building. Our opinion, as business owners who interact with the local neighbors and whose livelihood depends on understanding local demand, is that Briggs Village has enormous unmet demand and will support all types of businesses.

We would have been happy to tell whoever performed the market study for Mr. Gill about the pent-up demand for more commercial activity in the Briggs Village urban core, but nobody asked. We would also have been happy to discuss our views on the commercial potential for Briggs Village with staff from the City analyzing the proposal, but again, nobody asked. Existing businesses provide real-world information about demand, consumer sentiment, and possible obstacles to a proposed plan, so we would like to be involved with future discussions regarding the zoning around our businesses.

While we would each like to learn more about the proposals, we can provide some general comments.

First, the local residents want and will support more businesses, including a grocery store, restaurants, shops, and many others.

Second, the existing businesses want more commercial activity. A large percentage of our clients walk to our businesses – and they often frequent more than one business per visit. It is not unusual for a neighbor to come for a haircut and then go out for pizza; or for a parent to walk their child to the dentist's office and then get an ice cream reward. More businesses will increase this dynamic – "business creates business" is a true phrase.

Third, we support additional residents (i.e., customers!), but parking is an issue that will have to be addressed. Existing businesses already face a parking shortage, and increasing residential space without increasing walkable services will only make the problem worse. There need to be enough businesses here so local residents can choose to go car free if they want.

We chose to locate our businesses in Briggs Village largely because of the promises implied in the zoning and master plan – a walkable neighborhood with a mix of residences and commercial spaces. We do not oppose additional residences, but we would ask that the City keep its promises to the existing businesses and residents of a vibrant commercial urban village core.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Meegan Cronk Name:Meegan Cronk Business: Humble Cow Ice Cream
Levi Hendricks Name:Levi Hendricks Business:Briggs Taphouse
Tessa Effland Name:Tessa Effland Business: Fit Life Studio

Dear Planning Commission members and Jackson Ewing:

I, Brian Faller, am writing in support of the substitute amendments submitted by the Briggs Community. I live in Sten Village, adjacent to Briggs Village, and am one of the four authors of the substitute amendments.

I want to start my comments by asking: What's the problem that Gill's amendments seek to fix?

Gill says that he needs more flexibility to convert commercial space into residential space? Why more residential and less commercial?

First, Gill has no need at this point for more residential units. Jackson Ewing informed me that between 200-300 residential units remain to be built. So there's tons of housing Gill can still build. The recent Jolt article by Jim Lazar contains a graph showing that market rate apartments are not currently undersupplied (vacancy rates are 5%). The real problem is the lack of affordable housing. Our substitute amendments would incentivize Gill to increase affordable apartment units.

Second, why reduce commercial space? Commercial space is essential to having an URBAN VILLAGE—it is the CORE of the shopping and businesses of a walkable urban village. A real grocery store –not a mini mart-- is required to anchor the core. Under OMC 18.05.020, the urban village grocery is to serve not just the immediate Briggs neighborhood but the surrounding neighborhoods.

The 2014 Master Plan sets 94,985 sf as the minimum commercial area to support an urban village. Gill's amendments would reduce that by 45%--to 52,500 sf. However, according to Jackson Ewing, the

Taphouse/Humble Cow/Dentist complex is 16,000 sf. That leaves only a 36,500 sq. ft. minimum. See Table 1 below.

That little required commercial space would gut the commercial core. The city set the commercial minimum at 95,000 sq. ft. for a reason. That was the amount necessary to have successful commercial center. That still remains true.

Gill wants us to believe commercial space doesn't work in Briggs Village. That's pure baloney. The businesses there now are flourishing. The two commercial lots that Gill sold, he sold for multiple times their assessed values. That's real evidence of market demand, not abstract conjecture.

The fact is that over the last 10 years Gill done little if anything to attract retail and office business. He hasn't listed any lots in the MLS; he's provided no evidence he has sought out a real grocery store —not - a mini mart size---or offered any incentive to a grocery like the last owner did (who agreed to pay $8-10 million to build and equip a 25,000 sf store). Gill has a legal obligation under the urban village code and Master Plan to deliver the commercial and a real grocery, and yet there is no evidence has done anything to meet that obligation.

The businesses that finally came to Briggs Village—the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, etc., came despite Gill, not because of him. The lot containing the businesses, the owner was only able to get only after badgering Gill to sell it, and paying the extortionate price of $1m, which is more than 2 times the lot's then assessed value of $412,000. He did an even harsher shakedown of a second buyer who bought the lot just north of that. Gill sold that lot for or $1,445,000, over 4 times the then assessed value of $332,500.

Gill's intransigence to supplying a grocery and commercial is clear bad faith on his part. Instead of incentivizing the grocery and commercial, he's discouraging them by his price gouging. Instead of making a real effort to get a grocery or commercial, he's trying to downsize the grocery and commercial.

The city shouldn't reward Gill for his bad faith by passing his amendments. His amendments would drastically reduce the commercial requirement and would hand him a windfall. If they pass, he could simply turn around and market Briggs Village to another owner at a handsome profit.

More importantly, passing Gill's amendments, would betray the commitment the city made to the people of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods. That commitment was to provide an urban village that would have a commercial core that could met their daily needs within a walkable distance or short drive.

Having said this, we think that there is another way forward that could produce a win-win for all, where the Briggs community gets the village grocery and restaurants and a bakery, Gill gets more residential and less commercial, and the city gets more affordable apartment units.

That's the purpose of our substitute amendments.[1] They create an incentive for Gill to deliver the grocery and the commercial and affordable housing. The amendments incentivize Gill because they would reduce the commercial requirement and increase residential units, but only if Gill *first* actually delivers a real grocery store over

[1] Please note that there is an omission in Alternative Table 5.02 of the Substitute Amendments. Both of the references to "retail/office combined minimum" should include this parenthetical: "(the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)."

10,000 sf and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery. He would also have to commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less, which would provide more affordable housing.

We are certainly open to negotiate the terms of the substitute amendments, but what we do know is that without a real incentive we are unlikely to ever see a real grocery store and a functional commercial center at Briggs Village.

February 24,
Brian Faller
4460 Village Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Table 1 on next page below

Table 1: EFFECT OF GILL PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Metric	Existing requirements.	Gill proposal	Effect
Commercial space minimum (retail (incl grocery) & office and services)	Table 5.02, OMC 18.05.050: no min. 2014 Master Plan: Comm. Min. 94, 985 sq. ft. min.	New Table 5.02 52,500 sq feet min.	Reduces the com. min. from 94,985 to 52,500 sq ft. (45% reduction) Remaining commercial min. is 36,500 sf. after subtracting existing commercial:[2]
Retail min. including grocery	90,750 sq. ft. Retail min. 60,750 sq. ft plus grocery store per Table 5.02[3] 2014 Master Plan:. grocery store 30,000 sq. ft. min.	No retail min. referenced New metric Combined Retail/office-services: 52,500 sq. ft. [4]	Reduces retail min. from 90,750 sq. ft. to 0 sf min. since all 52,500 sq. ft. can be office-services. Remaining combined retail/office min. is 36,500 sq. ft. after subtracting existing commercial:[5]
Office and services combined minimum	Table 5.02 no min. 2014 Master Plan: Office & services 5,000 sq. ft. minimum	No office/service min. references New metric Combined Retail/office services: 52,500 sq. ft.	Reduces office & services min from 5,000 sf to 0 sf (since all 52,500 sq ft can be retail) Remaining combined retail/office is 36,500 sq. ft.

[2] According to the city, the existing parcel with Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, Humble Cow and Briggs Table House, Fit for Life, Fit Life Studio, iLash & Esthetics, Amber & Aloe Spray Tan Studio, Jaymes Paige Hair Studio, and Fika Coffee has 16,000 sq. ft. of commercial.

[3] Table 5.03 provides for a minimum retail of 75 sq. ft. per authorized unit exclusive of the grocery. There are currently 810 authorized units, resulting in a retail minimum of 60,750 sq. ft. plus the grocery store.

[4] Gill's actual proposal is for a 50,000 sq. ft. minimum, but since "combined retail/office & services" is the same as "commercial", the 50,000 minimum would create a conflict with the 52,500 minimum he proposed for commercial and his other "combined retail/office & services" minimum of the same amount . Thus, we assume, Gill meant 52,500 sq. ft.

[5] See note 1 above.

January 21, 2025

Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner
jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

City of Olympia, Planning Commission
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA 98501

Re: Amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 related master planned villages.

I am writing on behalf of the Thurston County Chamber of Commerce to express support for the staff recommendations regarding OMC18.05 related master planned villages and efforts to amend the code that would result in additional housing units to master planned villages, including Briggs Village.

The Thurston Chamber finds that the entire region has a housing crisis. There is a well-documented need for more housing, of all types, across the county. The lack of housing hinders our ability to sustain the local economy and is disproportionately hard on young families. The proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 will directly help address the region's housing crisis and the public's use and interest will be served the proposed changes.

Last June, the Thurston Chamber conducted a statistically valid and reliable survey of 500 registered Thurston County voters. The survey, administered by Elway Research, asked participants to assign a "grade" to community attributes, like you would in school. The survey found that almost 70 percent of participants handed "Housing Affordability" a grade of D or F (1.07 GPA). The Thurston Chamber believes that these survey results demonstrate the overall strength of voter awareness for greater actions that will address our housing crisis and support for growth, development, and additional housing.

The Thurston Chamber of Commerce encourages the Planning Commission to approve the staff recommended changes to OMC 18.05 related to master planned villages. Please contact us by emailing DSchaffert@thurstonchamber.com or calling (360) 357-3362 if you have any questions regarding our support for the resolution. Thank you.

Sincerely

Doug Mah, Director, Public Policy Division

Cc: David Schaffert, President and CEO
Thurston Chamber Board of Trustees

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Culhane <culhane_tom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Olympia Planning Commission consideration of zoning changes at Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments aim to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, specifically as they apply to Briggs Village. If this change were to occur it would strain the parking infrastructure at the Briggs YMCA, which is a tremendous asset to the surrounding community.

The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. Zoning requirements, at that time, also took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable community. This included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial properties.

However, all that would change at Briggs Village under the current proposal to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space. That is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered. The proposed changes would lead to fewer services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on current parking, leading to a less walkable neighborhood. We want to ensure all residents have access to critical services. The changes proposed, would decrease access and lead to development that does not meet our community's needs.

Tom Culhane
1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA

Jackson Ewing

From: PAMELA BAER <pamdabaer@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:37 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

Hello,

I'm writing to voice my concerns regarding possible rezoning the Briggs Village Master Plan thereby increasing the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space.

Since the last residential units went in it's been extremely difficult to procure a parking spot while visiting the Briggs YMCA. When I patronize the Briggs Taphouse or Humble Cow Ice Cream shop it is often hard to find parking for them as well. An increase of residential units would indeed increase pressure on current parking.

Sincerely,

Pamela Baer
YMCA Member

Jackson Ewing

From: Barbara Price <bl.price@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:45 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs

I am writing to object to the proposed zoning changes at Briggs Village. Parking for people who use the YMCA is almost non existent already. They will be forced to cancel classes, etc. This land was donated to the YMCA by the Briggs family and now developers want to destroy it. Please do not approve the zoning change. There is no where for gym members to park.

Jackson Ewing

From: Nancy Prosser <ladybuglaff@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

To Whom It May Concern;

The Briggs YMCA is an integral asset of the community, and reduced parking would severely impact the members. Hundreds of children come to the YMCA for positive social interaction, healthy recreation, and life-skills education, which sets the tone for the rest of their lives, in building self-esteem and a strong foundation for lifelong success.

Reducing parking would be detrimental to many of these children, who may be prohibited from enjoying all the positive experiences that could change the trajectory of their life's journey, to the benefit of all society. Reduced parking (and availability/accessibility) to the facility, will result in many members moving their membership elsewhere, adversely affecting the local economy, and all residents of the community.

The Briggs YMCA creates a sense of community and family among its members and in the surrounding neighborhoods, bringing people closer together in mutual comaraderie, as well as profits to local businesses, a vibrant economy, and a close-knit community.

For the benefit of the community and local economy, I strongly urge you to keep the YMCA parking unchanged, for the sake of the community and all the children.

Thank you,
Nancy Lafferty

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Jackson Ewing

From: Rob Cook <notsoloud@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: File Number: 24-0313 Project Name: Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05)

Good day!

My name is Rob Cook and I have been a resident of Thurston County since 1969. Over that time, I have seen growth, both good and bad and based on my experience with living with outcomes, both as a resident, an HOA President and volunteer I felt obligated to share my concerns.

As you know, the original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure by incorporating access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community.

Zoning requirements took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable community. This included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial properties. This is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

When Briggs was built [1997] and then expanded [2000], decisions were made and approvals granted by the City regarding the parking capacity at the time based on the Briggs Village plan and the grocery store parcel. The 'grocery store' parcel that was designed to be the 'overflow' parking that ensured Briggs Village functioned smoothly.

At present there is often barely any parking available at the Briggs Y and a change in zoning would make it even worse. It seems like this is an opportunity to maintain the existing zoning or at the very least, pursue a compromise that allows the owner to develop but maintain as aspect that allows overflow parking. From an outsider's perspective it appears that the owner may not have the concerns of the community at heart given the present state of this property. Now would be a great opportunity for him to not only make a profit but help the community as well.

Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rob Cook
6026 Braywood Lane SE
Olympia, WA 98513

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Whitaker <tom@greendolphinenterprises.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs YMCA parking vs proposed residential zoning change

As a regular user of the Briggs YMCA facility I am frequently confronted with a lack of parking spaces even though I am often able to adjust my times of attendance. The number of dedicated parking spaces for Y users is woefully inadequate. Street parking is frequently the only option. And that option will disappear as increased residential development fills curbside spaces with cars, trucks, boats, and trailers. I don't think the nearby dental office, coffee and ice cream shops want YMCA patrons parking in their dedicated lots.

The Y is bordered on three sides by streets that provide no parking spaces. I think that the nearest public parking is at Pioneer Park which is close to ½ mile south of the Y. I'm unsure if parking the small park on the western edge of existing residences is considered to be public parking. But even it is about ¼ mile distant.

Briggs is a valuable and heavily use public facility in need of at least 50 additional dedicated parking spaces. Would it not be possible for the property developer to cede a strip of land immediately north of the Y parking lot to add very much needed additional parking spaces in exchange for their proposed requested rezone?

Thomas Whitaker
2925 Boundary St SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Sherri Barrett <kikismama7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:21 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

It is already so difficult to park at Briggs YMCA, especially if you have a mobility issue. I used to go to Cindy Foley's water aerobics classes at 9 am on Monday, Wednesday, Friday; but had to stop because the parking lot would totally fill up and there would be multiple cars circling the parking lot to find a spot. If I could walk well, I would park on the street further out, but have knee arthritis which make walking any incline, stairs, or distances impossible for me for the past 34 years (yes I had worn off all my kneecap cartilage by age 29).. So I stopped going to the classes when people started getting aggressive to get the spot that just opened up because I feared an accident. So now I go in the early afternoon during the week and today at 1:15 pm on a Monday, the parking lot was completely full so I had to resume circling the parking lot and it took about 10 minutes to find a spot. I have already looked into taking the bus or using a Dial-a-Lift while using my motorized scooter, but it adds so much time and the bus service to this location is not frequent. It is frequent near my home on the westside. Due to my arthritis, working out in the water is my only option to get cardiopulmonary exercise. If I don't I get pneumonia and this has happened mulitiple times. I credit the YMCA with extending my life and helping me survive COVID. I know that many people doing water aerobics are like me, dependent on working out in the water to maintain health. Please do not make it more difficult to park at the YMCA, It will cut off access for vulnerable people in our community.

Sherri Barrett

Jackson Ewing

From: Gayle T. Bonnett <bonnegt@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:54 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning Amendments to Briggs Village

Jackson Ewing, Lead Planner

I am strongly opposed to the zoning amendment increasing the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in Briggs Village.

I'm a 30 plus year resident of southeast Olympia and presently go to the Briggs YWCA three or more times a week. It is too far for me to walk, I no longer ride a bike, the bus schedules don't work, so I need to drive my car and park in the Y's parking lot. Even with trying to schedule my Y trips at the lower parking volume times, the parking lot and adjacent side streets have very limited parking available.

Parking in Brigg Village is a limited and needs to be increased, not reduced through the proposed amendment. If residential units are increased, additional parking requirement of two to three parking spaces per unit need to be included in the Building and Zoning requirements.

Thank you,

Gayle Bonnett

Jackson Ewing

From: Michelle Gipson <gipsonm@ssymca.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 3:58 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Subject: Opposition to Proposed Zoning Amendments to the Urban Village Zone, OMC 18.05

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am Michelle, a staff member of the South Sound YMCA located in Briggs Village. I am writing to express our opposition to the proposed zoning amendments to the Urban Village Zone, OMC 18.05.

While we understand and support the need for more housing, it is crucial that development does not come at the cost of necessary commercial services. We urge the Planning Commission to consider a balanced approach that accommodates both residential growth and the needs of commercial entities that serve this community. Additionally, placing commercial and housing near each other to reduce car travel and encourage walking/biking aligns with the original intent of Briggs Village.

Our community is already grappling with woefully limited parking. The proposed zoning amendments to increase residential density without expanding parking facilities will exacerbate these challenges.

Thank you for considering our position.

Sincerely,

Michelle Gipson

Jackson Ewing

From: Paula Moore <moore_paula@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:12 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning Concerns

I write about the zoning changes for Briggs Village. I am a member of the YMCA. I also a resident of the Pioneer Elementary school catchment area. I have two concerns about the possible changes to the development.

Impact to Briggs YMCA
I am concerned that the design changes will limit parking and access to the Briggs YMCA. Briggs is the ONLY swimming pool gym in the City of Olympia. Evergreen, Discover Aquatics, and Tumwater Valley are all outside of City Limits. Additionally, the YMCA provides financial assistance for families, so the Briggs is affordable. Reducing the parking means that the pool will be used more by people nearby and less by the broader community. It is unreadable to assume a parent of young children can navigate the bus from across town for a 30 min swim lesson. They need parking. Preserve it. We live near water and it's important families can access swim lessons.

Pioneer Catchment Area Needs More Family Apartments
Pioneer has more capacity for children. It has one of the lowest family apartment counts in the school district. The two family apartment complexes in Briggs Village are popular. I've been glad to see more types of family housing feed into Pioneer. Build more of it. Locating family apartments in Briggs Village makes sense. It brings economic diversity to Pioneer, Washington, and Olympia HS. Kids can access the YMCA. Kids can access Kettle View Park. Kids can bike over to Pioneer, Washington, and OHS and the playgrounds and friends in the area. It's designed for families. Build more 2 and 3 bedroom apartments with parking.

Thank you for your time.

Paula Moore
360-489-7147

Jackson Ewing

From: Toni Weaver <weaveroly@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:24 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Zoning changes in Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

PLEASE no zoning changes in Briggs Village. Take a look at all the apartments and the new condo building that have built up there, with no commercial businesses to support them. We need grocery stores, restaurants, whatever to entice these people to shop in their own neighborhoods and they will need parking spaces to provide that interest and loyalty. Please listen to what the voters in that area are asking for and provide what they would need.

Toni Weaver
1520 Palomino Dr SE, Unit 222
Olympia 98501
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Sara Larsen <sllenssen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:49 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village zoning comments

I have some concerns about the proposal to change the zoning codes for the Briggs Urban Village.

With the infrastructure as it is, the impact of so many new dwellings would be challenging. Already several of the intersections can be difficult to navigate particularly as a pedestrian at certain times of day. As I understand the urban village concept, one of the goals is to create walkable communities with elements such as businesses and grocery stores within the community. With two senior housing developments on the corner in addition to numerous apartments already in the urban village, having a real grocery store rather than a mini mart seems like a wise choice.

Although I understand that trying to plan ahead necessitates anticipating growth, it seems like the 5 current apartment complexes are usually advertising as now leasing. I wonder if there really is a need for that many additional units. It doesn't seem like the site could realistically handle the increased number of vehicles that would result from increasing the number of apartments. Adding additional units of apartments seems like it would likely exacerbate an already crowded parking situation as well.

Just creating higher density does not make an urban village. Although I was originally somewhat skeptical about the urban village plan, seeing neighbors walking to Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, and the coffee shops has convinced me that the original plan was a good idea. Adding a grocery store would further the ideal of creating a walkable community. Please keep our community walkable by not crowding in too many housing units.

Sara Larsen
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Jeanne Miller <jamiller_studio@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: proposed amendments to Briggs Development Plan

Dear Mr. Ewing,

I am against changing the original Briggs Village Master Plan. Increasing the number of residential units in Briggs Village would not only increase traffic and exacerbate existing parking problems, but it would also put a strain on our already overburdened schools. Instead of more housing, the "village" badly needs a grocery store. Alterations to the original plan should NOT be allowed.

Thank you.

Jeanne Miller

1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Kuba Bednarek <bednarej@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I would like to comment on proposed amendments to Briggs Village plan.
Please prioritize housing. Please building more housing for people; less housing for cars. Please prioritze a grocery store and work with local grocers to vill the space (i.e. Food Co-op, Spuds, Jays farmstand).
Please also include mixed use spaces by including commercial space build under housing.

Thanks kindly,
Jakub Bednarek
Olympia WA SE neighborhood.

Review of Briggs Village

Commercial Market Demand Study

by Brian Faller, J.D., M.A.

February 22, 2025

My name is Brian Faller. I live at 4460 Village Dr. SE, Olympia, WA.

I am retired attorney. I retired in 2020, after having practice law for over 35 years. I have extensive experience critically reviewing expert quantitative reports and appraisals, including income capitalization studies and comparative sales studies which are similar to the demand analysis performed here. I estimate I have critiqued over 80 expert quantitative reports, including about 30 appraisals during my career, assisted in preparing at least 30 expert reports with quantitative analysis, and have deposed or cross-examined at least thirty experts on matters including quantitative analysis. Two examples of my work: As lead council for the City of Seattle, I worked extensively on appraisals with MAI appraisers for open space condemnations, I also work extensively with a claims expert critically reviewing over 50 complex outage loss claims resulting from a 3-day outage in downtown Seattle. As lead council for the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, I worked extensively with two leading forest economists preparing expert reports and cross-examined opposing forest economists on matters involving complex quantitative analysis regarding the economic production of over 2 million acres of state forest land.

MAJOR CREDIBILITY PROBLEMS WITH THE MARKET STUDY

The author of the market study is anonymous. At no place in the study is the person or persons who authored the study identified or their qualifications stated.[1] Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the author(s) to

[1] The only clue to its authorship is a reference to an acronym on the bottom of page 17, "CAI interviewed…". I googled this acronym and found that CAI may represent the Community Associations Institute, a large umbrella organization, which has no market studies publicized on their website. Nor does their site mention market analyses as a regular product.

answer questions, correct errors, and supply missing data. That is especially important here because the study did not provide any of the excel spreadsheets or other data showing the data and basis of the calculations.

In my 35 years practicing law reviewing expert reports, I have never seen a report that does not identify the author. No court or tribunal would ever accept an "anonymous" study, and the Planning Commission and City should do not do so.

I enlisted the assistance of Mike Ruth, a former lead trainer for ESRI who provided trainings around the world, and who is now a Professor at Evergreen State College, teaching GIS. I asked him to replicate the market study tables and he was unable to do so—he was able to replicate the population analysis, and it in fact showed that the figures ESRI produced came from American Community Survey (ACS) 2018-2022, which was not disclosed by the study. Such data would most likely not include all of the additional population that moved into Briggs Village late in 2022 or afterward. Mike said that had he been able to contact the author, he probably could likely have replicated the ESRI data runs if they were done properly and checked the study's modeling and assumptions.

The single real estate broker consulted is anonymous and his/her statements indicate a lack of knowledge of Briggs Village. The study (p. 18) says a broker was contacted but does not identify the person and their qualifications. Anonymity does not allow one to assess the broker's knowledge of the market, credibility, or contact them to confirm information. The study says the broker stated that because a Briggs Grocery would not be visible from Yelm Hwy, Briggs Village would not be a suitable location. That opinion is contradicted by numerous local groceries. The Hagens on the west-side is not visible from Cooper Point or Black Lake. The Trader Joe's on Black Lake is tucked away in a corner. The Tumwater Safeway is not visible from Capital Way, QFC and Safeway in Lacey are not visible on Yelm Hwy, the Walmart on Yelm Hwy in Lacey has limited visibility and requires one to drive about 3 blocks out of the way to enter, etc.

The "stakeholders" consulted are anonymous and appear to lack actual knowledge of the appeal of the Briggs Village site. The study (p. 18) discusses comments from "stakeholders," but provides no information who they are and why they are stakeholders. Their comments are subjective conclusions without supporting data. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the commenters.

The study states (p. 18) that the anonymous "stakeholders" said that the Briggs Village site has "low gravity" or attraction to customers. That unsubstantiated conclusion is inconsistent with a number of facts, the study fails to mentioned: The businesses at and immediately adjacent to Briggs Village are doing a brisk trade: including, the Starbucks, the Briggs Taphouse, Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, and the Humble Cow. Further, the conclusion does not take account of the high traffic from Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs Y Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekends. The "stakeholders" comments about the "low gravity" of the Briggs site seem uninformed.

Several aspects of the study suggest a bias towards the conclusions that the developer wants it to reach. The study author does that disclose that he/she knows that his client, the developer, is seeking the city's approval to lower the size of the grocery store size at Briggs Village and the overall size of the commercial. However, the study indicates that the study author was given a copy of the City's applications to change the commercial and grocery requirements due to fact that author referred to numbers only available from the applications. For example, on page 3, the author erroneously stated "A range of 1,500 to 12,000 square feet is allocated for a grocery store." These numbers are not the existing requirements,[2] but changes to the Master Plan the developer seeks.[3] .

The discussion below also highlights a number of unreasonable assumptions, obvious omissions, and failures to provide data, that in my opinion the author should have directly addressed, if he/she were seeking to be objective.

[2] The current 2014 Master Plan states that the grocery must a minimum of 30,000 sf and a maximum of 35,000 sf.

[3] Similarly, on page 25, the study erroneously states: "Briggs Village is slated for a total of 1250 residential units." Currently, the 2014 Master Plan states the unit number is 801. The 1250 units are what the developer is requesting that the city approve.

THE MARKET STUDY'S GROCERY GAP ANALYSIS (Exhibit 12, & p. 20) IS FLAWED.

1. **The market study did not validate the use of a five-minute drive radius from some undefined point in Briggs Village to define the "Briggs Village Trade Area" (BVTA) as a trustworthy tool.**

Selection of a five-minute drive to define the BVTA (with correction) appears arbitrary and may significantly distort the supply-demand gap. This can be seen by looking at the gaps between supply and demand resulting using three, four, and six minute drives to define the BVTA.

For 3 and 4 minutes, the Tumwater Safeway would fall outside of the BVTA and the only grocery would be the three mini-marts, which we estimate to have annual sales of $1,500,000. To calculate the supply-demand gap in a three or four minute drive BVTA, you subtract the sales from the food-beverage spending. Since we don't know the spending in three and four minute minutes, we can reasonable estimate it since the 3 minute population is 26% of the 5 minute population (Ex. 11 of study). 26% of $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) is $11,091,600 (3-minute spending estimate). $11,091,600 spending minus 1,500,000 sales is $9,591,600 (demand gap), nearly double the study's 5 minute BVTA estimated demand gap of $5,570,000. According to the grocery store size metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the 3-4 minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 19,183 sf.*

A six-minute BVTA would add a number of neighborhoods to BVTA. We don't have actual data for 6-minute BVTA spending and sales. However, they can reasonably be estimated. The 6 minute BVTA created by Mike Ruth https://arcg.is/iTmv10 (see also figure 1 after last page) shows two new stores in the trade area: Spuds, Ramirez Mexican Home which ESRI shows to have a collective sales of $961,000. So the estimate 6 minute grocery sales is $37,035,000 (5 minute) plus $961,000 = $37,996,000. Six minute spending can be estimated by increasing the 5-minute spending proportionate to the population increase from 5 to 6 minute BVTA. Population increases from 12,904 to 16,770, a 30% increase.[4] Thus, the six minute spending is estimated to be 1.30 x $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) = $60,658,000. $60,658,000 spending minus $37,996,000 sales = $22,662,000 demand gap. According to the grocery store size

[4] See attached excel spreadsheet.

metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the six-minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 45,324 sf.*

Here's a summary of the differences in selecting a 3-4, 5, and 6 minute drive time for the BVTA.

	Demand Gap $	Size of Grocery store supported
3-4 minute BVTA	$9,591,000	*19,183 sf*
5 minute BVTA	$5,570,000	11,200 sf
6 minute BVTA	$22,662,000	*45,324 sf*

The wide range of demand gaps and store sizes for the BVTAs based on three/four, five, and six minutes shows that a valid analysis should have looked at a range of trade area sizes to determine the size that would best reflect market demand.

Even if a five-minute BVTA were defensible here, the assumption that none of the Safeway sales would transfer to the BVTA is unreasonable and invalidates the gap analysis.

The assumption of no transfer to Briggs is contrary to any reasonable view of the facts.

Strong evidence exists that given a choice, a large number of residents in Briggs Village and surrounding neighborhoods, would prefer to shop close to or within a walkable distance. The gap analysis did not give weight to the large walkable population *immediately* around Briggs Center: five large multi-building complexes (Parkview Apartments (72 units), Briggs Village Apartments (72 units), Copper Leaf Residences (92 family units), Silver Leaf Residences (200 senior units); the Village Cooperative (67 upscale condo units), and the hundreds of town homes and detached homes in Briggs Village.

Further, the assumption that no traffic at Safeway would transfer to Briggs does not take account of the high traffic at Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs Y Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekends. It is reasonable to expect that many Y users would transfer some shopping to the more convenient Briggs grocery

The assumption also did not give weight to the fact that hundreds of people in the surrounding neighborhoods now walk from their homes to the YMCA, and to Starbucks, the Briggs Tap Room, the Humble Cow, and the other businesses at that site. Those neighborhoods include, the Farm, Orvas Court, Sten Village, the Cove, Holiday Hills, Brigadoon, and the Tumwater neighborhoods just northwest of Briggs Village.

The assumption did not give any weight to the fact that the Starbucks across from the YMCA was an instant success upon opening (including transfer sales from other Starbucks). It also did not consider the thriving businesses in Briggs Village (the Starbucks grange, the dentist, the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow), which draw people into the village and to each other's businesses.

All of these indicate that a significant likelihood that the residents in the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods would transfer a significant amount of their grocery purchases from the Safeway to the Briggs Village grocery if the Briggs Village grocery carried a full range of items commonly used for meal preparation. If the gap analysis were conservatively corrected to assume that residents of BVTA would shift just 10% of their grocery shopping ($3,600,000) from Safeway (@36,000,00 sales) to the Briggs Village grocery, the five-minute BVTA gap would be $9,170,000, not the $5.57 million presented in the market study. Thus, if this erroneous assumption is corrected by assuming a conservative 10% transfer of business, *the five-minute BVTA under the $500/sf metric would potentially support a grocery store of 18,340 sf.*

2. **Population estimate in the gap analysis did not consider people in Briggs Village, including those who moved in late 2022 and the over 1,000,000 new residents who will likely be added to Briggs Village if the currently unbuilt and proposed units and homes are constructed.**

The market study identifies the source of the five-minute BVTA population of 12,904 as the "ESRI Business Analyst, 2023; Community Attributes, 2023." However, the study does not supply the actual data as an appendix and it does not state how or when the ESRI data was collected. Mike Ruth an GIS and ESRI specialist model the 5 minute drive time population, and his results agree with

demand study. However, he found that the source for the population was the American Community Survey 2018-2020 estimate.[5]

My AI research indicates that ACS surveys do not specifically track housing starts or occupancy permits. Thus it seems it unlikely that any of the population of the new large complexes (Copper Leaf (96 family units), Silver Leaf (192 senior units), and the Village Cooperative (63 senior upscale condos)), and six new duplexes behind Cooper Leaf were included in the 12,904 figure. If they were not included, that would miss up to 450-500 persons who would be within a short easily walkable distance from the Village center, increasing market demand by about 3.5-3.8%. The market study author did not address that issue or provide any information about the specific datas or sources of his population data.

Further even if the population data were accurate to some point in time in 2023, it would still miss the hundreds of additional residents that would occupy the hundreds of units in Briggs Village yet to be built. Of the 810 units that are now permitted, about 200 -300 units have not yet been built. The developer has requested the city to add 440 more units. Built-out of the 30 Briggs West single homes would add between 70-90 people. These new units and homes could collectively add more than 1,000,000 new people to Briggs Village, who would frequent the businesses at the Briggs center. One thousand new residents who live at Briggs Village, would increase the BVTA demand by about 7.8%.

Cumulatively, the population additions discussed above could increase demand at Briggs Village by 7.8% to 11.3%. These increases would result in respective supply-demand grocery gaps of $8,893,130 and $10,384,365, which would support grocery stores of 17,786 sf and 20,768 sf.

ACS Population Summary

Briggs Village Drive Times
Town Square Ln SE, Olympia, Washington, 98501
Drive time: 5, 6 minute radii
Latitude: 47.00667
Longitude: -122.88203

	5 minutes				
		2018-2022 ACS Estimate	Percent	MOE(±)	Reliability
	TOTALS				
	Total Population	12,899		843	
	Total Households	4,707		266	
	Total Housing Units	4,940		266	
	POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT				

3. **Combining corrections from the erroneous assumption of no transfer and the missing population, results in a much larger grocery store.**

	Correction amount $	SF of grocery
No transfer correction	**3,547,000**	
Pop. correction	**3,123,000 – 4,714,000**	
5 minute demand	**5,570,000**	
Total corrected demand	**12,240,000 – 13,831,000**	**24,480 - -27,662**

.

Jackson Ewing

From: Kuba Bednarek <bednarej@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I would like to comment on proposed amendments to Briggs Village plan.
Please prioritize housing. Please building more housing for people; less housing for cars. Please prioritze a grocery store and work with local grocers to vill the space (i.e. Food Co-op, Spuds, Jays farmstand).
Please also include mixed use spaces by including commercial space build under housing.

Thanks kindly,
Jakub Bednarek
Olympia WA SE neighborhood.

Jackson Ewing

From: Craig Adair <dcadair@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:13 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: File: 24-0313 Community Planning and Development

Jackson,

My wife and I wish to submit the following input prior to the public hearing tonight regarding housing and commercial development in Briggs Village:

We read about Briggs Village around 2000, and we liked the idea of single and multifamily residences along with commercial development including a grocery store. We moved from the Steamboat area to Briggs Village in early 2010 as we prepared for retirement. We retired in 2014 and 2015 and live in a single-family home. We will soon be 78 and 76 years old and our next move may be to a Briggs Village apartment. A grocery store within short walking distance was part of our retirement plan and it has not happened yet. Gordie may be the third Briggs developer since 2010, and all developers have said that moving forward has been hampered by the Olympia Planning Commission. We hope that this is not true. In closing, we want the developer and the city to know that people make life decisions based on what they think is reasonable information. We hope that we won't have to alter our plans.

Sincerely,
Lynne & Craig Adair
1508 Brighton Way SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Hillary Harper <hmharp2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

Good afternoon,

I am writing as a citizen and home owner in area of Yelm and Henderson to respectfully request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

As I write this, I am listening to the emergency response of yet another accident at Yelm and Henderson. The irresponsible growth without an infrastructure increase has led to dangerous and reckless driving and an unsafe pedestrian environment in the area of schools. Please consider other impacts of packing in thousands more apartment units on traffic, safety, schools and the environment.

Thank you,

Hillary M. Harper

Jackson Ewing

From: Rose Curtis <s.rose.curtis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:04 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Please support new businesses and parking

Dear Olympia Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my support for maintaining the current Briggs Village Master Plan, ensuring space for a neighborhood grocery store, adequate parking for the YMCA, and a traffic signal at Henderson Blvd SE and Orchard Lane SE to improve safety at this busy intersection.

I acknowledge the current real estate market's demand for increased residential development. However, rather than reducing commercial space, a mixed-use approach—integrating residential units above commercial spaces like a grocery store—would allow for both necessary housing growth and essential community services. This strategy aligns with the original Urban Village vision, ensuring that commercial spaces remain viable while meeting residential needs.

Concerns with the Proposed Zoning Amendments

As being discussed in the Olympia Planning Commission's Feb. 24 agenda, the proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 would:

- Remove the requirement for a set amount of commercial space per residential unit.
- Increase multifamily housing allowances and remove density limits.
- Allow more residential units while decreasing space for essential businesses like grocery stores.

While these changes aim to support housing, they risk eliminating vital services and increasing parking strain, particularly for community spaces like the YMCA, which already faces parking limitations.

Why a Grocery Store and adequate Parking Are Essential for Briggs Village

- Briggs Village is in a food desert. Reducing commercial space could eliminate the possibility of a grocery store, making it even harder for residents to access fresh food.
- Mixed-use development (grocery below, residential above) ensures commercial viability while addressing housing needs.
- Parking constraints for the YMCA will worsen if commercial and residential growth isn't balanced properly.

Safety Concern: Traffic Signal at Henderson & Orchard Lane SE

Additionally, I strongly urge the city to prioritize a traffic signal at Henderson Blvd SE and Orchard Lane SE. This intersection is currently hazardous for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers, and increased residential density will only amplify safety risks.

Preserving the Original Urban Village Vision

The original Briggs Village Master Plan was thoughtfully designed to balance housing, businesses, green spaces, and walkability. I ask that the council:

1. Preserve space for a grocery store through mixed-use zoning rather than reducing commercial space.
2. Ensure adequate parking for the YMCA and other community services.
3. Implement a traffic signal at Henderson & Orchard Lane SE for improved safety.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate your commitment to making thoughtful planning decisions that serve both current and future community needs.

Best Regards,

Samantha Curtis

Briggs Denizen

Jackson Ewing

From: Irina Razvina <irina.razvina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:35 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Urban Village zoning and Briggs Village Master Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a concerned resident contacting you regarding Briggs Village Master Plan and Urban Village zoning. Just a couple of Saturdays ago I went to patron a business in the Briggs Village area. Not only was it extremely difficult to find parking, it was actually quite difficult to drive down one of the streets in that area because there were so many cars parked on the side of the road, making two-way traffic virtually impossible. I visited another business in the Briggs Village area late on a Monday morning, and had the same issue -- too many cars, not nearly enough parking, hard to even drive down side streets in the area. As a long-term resident of Thurston County, and having now lived in this area of Thurston County for 8 years, I am extremely concerned about the proposal to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages. I do not believe we currently have enough infrastructure to support all the residents in this area, and increasing the number of residential units allowed will only make the problem worse.

Respectfully,

Irina Razvina
(360) 791-9813

Jackson Ewing

From: Mattie Sobotka <mattiesobotka@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:45 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: YMCA Community Re-zoning

Hello,

I have become aware that there are **proposed zoning changes to the neighborhood surrounding the YMCA Briggs community. I strongly encourage you to NOT reszone this area** to include more residential space and instead leave it under the current zoning plan.

The original plan is exactly what is needed in our Thurston County communities. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. This is how humans are supposed to live, connected to community and connected to each other.

I understand there are housing pressures in Thurston County, but removing the few examples we have of good communities is not the way to do it. **Please do not rezone this area.**

Thank you for your time,
-Mattie Sobotka

Jackson Ewing

From: Barbara Putnam <barbara.putnam7@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 6:47 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking Challenges at Briggs

I am writing you with my concerns that the current city plans to increase housing without increasing parking is going to be too difficult for current businesses and people living in the area to find viable parking.

It already takes us a long time to find parking without an increase in housing. I go to the Briggs YMCA several times a week. It is a critical part of keeping my health in old age. Do NOT increase housing with adequate additional parking as a requirement. We are already pretty pushed.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Barb Putnam
1226 Devon Loop NE
Olympia, WA. 98506

Jackson Ewing

From: Mandy Weeks <mandyweeks@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:28 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village Zoning

Dear Olympia Planning Commission,

I understand the Olympia Planning Commission is considering zoning changes in Briggs Village that will lead to INCREASED PARKING DIFFICULTIES and will limit access to services including the Y. The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an “urban village” with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business & residents with regard to infrastructure. I love this structure, but even now parking if difficult during busy time.

The Y is critical to the neighborhood, providing a space for activities for all neighbors. Your plan will lead to fewer services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on current parking, leading to a less walkable neighborhood and less of a neighborhood with activities for all neighbors.

Thank you,

Mandy Weeks-Green
YMCA Member and Olympia Resident

esri
THE SCIENCE OF WHERE®

ACS Population Summary

Briggs Village Drive Times
Town Square Ln SE, Olympia, Washington, 98501
Drive time: 5, 6 minute radii
Latitude: 47.00667
Longitude: -122.88203

		5 minutes
		2018-2022
		ACS Estimate
	TOTALS	
	Total Population	12,899
	Total Households	4,707
	Total Housing Units	4,940
	POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	
	Total	12,521
	Enrolled in school	3,533
	Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	204
	Public school	69
	Private school	135
	Enrolled in kindergarten	119
	Public school	83
	Private school	36
	Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	794
	Public school	765
	Private school	30
	Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	845
	Public school	794
	Private school	50
	Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	882
	Public school	882
	Private school	1
	Enrolled in college undergraduate years	517
	Public school	453
	Private school	64
	Enrolled in graduate or professional school	171
	Public school	74

	Private school	97
	Not enrolled in school	8,988

		5 minutes
	POPULATION AGE 65+ BY RELATIONSHIP AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Total	2,176
	Living in Households	2,146
	Living in Family Households	1,600
	Householder	726
	Spouse	602
	Parent	174
	Parent-in-law	10
	Other Relative	63
	Nonrelative	25
	Living in Nonfamily Households	546
	Householder	489
	Nonrelative	57
	Living in Group Quarters	30

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE AND SIZE	
	Family Households	3,380
	2-Person	1,235
	3-Person	969
	4-Person	719
	5-Person	342
	6-Person	60
	7+ Person	55
	Nonfamily Households	1,327
	1-Person	1,005
	2-Person	239
	3-Person	81
	4-Person	2
	5-Person	0
	6-Person	0
	7+ Person	0
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE UNDER 18 YEARS BY	
	HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Households with one or more people under 18 years	1,824
	Family households	1,824
	Married-couple family	1,195
	Male householder, no wife present	200
	Female householder, no husband present	430

	Nonfamily households	0
	Households with no people under 18 years	2,882
	Married-couple family	1,381
	Other family	174
	Nonfamily households	1,327
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE 65 YEARS AND OVER,	
	HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
	Households with Pop 65+	1,423
	1-Person	434
	2+ Person Family	929
	2+ Person Nonfamily	59
	Households with No Pop 65+	3,284
	1-Person	571
	2+ Person Family	2,450
	2+ Person Nonfamily	263

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLD TYPE BY RELATIVES AND NONRELATIVES FOR POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS	
	POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS	
	Total	12,859
	In Family Households	11,061
	In Married-Couple Family	8,343
	Relatives	8,265
	Nonrelatives	78
	In Male Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	884
	Relatives	723
	Nonrelatives	160
	In Female Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	1,835
	Relatives	1,747
	Nonrelatives	88
	In Nonfamily Households	1,798

		5 minutes
	POPULATION AGE 5+ YEARS BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	
	AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH	
	Total	12,208
	5 to 17 years	
	Speak only English	2,304
	Speak Spanish	160
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	151
	Speak English "not well"	10
	Speak English "not at all"	0

	Speak other Indo-European languages	76
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	76
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	129
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	129
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	18 to 64 years	
	Speak only English	6,542
	Speak Spanish	179
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	171
	Speak English "not well"	8
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other Indo-European languages	190
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	190
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	452
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	399
	Speak English "not well"	53
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	65 years and over	
	Speak only English	2,030
	Speak Spanish	83
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	83
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak other Indo-European languages	30
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	30
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0
	Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	32
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	20
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	12

	Speak other languages	0
	Speak English "very well" or "well"	0
	Speak English "not well"	0
	Speak English "not at all"	0

		5 minutes
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY PLACE OF WORK	
	Total	5,855
	Worked in state and in county of residence	4,827
	Worked in state and outside county of residence	1,028
	Worked outside state of residence	0

		5 minutes
	SEX BY CLASS OF WORKER FOR THE CIVILIAN EMPLOYED POPULATION 16 YEARS	
	AND OVER	
	Total:	5,972
	Male:	2,992
	Employee of private company workers	1,547
	Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	156
	Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	192
	Local government workers	253
	State government workers	529
	Federal government workers	144
	Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	164
	Unpaid family workers	7
	Female:	2,979
	Employee of private company workers	1,056
	Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	73
	Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	387
	Local government workers	401
	State government workers	808
	Federal government workers	61
	Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	186
	Unpaid family workers	7

		5 minutes
	POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS AND PRESENCE OF A COMPUTER	
	Total	12,859
	Population <18 in Households	3,358
	Have a Computer	3,340
	Have NO Computer	18
	Population 18-64 in Households	7,355

	Have a Computer	7,321
	Have NO Computer	34
	Population 65+ in Households	2,146
	Have a Computer	2,072
	Have NO Computer	74

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS AND INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS	
	Total	4,707
	With an Internet Subscription	4,543
	Dial-Up Alone	6
	Broadband	4,271
	Satellite Service	90
	Other Service	25
	Internet Access with no Subscription	80
	With No Internet Access	85

		5 minutes
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION	
	TO WORK	
	Total	5,855
	Drove alone	3,793
	Carpooled	486
	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	123
	Bus or trolley bus	27
	Light rail, streetcar or trolley	0
	Subway or elevated	34
	Long-distance/Commuter Train	21
	Ferryboat	41
	Taxicab	0
	Motorcycle	44
	Bicycle	35
	Walked	68
	Other means	87
	Worked at home	1,218
	WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS (WHO DID NOT WORK FROM HOME)	
	BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK	
	Total	4,637
	Less than 5 minutes	134
	5 to 9 minutes	462
	10 to 14 minutes	1,267

	15 to 19 minutes	887
	20 to 24 minutes	510
	25 to 29 minutes	185
	30 to 34 minutes	383
	35 to 39 minutes	112
	40 to 44 minutes	215
	45 to 59 minutes	176
	60 to 89 minutes	128
	90 or more minutes	179
	Average Travel Time to Work (in minutes)	

		5 minutes
	FEMALES AGE 20-64 YEARS BY AGE OF OWN CHILDREN AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
	Total	3,743
	Own children under 6 years only	235
	In labor force	204
	Not in labor force	31
	Own children under 6 years and 6 to 17 years	141
	In labor force	112
	Not in labor force	29
	Own children 6 to 17 years only	1,263
	In labor force	981
	Not in labor force	281
	No own children under 18 years	2,104
	In labor force	1,722
	Not in labor force	383

		5 minutes
	CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION BY AGE & TYPES OHEALINSURANCE	
	OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE	
	Total	12,778
	Under 19 years:	3,543
	One Type of Health Insurance:	3,379
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,972
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	36
	Medicare Coverage Only	0
	Medicaid Coverage Only	924
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	447
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	154
	No Health Insurance Coverage	10
	19 to 34 years:	1,982

	One Type of Health Insurance:	1,630
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,064
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	145
	Medicare Coverage Only	5
	Medicaid Coverage Only	384
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	32
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	224
	No Health Insurance Coverage	128
	35 to 64 years:	5,095
	One Type of Health Insurance:	4,315
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	3,247
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	288
	Medicare Coverage Only	50
	Medicaid Coverage Only	535
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	190
	VA Health Care Only	6
	2+ Types of Health Insurance	428
	No Health Insurance Coverage	351
	65+ years:	2,159
	One Type of Health Insurance:	607
	Employer-Based Health Ins Only	69
	Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	0
	Medicare Coverage Only	538
	TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	0
	VA Health Care Only	0
	2+ Types of Health Insurance:	1,551
	Employer-Based & Direct-Purchase Health Insurance	18
	Employer-Based Health & Medicare Insurance	643
	Direct-Purchase Health & Medicare Insurance	346
	Medicare & Medicaid Coverage	55
	Other Private Health Insurance Combos	0
	Other Public Health Insurance Combos	0
	Other Health Insurance Combinations	488
	No Health Insurance Coverage	0

		5 minutes
	POPULATION BY RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL	
	Total	12,854
	Under .50	331
	.50 to .99	512
	1.00 to 1.24	83
	1.25 to 1.49	106
	1.50 to 1.84	828

	1.85 to 1.99	69
	2.00 and over	10,925

		5 minutes
	CIVILIAN POPULATION AGE 18 OR OLDER BY VETERAN STATUS	
	Total	9,438
	Veteran	956
	Nonveteran	8,482
	Male	4,495
	Veteran	807
	Nonveteran	3,688
	Female	4,943
	Veteran	149
	Nonveteran	4,794
	CIVILIAN VETERANS AGE 18 OR OLDER BY PERIOD OF	
	MILITARY SERVICE	
	Total	955
	Gulf War (9/01 or later), no Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	214
	Gulf War (9/01 or later) and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	81
	Gulf War (9/01 or later), and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), and Vietnam Era	20
	Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	137
	Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01) and Vietnam Era	32
	Vietnam Era, no Korean War, no World War II	291
	Vietnam Era and Korean War, no World War II	0
	Vietnam Era and Korean War and World War II	0
	Korean War, no Vietnam Era, no World War II	38
	Korean War and World War II, no Vietnam Era	0
	World War II, no Korean War, no Vietnam Era	0
	Between Gulf War and Vietnam Era only	97
	Between Vietnam Era and Korean War only	46
	Between Korean War and World War II only	0
	Pre-World War II only	0

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY POVERTY STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	Income in the past 12 months below poverty level	226
	Married-couple family	43

	Other family - male householder (no wife present)	102
	Other family - female householder (no husband present)	25
	Nonfamily household - male householder	47
	Nonfamily household - female householder	9
	Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level	4,481
	Married-couple family	2,533
	Other family - male householder (no wife present)	141
	Other family - female householder (no husband present)	535
	Nonfamily household - male householder	483
	Nonfamily household - female householder	788
	Poverty Index	39

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY OTHER INCOME	
	Social Security Income	1,429
	No Social Security Income	3,278
	Retirement Income	1,520
	No Retirement Income	3,187

		5 minutes
	GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN	
	THE PAST 12 MONTHS	
	<10% of Income	21
	10-14.9% of Income	128
	15-19.9% of Income	132
	20-24.9% of Income	292
	25-29.9% of Income	166
	30-34.9% of Income	101
	35-39.9% of Income	68
	40-49.9% of Income	169
	50+% of Income	493
	Gross Rent % Inc Not Computed	27

		5 minutes
	HOUSEHOLDS BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE INCOME IN THE PAST	
	12 MONTHS	
	Total	4,707
	With public assistance income	44
	No public assistance income	4,663
	HOUSEHOLDS BY FOOD STAMPS/SNAP STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	With Food Stamps/SNAP	302

	With No Food Stamps/SNAP	4,405
	HOUSEHOLDS BY DISABILITY STATUS	
	Total	4,707
	With 1+ Persons w/Disability	1,352
	With No Person w/Disability	3,355

	Data Note: N/A means not available. Population by Ratio of Income to Poverty Level repr income in 2022, adjusted for inflation. **2018-2022 ACS Estimate:** The American Community Survey (ACS) replaces census sample monthly from January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2022. Although the ACS includes ma significant differences between the two surveys including fundamental differences in surve **Margin of error (MOE):** The MOE is a measure of the variability of the estimate due to sam estimate with 90 percent confidence. The range of uncertainty is called the confidence int reports an estimate of 100 with an MOE of +/- 20, then you can be 90 percent certain the **Reliability:** These symbols represent threshold values that Esri has established from the Cc measures the amount of sampling error relative to the size of the estimate, expressed as a	
		High Reliability: Small error is small relative to
		Medium Reliability: Es
		Low Reliability: Large relative to the estimat

Source: U.S.		Reliability:

©2025 Esri

Percent	MOE(±)	Reliability
	843	
	266	
	266	
100.0%	747	
28.2%	365	
1.6%	54	
0.6%	48	
1.1%	42	
1.0%	107	
0.7%	106	
0.3%	42	
6.3%	110	
6.1%	111	
0.2%	31	
6.7%	120	
6.3%	117	
0.4%	25	
7.0%	207	
7.0%	207	
0.0%	51	
4.1%	147	
3.6%	145	
0.5%	42	
1.4%	76	
0.6%	70	

0.8%	52	
71.8%	376	

100.0%	227	
98.6%	227	
73.5%	206	
33.4%	103	
27.7%	101	
8.0%	72	
0.5%	14	
2.9%	59	
1.1%	22	
25.1%	111	
22.5%	94	
2.6%	38	
1.4%	6	

71.8%	247	
26.2%	139	
20.6%	165	
15.3%	95	
7.3%	154	
1.3%	72	
1.2%	30	
28.2%	167	
21.4%	153	
5.1%	76	
1.7%	55	
0.0%	7	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
38.8%	235	
38.8%	235	
25.4%	129	
4.2%	140	
9.1%	147	

0.0%	0	
61.2%	214	
29.3%	147	
3.7%	35	
28.2%	167	
30.2%	139	
9.2%	89	
19.7%	112	
1.3%	35	
69.8%	252	
12.1%	142	
52.1%	231	
5.6%	78	

100.0%	843	
86.0%	869	
64.9%	523	
64.3%	521	
0.6%	28	
6.9%	520	
5.6%	448	
1.2%	76	
14.3%	541	
13.6%	511	
0.7%	56	
14.0%	239	

100.0%	740	
18.9%	308	
1.3%	138	
1.2%	141	
0.1%	33	
0.0%	0	

0.6%	53		
0.6%	53		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
1.1%	124		
1.1%	124		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	3		
0.0%	3		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
53.6%	412		
1.5%	105		
1.4%	108		
0.1%	28		
0.0%	0		
1.6%	69		
1.6%	56		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
3.7%	125		
3.3%	97		
0.4%	47		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	6		
0.0%	6		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
16.6%	227		
0.7%	121		
0.7%	121		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.2%	19		
0.2%	19		
0.0%	0		
0.0%	0		
0.3%	16		
0.2%	10		
0.0%	5		
0.1%	36		

0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	346	
82.4%	322	
17.6%	162	
0.0%	3	

100.0%	382	
50.1%	231	
25.9%	208	
2.6%	48	
3.2%	55	
4.2%	81	
8.9%	87	
2.4%	59	
2.7%	64	
0.1%	10	
49.9%	223	
17.7%	142	
1.2%	38	
6.5%	45	
6.7%	94	
13.5%	161	
1.0%	66	
3.1%	59	
0.1%	12	

100.0%	843	
26.1%	512	
26.0%	514	
0.1%	28	
57.2%	411	

56.9%	410	
0.3%	33	
16.7%	227	
16.1%	220	
0.6%	49	

100.0%	266	
96.5%	265	
0.1%	28	
90.7%	274	
1.9%	38	
0.5%	30	
1.7%	30	
1.8%	36	

100.0%	346	
64.8%	288	
8.3%	172	
2.1%	136	
0.5%	23	
0.0%	0	
0.6%	90	
0.4%	21	
0.7%	108	
0.0%	0	
0.8%	114	
0.6%	39	
1.2%	66	
1.5%	65	
20.8%	163	
100.0%	308	
2.9%	69	
10.0%	69	
27.3%	202	

19.1%	119	
11.0%	92	
4.0%	89	
8.3%	84	
2.4%	46	
4.6%	73	
3.8%	58	
2.8%	59	
3.9%	92	

100.0%	245	
6.3%	66	
5.5%	66	
0.8%	22	
3.8%	49	
3.0%	39	
0.8%	36	
33.7%	187	
26.2%	176	
7.5%	92	
56.2%	188	
46.0%	173	
10.2%	114	

100.0%	840	
27.7%	521	
26.4%	517	
15.4%	370	
0.3%	25	
0.0%	0	
7.2%	347	
3.5%	178	
0.0%	0	
1.2%	60	
0.1%	30	
15.5%	302	

12.8%	262	
8.3%	149	
1.1%	91	
0.0%	11	
3.0%	218	
0.3%	41	
0.0%	0	
1.8%	95	
1.0%	110	
39.9%	314	
33.8%	296	
25.4%	283	
2.3%	97	
0.4%	39	
4.2%	127	
1.5%	90	
0.0%	28	
3.3%	112	
2.7%	126	
16.9%	227	
4.8%	135	
0.5%	34	
0.0%	1	
4.2%	127	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
12.1%	207	
0.1%	28	
5.0%	118	
2.7%	97	
0.4%	35	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
3.8%	96	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	843	
2.6%	161	
4.0%	447	
0.6%	88	
0.8%	27	
6.4%	329	

0.5%	61	
85.0%	710	

100.0%	443	
10.1%	126	
89.9%	421	
47.6%	251	
8.6%	105	
39.1%	244	
52.4%	268	
1.6%	66	
50.8%	261	
100.0%	126	
22.4%	85	
8.5%	44	
2.1%	13	
14.3%	54	
3.4%	28	
30.5%	53	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	
4.0%	28	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	7	
10.2%	42	
4.8%	23	
0.0%	0	
0.0%	0	

100.0%	266	
4.8%	146	
0.9%	31	

2.2%	138	
0.5%	41	
1.0%	24	
0.2%	20	
95.2%	255	
53.8%	183	
3.0%	36	
11.4%	141	
10.3%	93	
16.7%	155	

30.4%	146	
69.6%	260	
32.3%	193	
67.7%	246	

1.3%	63	
8.0%	72	
8.3%	45	
18.3%	89	
10.4%	65	
6.3%	62	
4.3%	74	
10.6%	127	
30.9%	188	
1.7%	23	

100.0%	266	
0.9%	31	
99.1%	265	
100.0%	266	
6.4%	151	

93.6%	253	
100.0%	266	
28.7%	214	
71.3%	244	

esents persons for whom poverty status is determined. Household income represents

data. Esri is releasing the 2018-2022 ACS estimates, five-year period data collected
ny of the subjects previously covered by the decennial census sample, there are
ey design and residency rules.

npling error. MOEs enable the data user to measure the range of uncertainty for each
erval, and it is calculated by taking the estimate +/- the MOE. For example, if the ACS
value for the whole population falls between 80 and 120.

efficients of Variation (CV) to designate the usability of the estimates. The CV
percentage.

CVs (less than or equal to 12 percent) are flagged green to indicate that the sampling
the estimate and the estimate is reasonably reliable.

timates with CVs between 12 and 40 are flagged yellow-use with caution.

CVs (over 40 percent) are flagged red to indicate that the sampling error is large
e. The estimate is considered very unreliable.

	high		medi um		low

6 minutes		
	2018-2022	
	ACS Estimate	**Percent**
TOTALS		
Total Population	16,770	
Total Households	6,099	
Total Housing Units	6,430	
POPULATION AGE 3+ YEARS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
Total	16,296	100.0%
Enrolled in school	4,595	28.2%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	247	1.5%
Public school	77	0.5%
Private school	170	1.0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	138	0.8%
Public school	94	0.6%
Private school	44	0.3%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	1,081	6.6%
Public school	1,011	6.2%
Private school	71	0.4%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	1,132	6.9%
Public school	1,060	6.5%
Private school	71	0.4%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1,087	6.7%
Public school	1,075	6.6%
Private school	13	0.1%
Enrolled in college undergraduate years	685	4.2%
Public school	612	3.8%
Private school	74	0.5%
Enrolled in graduate or professional school	224	1.4%
Public school	113	0.7%

Private school	112	0.7%
Not enrolled in school	11,701	71.8%

6 minutes		
POPULATION AGE 65+ BY RELATIONSHIP AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Total	2,766	100.0%
Living in Households	2,732	98.8%
Living in Family Households	2,017	72.9%
Householder	901	32.6%
Spouse	761	27.5%
Parent	234	8.5%
Parent-in-law	31	1.1%
Other Relative	63	2.3%
Nonrelative	26	0.9%
Living in Nonfamily Households	716	25.9%
Householder	638	23.1%
Nonrelative	78	2.8%
Living in Group Quarters	34	1.2%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE AND SIZE		
Family Households	4,302	70.5%
2-Person	1,626	26.7%
3-Person	1,141	18.7%
4-Person	930	15.2%
5-Person	402	6.6%
6-Person	121	2.0%
7+ Person	81	1.3%
Nonfamily Households	1,797	29.5%
1-Person	1,378	22.6%
2-Person	318	5.2%
3-Person	97	1.6%
4-Person	5	0.1%
5-Person	0	0.0%
6-Person	0	0.0%
7+ Person	0	0.0%
HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE UNDER 18 YEARS BY		
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Households with one or more people under 18 years	2,317	38.0%
Family households	2,317	38.0%
Married-couple family	1,544	25.3%
Male householder, no wife present	269	4.4%
Female householder, no husband present	504	8.3%

Nonfamily households	0	0.0%
Households with no people under 18 years	3,782	62.0%
Married-couple family	1,754	28.8%
Other family	230	3.8%
Nonfamily households	1,797	29.5%
HOUSEHOLDS BY PRESENCE OF PEOPLE 65 YEARS AND OVER,		
HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Households with Pop 65+	1,810	29.7%
1-Person	566	9.3%
2+ Person Family	1,165	19.1%
2+ Person Nonfamily	79	1.3%
Households with No Pop 65+	4,289	70.3%
1-Person	811	13.3%
2+ Person Family	3,137	51.4%
2+ Person Nonfamily	341	5.6%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLD TYPE BY RELATIVES AND NONRELATIVES FOR POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS		
POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS		
Total	16,717	100.0%
In Family Households	14,291	85.5%
In Married-Couple Family	10,908	65.3%
Relatives	10,814	64.7%
Nonrelatives	94	0.6%
In Male Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	1,164	7.0%
Relatives	929	5.6%
Nonrelatives	234	1.4%
In Female Householder-No Spouse Present-Family	2,220	13.3%
Relatives	2,109	12.6%
Nonrelatives	111	0.7%
In Nonfamily Households	2,426	14.5%

6 minutes		
POPULATION AGE 5+ YEARS BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME		
AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH		
Total	15,889	100.0%
5 to 17 years		
Speak only English	3,012	19.0%
Speak Spanish	206	1.3%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	194	1.2%
Speak English "not well"	13	0.1%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%

Speak other Indo-European languages	104	0.7%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	104	0.7%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	162	1.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	162	1.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other languages	2	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	2	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
18 to 64 years		
Speak only English	8,501	53.5%
Speak Spanish	299	1.9%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	282	1.8%
Speak English "not well"	16	0.1%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other Indo-European languages	254	1.6%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	254	1.6%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	577	3.6%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	508	3.2%
Speak English "not well"	69	0.4%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other languages	5	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	5	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
65 years and over		
Speak only English	2,553	16.1%
Speak Spanish	128	0.8%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	128	0.8%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak other Indo-European languages	33	0.2%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	33	0.2%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%
Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages	50	0.3%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	28	0.2%
Speak English "not well"	3	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	19	0.1%

Speak other languages	2	0.0%
Speak English "very well" or "well"	2	0.0%
Speak English "not well"	0	0.0%
Speak English "not at all"	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY PLACE OF WORK		
Total	7,745	100.0%
Worked in state and in county of residence	6,372	82.3%
Worked in state and outside county of residence	1,366	17.6%
Worked outside state of residence	7	0.1%

6 minutes		
SEX BY CLASS OF WORKER FOR THE CIVILIAN EMPLOYED POPULATION 16 YEARS		
AND OVER		
Total:	7,861	100.0%
Male:	4,020	51.1%
Employee of private company workers	2,083	26.5%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	240	3.1%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	236	3.0%
Local government workers	323	4.1%
State government workers	727	9.2%
Federal government workers	192	2.4%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	213	2.7%
Unpaid family workers	7	0.1%
Female:	3,841	48.9%
Employee of private company workers	1,368	17.4%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	89	1.1%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	512	6.5%
Local government workers	482	6.1%
State government workers	1,032	13.1%
Federal government workers	88	1.1%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	264	3.4%
Unpaid family workers	7	0.1%

6 minutes		
POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS AND PRESENCE OF A COMPUTER		
Total	16,717	100.0%
Population <18 in Households	4,364	26.1%
Have a Computer	4,337	25.9%
Have NO Computer	28	0.2%
Population 18-64 in Households	9,621	57.6%

Have a Computer	9,569	57.2%
Have NO Computer	52	0.3%
Population 65+ in Households	2,732	16.3%
Have a Computer	2,647	15.8%
Have NO Computer	86	0.5%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS AND INTERNET SUBSCRIPTIONS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With an Internet Subscription	5,852	96.0%
Dial-Up Alone	10	0.2%
Broadband	5,503	90.2%
Satellite Service	107	1.8%
Other Service	25	0.4%
Internet Access with no Subscription	132	2.2%
With No Internet Access	115	1.9%

6 minutes		
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS BY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION		
TO WORK		
Total	7,745	100.0%
Drove alone	5,022	64.8%
Carpooled	597	7.7%
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	207	2.7%
Bus or trolley bus	54	0.7%
Light rail, streetcar or trolley	0	0.0%
Subway or elevated	56	0.7%
Long-distance/Commuter Train	31	0.4%
Ferryboat	66	0.9%
Taxicab	1	0.0%
Motorcycle	72	0.9%
Bicycle	54	0.7%
Walked	107	1.4%
Other means	95	1.2%
Worked at home	1,589	20.5%
WORKERS AGE 16+ YEARS (WHO DID NOT WORK FROM HOME)		
BY TRAVEL TIME TO WORK		
Total	6,156	100.0%
Less than 5 minutes	169	2.7%
5 to 9 minutes	712	11.6%
10 to 14 minutes	1,631	26.5%

15 to 19 minutes	1,227	19.9%
20 to 24 minutes	634	10.3%
25 to 29 minutes	247	4.0%
30 to 34 minutes	465	7.6%
35 to 39 minutes	165	2.7%
40 to 44 minutes	291	4.7%
45 to 59 minutes	221	3.6%
60 to 89 minutes	162	2.6%
90 or more minutes	233	3.8%
Average Travel Time to Work (in minutes)		

6 minutes		
FEMALES AGE 20-64 YEARS BY AGE OF OWN CHILDREN AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Total	4,862	100.0%
Own children under 6 years only	321	6.6%
In labor force	276	5.7%
Not in labor force	45	0.9%
Own children under 6 years and 6 to 17 years	218	4.5%
In labor force	153	3.1%
Not in labor force	66	1.4%
Own children 6 to 17 years only	1,552	31.9%
In labor force	1,219	25.1%
Not in labor force	334	6.9%
No own children under 18 years	2,771	57.0%
In labor force	2,243	46.1%
Not in labor force	528	10.9%

6 minutes		
CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION BY AGE & TYPES OHEALINSURANCE		
OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE		
Total	16,635	100.0%
Under 19 years:	4,601	27.7%
One Type of Health Insurance:	4,369	26.3%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	2,721	16.4%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	56	0.3%
Medicare Coverage Only	0	0.0%
Medicaid Coverage Only	1,066	6.4%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	497	3.0%
VA Health Care Only	29	0.2%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	210	1.3%
No Health Insurance Coverage	22	0.1%
19 to 34 years:	2,602	15.6%

One Type of Health Insurance:	2,171	13.1%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	1,519	9.1%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	181	1.1%
Medicare Coverage Only	5	0.0%
Medicaid Coverage Only	432	2.6%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	34	0.2%
VA Health Care Only	0	0.0%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	257	1.5%
No Health Insurance Coverage	175	1.1%
35 to 64 years:	6,684	40.2%
One Type of Health Insurance:	5,742	34.5%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	4,380	26.3%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	403	2.4%
Medicare Coverage Only	54	0.3%
Medicaid Coverage Only	628	3.8%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	243	1.5%
VA Health Care Only	34	0.2%
2+ Types of Health Insurance	552	3.3%
No Health Insurance Coverage	391	2.4%
65+ years:	2,747	16.5%
One Type of Health Insurance:	788	4.7%
Employer-Based Health Ins Only	82	0.5%
Direct-Purchase Health Ins Only	1	0.0%
Medicare Coverage Only	705	4.2%
TRICARE/Military Hlth Cov Only	0	0.0%
VA Health Care Only	0	0.0%
2+ Types of Health Insurance:	1,959	11.8%
Employer-Based & Direct-Purchase Health Insurance	20	0.1%
Employer-Based Health & Medicare Insurance	800	4.8%
Direct-Purchase Health & Medicare Insurance	446	2.7%
Medicare & Medicaid Coverage	68	0.4%
Other Private Health Insurance Combos	0	0.0%
Other Public Health Insurance Combos	0	0.0%
Other Health Insurance Combinations	624	3.8%
No Health Insurance Coverage	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
POPULATION BY RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL		
Total	16,712	100.0%
Under .50	448	2.7%
.50 to .99	573	3.4%
1.00 to 1.24	125	0.7%
1.25 to 1.49	166	1.0%
1.50 to 1.84	962	5.8%

1.85 to 1.99	134	0.8%
2.00 and over	14,303	85.6%

6 minutes		
CIVILIAN POPULATION AGE 18 OR OLDER BY VETERAN STATUS		
Total	12,289	100.0%
Veteran	1,241	10.1%
Nonveteran	11,048	89.9%
Male	5,888	47.9%
Veteran	1,042	8.5%
Nonveteran	4,846	39.4%
Female	6,401	52.1%
Veteran	199	1.6%
Nonveteran	6,202	50.5%
CIVILIAN VETERANS AGE 18 OR OLDER BY PERIOD OF		
MILITARY SERVICE		
Total	1,241	100.0%
Gulf War (9/01 or later), no Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	288	23.2%
Gulf War (9/01 or later) and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	127	10.2%
Gulf War (9/01 or later), and Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), and Vietnam Era	28	2.3%
Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01), no Vietnam Era	181	14.6%
Gulf War (8/90 to 8/01) and Vietnam Era	34	2.7%
Vietnam Era, no Korean War, no World War II	359	28.9%
Vietnam Era and Korean War, no World War II	0	0.0%
Vietnam Era and Korean War and World War II	0	0.0%
Korean War, no Vietnam Era, no World War II	41	3.3%
Korean War and World War II, no Vietnam Era	0	0.0%
World War II, no Korean War, no Vietnam Era	0	0.0%
Between Gulf War and Vietnam Era only	130	10.5%
Between Vietnam Era and Korean War only	53	4.3%
Between Korean War and World War II only	0	0.0%
Pre-World War II only	0	0.0%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY POVERTY STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level	318	5.2%
Married-couple family	45	0.7%

Other family - male householder (no wife present)	102	1.7%
Other family - female householder (no husband present)	35	0.6%
Nonfamily household - male householder	74	1.2%
Nonfamily household - female householder	62	1.0%
Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level	5,781	94.8%
Married-couple family	3,253	53.3%
Other family - male householder (no wife present)	214	3.5%
Other family - female householder (no husband present)	652	10.7%
Nonfamily household - male householder	685	11.2%
Nonfamily household - female householder	977	16.0%
Poverty Index	42	

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY OTHER INCOME		
Social Security Income	1,803	29.6%
No Social Security Income	4,296	70.4%
Retirement Income	1,940	31.8%
No Retirement Income	4,159	68.2%

6 minutes		
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN		
THE PAST 12 MONTHS		
<10% of Income	46	2.2%
10-14.9% of Income	161	7.9%
15-19.9% of Income	184	9.0%
20-24.9% of Income	371	18.1%
25-29.9% of Income	233	11.4%
30-34.9% of Income	150	7.3%
35-39.9% of Income	86	4.2%
40-49.9% of Income	193	9.4%
50+% of Income	568	27.7%
Gross Rent % Inc Not Computed	55	2.7%

6 minutes		
HOUSEHOLDS BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE INCOME IN THE PAST		
12 MONTHS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With public assistance income	60	1.0%
No public assistance income	6,039	99.0%
HOUSEHOLDS BY FOOD STAMPS/SNAP STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With Food Stamps/SNAP	342	5.6%

With No Food Stamps/SNAP	5,757	94.4%
HOUSEHOLDS BY DISABILITY STATUS		
Total	6,099	100.0%
With 1+ Persons w/Disability	1,717	28.2%
With No Person w/Disability	4,382	71.8%

MOE(±)	Reliability
861	
276	
298	
767	
368	
53	
46	
42	
107	
106	
38	
112	
115	
37	
124	
118	
31	
208	
208	
92	
148	
146	
42	
74	
72	

45	
398	

233	
234	
211	
105	
103	
79	
39	
59	
22	
118	
101	
41	
7	

255	
144	
171	
100	
154	
63	
30	
175	
161	
79	
52	
9	
0	
0	
0	
241	
241	
132	
148	
148	

0	
223	
153	
34	
175	
145	
97	
115	
38	
264	
150	
240	
80	

861	
886	
545	
542	
31	
531	
456	
83	
543	
512	
58	
248	

757	
312	
150	
154	
34	
0	

60	
60	
0	
0	
127	
127	
0	
0	
21	
21	
0	
0	
436	
102	
105	
22	
0	
68	
55	
0	
0	
125	
98	
48	
0	
25	
25	
0	
0	
233	
128	
129	
6	
0	
18	
18	
0	
0	
16	
9	
27	
39	

15	
15	
0	
0	

372	
349	
167	
23	

405	
249	
218	
58	
56	
85	
90	
62	
64	
10	
231	
137	
40	
51	
99	
168	
72	
56	
12	

861	
516	
517	
33	
435	

435	
62	
234	
226	
49	

276	
274	
31	
283	
38	
30	
33	
51	

372	
308	
174	
138	
40	
0	
92	
26	
108	
13	
116	
42	
69	
65	
173	
332	
72	
106	
205	

129	
92	
89	
85	
48	
72	
63	
60	
94	

255	
62	
61	
23	
50	
42	
43	
189	
178	
92	
201	
187	
114	

859	
524	
519	
374	
25	
0	
345	
180	
116	
70	
30	
308	

266	
156	
91	
12	
218	
40	
0	
95	
114	
333	
314	
301	
103	
36	
124	
91	
30	
113	
125	
234	
141	
41	
15	
131	
0	
0	
213	
29	
124	
99	
37	
0	
12	
99	
0	

861	
162	
448	
93	
46	
313	

75	
732	

465	
131	
444	
266	
109	
259	
278	
67	
271	
131	
86	
45	
16	
55	
27	
57	
15	
0	
28	
0	
7	
46	
23	
0	
0	

276	
147	
31	

138	
42	
25	
41	
267	
190	
58	
142	
101	
163	

150	
273	
197	
259	

49	
60	
47	
91	
68	
67	
74	
135	
192	
28	

276	
32	
276	
276	
151	

264	
276	
220	
250	

JAN BLACK
Olympia, WA 98501

February 23, 2025

From: jblackinteriors@comcast.net
To: Jackson Ewing – jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Briggs Urban Village

Jackson Ewing – Associate Planner:

My name is Jan Black. I live in Sten Village which is only several blocks from the Briggs property. Twenty five years ago the planned development was to create a park like setting with mix housing and a boutique style grocery store. The idea was to develop a sustainable community where people could live and have access to the bus line to commute to work limiting car traffic and congestion.

I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units from three floors to four floors. It will alter the scale and overall feeling of the entire area creating more of a city environment. The proposed amendment to the Village will drastically alter the intent of the original plan by increasing more vehicle traffic, increase pressure on current parking and decrease access to the current facilities that now exist. The development that has already taken place in the last several years along the Yelm highway and Henderson has already created an increase in traffic and accidents in the village area as well as limiting parking to the Briggs YMCA.

The proposed amendment will simply be an Urban Sprawl compromising the quality of life that we as residents envisioned in the original plan for the Briggs Village. I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the commercial space with the Village.

Best Regards,

Jan Black

Jackson Ewing

From: Eika Petermann <eikapetermann@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:14 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: CORRECTION NOTICE; RE: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Hi Jackson,


Thanks for your follow up! I wanted to add to the comments I already submitted.

With regards to the height of the proposed multi-family housing, I'm opposed to four stories as it creates more shade and more of an "office-y" feel. Retail on the bottom is great, but the taller the buildings, the more office park it becomes. I've also lost quite a bit of sun on my front yard with the apartments along Briggs Drive. With respect to the rooftop gardens being qualified as public space, that is not an appropriate designation. We must be assured we keep public space open and on street level for residents, owners and visitors.

Above all, if the grocery store footprint is smaller, that's fine as long as it does not become a convenience store. I'm still confident a grocery store would attract plenty of people from the surrounding area.

Thanks for your time!

Eika Petermann
EdenSpa Wellness
eikapetermann@gmail.com
360.790.5032
FarmHouse Fresh Affiliate
Le Mieux Cosmetics Affiliate



On Thu, Feb 20, 2025 at 1:47 PM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Good afternoon,

A mistake was made when routing the public notice via email. The body of the email sent 2/14/2025 referenced a planning commission hearing on 1/27/2025 is **INCORRECT**.

The Planning Commission public hearing will be held on 2/24/2025 at 6:30pm

The attached notice provides details on how to register and review applicable staff reports and attachments.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Jackson Ewing
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 10:24 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing; Amendments to OMC 18.05 related to Urban Villages

Good morning,

You are receiving this notice because you have had previous interest in Briggs Village projects and have been included as a party of record. The attached Notice of Public Hearing is for text code amendments to OMC 18.05 which establishes “Urban Villages”. This is not a revision to the Master Plan. Future Master Plan amendments will have a separate Notice of Application and comment period.

A planning commission public hearing will be held January 27th, 2025 at 630pm virtually. A detailed staff report will be available one week prior to the planning commission hearing.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

Jackson Ewing

From: Glenn Wells <glennwellsarchitect@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 2:25 PM
To: Gordie Gill; Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Important: Action Needed re: Parking at Briggs

Hi Jackson,

Here are my comments in response to the YMCA's action needed post:

The revisions proposed still creates an urban village with the same variety of housing options, walkable surfaces, fresh food, green spaces and critical services, with the exception of one thing: A big box grocery store.

The smaller grocery store proposed will not be a convenience store as some have conjectured, since the products they sell are for travelers along highways, not neighborhoods. Whatever the size of the grocery store, it will accommodate all day-to-day needs to the neighborhood, such as fresh foods. If anything, the traffic, walkability and green spaces of the site will be greater, not less, because the large parking lot for a grocery store is not needed.

If a 30,000 SF grocery store was viable, it would be because it could draw a significant number of customers from Yelm Hwy. That would be the only way such a large store would generate enough business to stay afloat. That would mean a lot more traffic than what the proposed amendment would generate. The 52,500 SF of commercial proposed by this amendment would mostly be relying on the local neighborhoods to survive, not the general population of Thurston Co, which means the commercial traffic would not be overwhelming. The increased residential traffic would primarily occur during the morning and evening peak traffic periods and the many Briggs streets and outlets would disperse the traffic reasonably. The parking design for the residential units would be the max parking allowed by the city of Olympia code and would not rely on street parking.

It is disingenuous to state that the 2014 amendment provides more amenities, walkable surfaces, fresh food, green spaces and critical services when the YMCA only wants to preserve the status quo, or have a big box grocery store with a large parking lot that they can direct to their customers.

If one studies the 2001 and 2014 Briggs amendment, the parking lot proposed for the grocery store is not so large that they could afford to allow 30 or 40 YMCA patrons to use it during business hours, which for a grocery store is typically 5 am to midnight. Since the YMCA didn't build enough parking, they should have purchased land to build an auxiliary parking lot, rather than attempt to sabotage the ability to develop anything at all.

Under the current Briggs mixed-use district amendment, nothing more can be developed until a 30,000 SF grocery store can be found. Killing this amendment ensures that the property will not be developed, because after 25 years of inactivity, it is clear that a 50,000 to 30,000 SF grocery store will not come to this market.

Glenn Wells, AIA

> On Feb 20, 2025, at 10:08 AM, Gordie Gill <gordie@glenlyon.ca> wrote:
>
> Glenn
>
> Here is the email sent to its members and correspondence from Heather that is helping me with working an agreement for the parking.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **From:** Heather Burgess <hburgess@dfpblaw.com>
> > **Date:** February 20, 2025 at 10:02:15 AM PST
> > **To:** Gordie Gill <gordie@glenlyon.ca>
> > **Cc:** David Schaffert <DSchaffert@thurstonchamber.com>
> > **Subject: FW: Important: Action Needed re: Parking at Briggs**
> >
> > Gordie,
> >
> > I hope all is well. This email will introduce you to David Schaffert with the Thurston Chamber, who shared with me today the below advocacy piece that he received from the YMCA urging opposition to your proposed Briggs Village Master Plan amendments. The Chamber has generally been working to support increased housing availability in Thurston County, and so he may be interested in providing you with some support going into the PC public hearing on Monday 2/24. I encourage you to reach out. He is copied here, and his contact information is below.
> >
> > David,
> >
> > Gordie let me know about this application being advanced a few months ago, but I have not been actively representing him on it. Please discuss this with Gordie to be sure the facts are right, but if I recall correctly, the issue here is that the City allowed the YMCA to be built without having to provide adequate parking in the first place, and then the YMCA failed

to get the necessary legal agreements in place with Gordie's predecessor to secure parking in such a way that would be binding when the property was sold. The commercial area was way oversized for current demand even when we did that last round of amendments for the prior owner many years ago; housing is what the market wants and needs out there. The YMCA is doing nothing more than trying to leverage this issue to extract parking from the property owner.

Best,

Heather
Heather Burgess | partner
Dickson Frohlich Phillips Burgess PLLC
Direct: (360) 742-3504
Scheduling Contact: Sherry Kangiser, Paralegal
– skangiser@dfpblaw.com
Scheduling Link: https://calendly.com/hburgess-twu/30min
Our Tacoma office has moved! Effective December 1, 2024, you can find us at 909 A Street, Ste. 900, Tacoma, WA 98402.

<image001.png>


David Schaffert
President/CEO

809 Legion Way, Olympia, WA 98501
Ph. 360.357.3362 Cell 360 789 6045
dschaffert@thurstonchamber.com • thurstonchamber.com

<image002.png><image003.jpg><image004.png>

Participate in Planning Commission Hearing on Zoning Amendments to Briggs V





Dear YMCA Members,

Thank you for belonging to the Y! We are reaching out to inform you about an upcoming event that h
implications for our YMCA and the wider Briggs Village community. The Olympia Planning Commissior
zoning amendments that could affect the balance of residential and commercial space in our area, po
to **increased parking difficulties** and access to services including the Y.



⚠️ ⚠️**What's Happening?** The proposed amendments aim to increase the number of residential uni
decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, including Briggs Village. This change will
existing parking infrastructure, which is already under pressure, and impact your daily access to the Y
businesses.

🏠 🏠**Why we are advocating.** The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" wit
housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of b
residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood groce
sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community.

🚗 🚗Zoning requirements took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable co
included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial pro
why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered.

These changes will lead to *fewer* services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on curren
to *a less walkable neighborhood.* We want to ensure all residents have access to critical services. The
proposed, will decrease access and lead to development that does not meet community need.

We Need Your Voice! It's crucial that our community's concerns are heard. We encourage all members to participate in the Public Hearing.

- Share how these proposed changes could affect your experience and access to the YMCA.
- Request that current zoning requirements stay in effect for the Briggs Village development.

How to Participate:

- **Attend the Virtual Hearing:** The public hearing will be held virtually with an option to participa on **Monday, February 24, 2025, at 6:30 PM.**
  - Zoom Webinar Registration Required. Once registered, you will receive a confirmation en information on how to join the webinar.
  - A computer with Zoom will be made available in Room 207 at Olympia City Hall – 601 4t Olympia – for those without access to a personal computer.
- **Email Your Concerns:** If you cannot attend the hearing, you can still make your voice heard by to the lead planner, Jackson Ewing, at jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us. Please send your concerns by **5 of the hearing** to ensure they are considered.

Your participation is crucial in making sure that our community's needs are considered in these zo standing together and voicing our concerns, we can advocate for a development that respects the bal residential growth and community services.

<image005.png> <image006.png>

Thank you for your continued support and participation.

Warm regards,

Kyle
President, South Sound YMCA

Manage your preferences | Opt Out using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? Sign up to receive our future emails.
View this email online.

1530 Yelm Hwy SE | Olympia, WA 98501 US

This email was sent to dschaffert@thurstonchamber.com.
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

Jackson Ewing

From: jandjneff@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:51 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: OMC 18.05 Comments

February 25, 2025
Regarding: Revising Olympia Municipal Code 18.05

Mr. Ewing and Commissioners :

Thank you for extending the deadline for comments on the revision of Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 relating to Briggs Urban Village.

Please do not reduce the amount of required commercial retail development as established in the existing plan. We need a grocery store here, more restaurants and other retail establishments, plus a daycare.

I agree that the need for office space has been reduced due to the pandemic, but our need for retail in this area has increased as more and more people live near this area now and many work from their homes. With people working from home now, they no longer "swing by" the grocery store or pick up carryout meals on their way home from work. They would, however, like to walk to the neighborhood grocery store on their lunch break or when work is concluded for the day; or walk to dinner at the neighborhood restaurant.

I have lived near Briggs Village since 1988 and have watched this project develop. I was impressed with the vision of the planners to develop such a beautiful, walkable community all those years ago. I sold my single-family home and moved to senior housing near Briggs Village because I always understood that a grocery store was going to be built here, and I just needed to be patient. As an active senior, I envisioned that I would be able to walk to the grocery store, walk to a choice of restaurants, etc. Please do not abandon this element of the Master Plan.

Also, please do not abandon the good work of the planners by bowing to the request of the developer to increase density. I read that Olympia has a glut of rental units currently. I am skeptical that the developer has the best interests of the community at heart by requesting an increase in density and a reduction of commercial retail.

Please require the developer to build a grocery store, a daycare, and retail establishments as initially planned; do not increase the density.

Thank you
Joan Neff
1520 Palomino Dr SE, Unit 306

Jackson Ewing

From: Pamela Anderson <ptanderfam@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:34 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Parking Difficulties

I hope this email doesn't arrive too late. I hope that parking is not further restricted at the Y because it's already often difficult to find a parking space, especially in the mornings. If more and more apartment complexes get built, resulting in a greater need for parking, without accommodating this need with parking structures, eventually, the Y will lose its membership, resulting in a "private club" for those nearby.

I drive from the Stikes Woods area, a 20 minute drive. I have had multiple joint replacements (4) and rheumatoid arthritis. My doctors have said that water exercises are the best thing I can do for my mobility issues. I attend the Joints in Motion class when I can, when my health permits. If you further restrict access to the Y, I won't be able to attend anymore, leading to a faster decline in my health. Please keep parking at the Y accessible to all.

In my view, we need to build more community pools to alleviate the shortage of pools in our area, especially as our population continues to expand.

Regards,
Pam Anderson

Jackson Ewing

From: Casey Mauck
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:08 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: FW: Written Comments on Zoning Code Amendment related to Urban Village

Casey Mauck (*she/her*)
Associate Planner | City of Olympia
601 4th Ave E. | Olympia, WA 98501
Ph: 360.753.8048
Web: olympiawa.gov
Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) I Permit Portal

All emails to and from this address are public records and subject to disclosure.

From: cpdinfo <cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 8:29 AM
To: Casey Mauck <cmauck@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: FW: Written Comments on Zoning Code Amendment related to Urban Village

Good morning,

Please see customer inquiry.

Kind Regards,

Keilah Dowies
Program Assistant
Community Planning & Development
kdowies@ci.olympia.wa.us
601 4th Avenue East, Olympia
PO BOX 1967, Olympia, WA 98507

From: Andrew Krawczyk <andykrawczyk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:59 PM
To: cpdinfo <cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Written Comments on Zoning Code Amendment related to Urban Village

Please find our written opposition to the proposal to reduce the required amount of commercial space. While an increase in multifamily housing unit density should be considered for the village zone to accommodate current growth management needs, it should not come at the sacrifice of commercial density. A medium to large central marketplace is a strongly needed component for an urban village, and increasing density will only increase the need for a central commercial hub, please do not reduce the necessary commercial square footage required.

Best,

Andrew Krawczyk + Casey Eastman

4500 Village Dr. SE
Olympia WA 98501

Revised[1] Review of Briggs Village

Commercial Market Demand Study

by Brian Faller, J.D., M.A.

February 26, 2025

My name is Brian Faller. I live at 4460 Village Dr. SE, Olympia, WA.

I retired in 2020, after having practiced law for over 35 years. I have extensive experience critically reviewing expert quantitative reports and appraisals, including income capitalization studies and comparative sales studies which are similar to the demand analysis performed here. I estimate I have critiqued over 80 expert quantitative reports, including about 30 appraisals during my career, assisted in preparing at least 30 expert reports with quantitative analysis, and have deposed or cross-examined at least thirty experts on matters including quantitative analysis.

MAJOR CREDIBILITY PROBLEMS WITH THE MARKET STUDY

The author of the market study is anonymous. At no place in the study is the person or persons who authored the study identified or their qualifications stated. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the author(s) to answer questions, correct errors, and supply missing data. That is especially important here because the study did not provide any of the excel spreadsheets or other data showing the data sources and dates and bases of the calculations.

In my 35 years practicing law reviewing expert reports, I have never seen a report that does not identify the author. No court or tribunal would ever accept an *anonymous* study, and the Planning Commission and City should not do so.

I enlisted the assistance of Mike Ruth, a former lead trainer for ESRI who provided trainings around the world, and who is now a Professor at Evergreen State College, teaching GIS. I asked him to replicate the market study tables and he was unable to do so. He was able to replicate the population analysis, which revealed that the figures ESRI produced came from American Community Survey (ACS) 2018-

[1] This revised review replaces the prior version dated February 25, 2025, which I hurriedly assembled to meet the 5:00 pm, February 24, 2025, comment deadline. I apologize for the inconvenience.

2022, which was not disclosed by the study. Mike said that had he been able to contact the author, he probably could have replicated the ESRI data runs to see if they were done properly.

The single real estate broker consulted is anonymous and his/her statements indicate a lack of knowledge of Briggs Village. The study (p. 18) says a broker was contacted but does not identify the person and their qualifications. Anonymity does not allow one to assess the broker's knowledge of the market, credibility, or contact them to confirm information. The study says the broker stated that because a Briggs Grocery would not be visible from Yelm Hwy, Briggs Village would not be a suitable location. That opinion is contradicted by numerous local groceries. The Hagens on the west-side is not visible from Cooper Point or Black Lake. The Trader Joe's on Black Lake is tucked away in a corner. The Tumwater Safeway is not visible from Capital Way, the QFC and the Safeway in Lacey off Yelm highway have very little visibility from Yelm Hwy, the Walmart on Yelm Hwy in the Lacey has limited visibility and requires one to drive about 3 blocks out of the way and then back to enter.

The "stakeholders" consulted are anonymous and appear to lack actual knowledge of the appeal of the Briggs Village site. The study (p. 18) discusses comments from "stakeholders," but provides no information who they are and why they are stakeholders. Their comments are subjective conclusions without supporting data. Anonymity does not allow one to assess credibility or contact the commenters.

The study states (p. 18) that the anonymous "stakeholders" said that the Briggs Village site has "low gravity" or attraction to customers. That unsubstantiated conclusion is inconsistent with a number of key facts that the study fails to mention: (1) The businesses at and immediately adjacent to Briggs Village are doing a brisk trade: including, the Starbucks, the Briggs Taphouse, Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, and the Humble Cow. (2) The two commercial lots that the developer sold at Briggs Village sold respectively at over two times and four times their assessed value at the time. (3) The high traffic from Briggs YMCA, which is the regional YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs Y Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekends. In sum, the "stakeholders" comments about the "low gravity" of the Briggs site seem uninformed of key facts.

Several aspects of the study suggest a bias towards the conclusions that the developer wants it to reach. The study author does not disclose that he/she knows that his client, the developer, is seeking the city's approval to lower the size of the grocery store size at Briggs Village and the overall size of the commercial. However, the study indicates that the study author was given a copy of the City's applications to change the commercial and grocery requirements due to fact that author referred to numbers only available from the applications. For example, on page 3, the author erroneously stated "A range of 1,500 to 12,000 square feet is allocated for a grocery store." These numbers are not the existing requirements,[2] but changes to the Master Plan the developer seeks.[3]

The discussion below also highlights a number of unreasonable assumptions, omissions, and failures to provide data, that in my opinion the author should have directly addressed, if he/she were seeking to be objective.

THE MARKET STUDY'S GROCERY GAP ANALYSIS (Exhibit 12, & p. 20) IS FLAWED.

1. **The market study did not validate the use of a five-minute drive BVTA as a trustworthy tool to determine an appropriate demand gap. Comparison of drive times between 3 - 6 minutes in fact shows a wide range of demand gaps.**

Selection of a five-minute drive to define the BVTA appears arbitrary and distortive of the supply-demand gap. This can be seen by comparing the gaps between supply and demand resulting from using three, four, five, and six minute drives to define the BVTA.

For 3 and 4 minutes, the Tumwater Safeway would fall outside of the BVTA and the only grocery in the BVTA are three mini-marts, which I estimated to have annual sales of $1,500,000. To calculate the supply-demand gap in a three or four

---

[2] The current 2014 Master Plan states that the grocery must be a minimum of 30,000 sf and a maximum of 35,000 sf.

[3] Similarly, on page 25, the study erroneously states: "Briggs Village is slated for a total of 1250 residential units." Currently, the 2014 Master Plan states the unit number is 801. The 1250 units are what the developer is requesting that the city approve.

minute drive BVTA, one needs to estimate the sales and the food-beverage spending for those BVTAs. I was able to estimate the food and beverage spending in three and four minute minutes, since we know for Ex. 11 of the market study that the 3 minute population is 26% of the 5 minute population. 26% of $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) is $11,091,600 (3-minute spending estimate).[4] So the demand gap for 3-4 minutues, is $11,091,600 spending minus $1,500,000 sales resulting in a $9,591,600 (3-4 minute demand gap). That gap is 72% larger than the study's 5 minute BVTA estimated demand gap of $5,570,000. According to the grocery store size metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the 3-4 minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 19,183 sf.*

A six-minute BVTA would add a number of neighborhoods to BVTA, both only two small grocery stores, identified below. I don't have actual data for the 6-minute BVTA spending and sales. However, those figures can reasonably be estimated. The 6 minute BVTA created by Mike Ruth https://arcg.is/iTmv10 (see also figure 1 after last page) shows two additional small grocery stores in the trade area: Spuds, Ramirez Mexican Home. ESRI shows those two stores have collective sales of $961,000. So the estimated 6 minute grocery sales is $37,035,000 (5 minute sales) plus $961,000 (addition from 5-6 minutes) = $37,996,000 (six-minute sales). Six minute spending can be estimated by increasing the 5-minute spending proportionate to the population increase from 5 to 6 minute BVTA. Population increases 30% from 12,904 (five minutes) to 16,770 (six minutes).[5] Thus, the six minute spending is estimated to be 1.30 x $46,660,000 (5 minute spending) = $60,658,000 (six-minute spending). Six minute spending $60,658,000 minus six minute sales $37,996,000 = a six minute demand gap of $22,662,000. According to the grocery store size metric in the market study ($500 per sf), *the six-minute BVTA would potentially support a grocery store of 45,324 sf.*

Here's a summary of the differences in selecting a 3-4, 5, and 6 minute drive time for the BVTA.

[4] Since I did not have a population figure for the 4-minute drive area, I conservatively used the same spending amount from the 3 minute area for the 4 minute area. If I had figures for the 4 minute area, they would have higher spending and result in a larger demand gap.

[5] See attached excel spreadsheet.

	Demand Gap $	Size of Grocery store supported
3-4 minute BVTA	$9,591,000	*19,183 sf*
5 minute BVTA	$5,570,000	11,200 sf
6 minute BVTA	$22,662,000	*45,324 sf*

The wide range of demand gaps and store sizes for the BVTAs based on three/four, five, and six minutes shows that a valid analysis should have looked at a range of trade area sizes to validate the size that would best reflect market demand.

2. **Even if a five-minute BVTA were defensible here, the assumption that none of the Safeway sales would transfer to the BVTA is unreasonable and invalidates the gap analysis.**

The market study assumes (p.20) that no sales from the Tumwater Safeway would transfer to a Briggs grocery. That assumption is unreasonable.

The study author failed to discuss the proximity of the thousands of people who live in Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods as well as the fact that hundreds daily walk from their homes to the YMCA, Starbucks, the Briggs Tap Room, the Humble Cow, and the other businesses at that site. That is evidenced by the high numbers of walking customers at these businesses and the number of users at the Briggs YMCA.

In Briggs Village, over a thousand reside in the hundreds of town homes and detached homes in the village and the five large multi-building complexes (Parkview Apartments (72 units), Briggs Village Apartments (72 units), Copper Leaf Residences (92 family units), Silver Leaf Residences (200 senior units); the Village Cooperative (67 condo units).

In the surrounding neighborhoods, over a thousand reside in the Farm, Orvas Court, Sten Village, the Cove, Holiday Hills, Brigadoon, and the Tumwater neighborhoods just northwest of Briggs Village.

The Briggs branch is the *regional* YMCA for Thurston County. Jake Grater, the Briggs YMCA Branch CEO, informed me that the branch typically has more than 1,000 visits on weekdays and 300-400 on weekend days. It is reasonable to expect

that many YMCA users would transfer some shopping to the more convenient Briggs grocery.

It is reflective of the incompleteness of the grocery gap demand analysis that it never mentions these facts or reports the user counts of the YMCA, although those facts are directly relevant to the Briggs Village demand.

If the gap analysis were conservatively corrected to assume that the residents of five-minute BVTA would collectively shift just 10% of their food and beverage shopping ($3,600,000) from Safeway (36,000,00 sales) to the Briggs Village grocery, the five-minute BVTA gap would be $9,170,000, not the $5.57 million presented in the market study. Correcting this faulty assumption of no transfer of sales by assuming a conservative 10% transfer, *the five-minute BVTA under the $500/sf metric would potentially support a grocery store of 18,340 sf.*

3. The population estimate used in the gap analysis missed many people who live in Briggs Village now and all of the people who will live in the unbuilt and proposed units and homes.

The market study identifies the source of the five-minute BVTA population of 12,904 as the "ESRI Business Analyst, 2023; Community Attributes, 2023." However, the study does not supply the actual data as an appendix and it does not state when and how the ESRI data was collected and calculated. Mike Ruth an GIS and ESRI specialist modelled the 5-minute drive time population, and his results agree with demand study. He found that the source for the population was the American Community Survey *2018-2022* estimate. See separate Excel spreadsheet.

My internet research indicates that ACS surveys do not specifically track housing starts or occupancy permits. Thus, it seems likely that most if not all of the population of the new large complexes at Briggs Village that were only partially complete or unleased by late 2022 would have been left out. The large complexes include Copper Leaf (92 family units), Silver Leaf (200 senior units), and the Village Cooperative (67 senior upscale condos)), and six new duplexes behind Cooper Leaf (12 homes). Those total 292 units, which at 2 persons average per unit would be 584 persons.

Assuming only 450 residents of that population were missed and should have been included, the BVTA population (12,904) and market demand would increase by

about 3.5%. The market study author did not address that issue or provide any information about the specific dates or sources of the population data.

Further, the market study ignored the additional residents that will occupy the hundreds of units in Briggs Village yet to be built. Of the 810 units that are now permitted, about 200 -300 units have not yet been built. The developer has requested the city to add 440 more units. Build-out of the 30 Briggs West single homes will also add between 70-130 people, depending on whether ADUs are used. Assuming only 450 new units will be built and have a 2 persons per unit average, and only 100 will live in West Briggs, add more than 1,000,000 new people to Briggs Village, who would frequent the businesses at the Briggs center. One thousand new residents who live at Briggs Village, would increase the BVTA population and demand by about 7.8%.

Thus, the two population issues discussed above could increase demand at Briggs Village (1) by 7.8% on account of the future newcomers assuming none of the current large complex residents were missed, or (2) by 11.3% on account of future newcomers and assuming 450 residents of the large complex residents were missed. These increases would result in respective supply-demand grocery gaps of $8,893,130 and $10,384,365, which would support grocery stores of 17,786 sf and 20,768 sf.

4. **Correcting for both the failure to account for transfer sales and the missing population indicates that the five-minute BVTA demand would likely support a much larger grocery store.**

	Correction amount $	**Size of grocery**
Transferred sales gap correction	**3,547,000**	**n/a**
Population gap correction	**3,123,000 – 4,714,000**	
5 minute demand gap (uncorrected)	**5,570,000**	**11,200 sf**
Total corrected 5 minute demand gap	**12,240,000 – 13,831,000**	**24,480 - -27,662 sf**

Jackson Ewing

From: Kathy McCormick <kathy.mccormick@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 2:56 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Response to Proposed Amendments to OMC 18.05 Re Briggs Master Planned Village

I support the proposed staff changes both to building height and expectations for commercial with a few caveats and additional ideas. These are based on testimony from the public hearing on February 24th, and 27 years of experience working as a city and regional planner.

The changes proposed for building height will help maximize much needed multifamily housing.

Note: *Buildout of proposed additional units will help make some commercial viable and should be maximized to make up for the loss of single family zoned land in the surrounding SE Olympia area. As noted in my letter of February 14th at least 900 housing units that would have supported Briggs planned commercial/retail were never built. The land was rezoned to parks/open space. This action rendered obsolete the expectations for the amount of commercial/retail that could be supported within Briggs.*

I support retaining the 1st floor commercial in mixed use buildings facing the central UV plot of land. The increased height should help the viability of the expected mixed use buildings.

Caution should be taken in the expectations for 1st floor commercial within the remainder of the UV plot of land planned for multifamily in a mixed use form. I suggest considering a tradeoff of 1st floor commercial in exchange for a percentage of smaller size apartment units such as studio and one bedroom units.

Note: *During the public hearing some ideas were proposed for encouraging much needed smaller apartments to help fill the serious deficit in affordable housing. Consider the design of the most recently built multifamily "Briggs Town Center Apartments" (2017/18). This is an example of well designed multifamily without 1st floor commercial. These buildings create a continuous street edge and a pedestrian friendly exterior design.*

Note: *Briggs multifamily is a market rate development not a subsidized housing development which requires federal, state, or local funds for finance and development. Subsidized housing projects have more complicated specifications spelled out in each financing package. All development requires a project developer who can meet bank finance requirements. These include a track record of successful projects that meet profit expectations. Mixed use projects (housing with commercial) are more complicated to finance, design and build. The commercial/retail portion of a mixed use project caries with it the additional higher risk for periods of vacancy than the residential portion.*

Some additional thoughts related to comments/ideas shared at the public hearing.

YMCA staff and members have concerns about current and future parking problems. Perhaps YMCA users could be given some kind of priority for the use of the surface lot adjacent to the YMCA building.

Note: *The beauty of an UV form is its continuous street edge that encourages walking from one place to another. Additions of large surface parking lots seriously erodes the walkability of an activity center as well as land area for housing and additional commercial/retail.* ***Briggs streets are wide and were***

designed to encourage street edge parking. *Parked cars on a street edge slow moving vehicle speed and create a barrier and safety for pedestrians*.

Some people appear skeptical of the market study completed as part of the analysis of the proposed code changes. The market study should be considered.

Note: *I worked with market studies done for various plans over two decades. I observed the value of these increase as more and better data became available. I understand the disappointment of some UV residents and those in the surrounding area especially in the loss of a more traditional full service grocery store. However, the change in zoning (the loss of residentially zoned land) in SE Olympia has forever affected the viability of the amount of commercial/retail that can be supported within Briggs UV*.

Some public hearing testimony suggested more time be spent to review this portion of the OMC code and Master Plan amendments. My fear is that another decade of two will pass with no additional housing built which will preclude the seemingly popular anticipated mixed use in the UV center. I also fear yet another project proposal that spends time/money on the process rather than the product.

After 30 years it is time for completion of this beautiful well designed and built Briggs Urban Village.

Thank you for your consideration. Please include in the record and share with the OPC and OCC.

Kathy McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: ruthkatz411@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 1:02 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: A couple of additional points re: Planning Commission considering possible zoning changes in Briggs Village?

Hello Mr. Ewing,

Thank you for your response. A couple of additional points. As a local resident, I truly enjoy walking around the neighborhood, and as an instructor at the YMCA, I am proud to be an active member of this community. One of the main reasons many of us chose to live in this urban village was its original vision—a walkable community with a mixed-use, regional commercial center. The ability to access essential services, like groceries, without the need to drive, especially in poor weather, was a significant part of the appeal.

I noticed a sign indicating that a grocery store was planned for a specific location, but I am curious about the status of this development, as it has yet to come to fruition. Additionally, while there seem to be numerous vacant residences in the area, I have observed several signs advertising available leases, but what efforts are being made to attract commercial services to the community?

No need to reply to this message, I will watch for details of the next Zoom webinar.

Looking forward,
Ruth Katz

On Wednesday, February 26, 2025 at 01:11:20 PM PST, Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Good afternoon, Ruth,

These changes are being considered by the city at the request of the applicant. An owner of many parcels with the Briggs Urban Village has made an application to amend the city zoning code. The city is obligated to review the proposal and take it to Planning Commission for consideration. The applicant is seeking flexibility to provide additional residential dwelling units and reduce the amount of required commercial space.

The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to City Council for final review and approval.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: ruthkatz411@yahoo.com <ruthkatz411@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:33 AM
To: Lisa Cummings <lcumming@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Why is the Planning Commission considering possible zoning changes in Briggs Village?

Hello Ms. Floyd and Mr. Ewing,

I live in the Briggs Village Silverleaf apartments and attended the Planning Commission Zoom webinar last night. However, I am still unclear about the reasons behind the potential zoning changes in Briggs Village.

Could you kindly provide more information on why these changes are being considered?

Thank you in advance for your prompt response.

Best regards,


Ruth Katz

On Monday, February 24, 2025 at 05:25:01 PM PST, Community Planning & Development <no-reply@zoom.us> wrote:

Yahoo Calendar

5TyYFwUGmE.DQcAAAAUWNlIXxYwTzluYmc5TlRzT2NmUmlkR2UxSEN3AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA


3 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 669
1 929 205 6099 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or
99



+1.888.799.9666

Copyright ©2025 Zoom Video Communications, Inc.

Visit Zoom.us
55 Almaden Blvd
San Jose, CA 95113



Jackson Ewing

From: Riley Caton <hrileycaton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 2:33 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Written Testimony Re: OMC 18.05

Dear Mr. Ewing,

Please transmit the following testimony to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,
Hugh Caton

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

We are responding to the proposed changes to Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 as it relates to Urban villages.

It is our understanding that the Briggs Village development is the first urban village developed in Olympia. We purchased, and live in, a residence in Briggs Village in July of 2021. We purchased here after reading the Briggs Village master plan and learning about future commercial development that would be within walking distance.

We are very disappointed that a proposal has been made to change OMC 18.05 in a way that would be detrimental to eventual commercial development. We have drawn that conclusion from the following:

- Building height would be increased creating the opportunity for a significant increase in density
- Commercial space would be reduced
- This proposal would remove the relationship between commercial square footage and residential density
- There would be no limit on density
- There is no relationship between the number of dwelling units and parking in OMC 18.05 and nothing is proposed in the changes

The current developer of Briggs Village has stated that he is unable to generate interest in commercial development or a grocery store in the development. Consequently, he is attempting to change the code to make it easier to develop multi-family residential on the sites where commercial development is to take place. We submit that the developer does not have an acceptable market study that truly describes the commercial marketability of this property. Furthermore, residents provided testimony describing the lack of marketing by the developer.

The residents in Briggs Village have a significant stake in the outcome of this proposal. Mr. Jackson Ewing stated "There is understanding that whatever changes are made to the code will affect Briggs master plan in the future if these are recommended for approval," So, why overhaul OMC 18.05 based on the whim of a developer that has not marketed the property and does not have a commercial market study?

We urge the Planning Commission to reject the proposed changes to OMC 18.05.

Sincerely,
Hugh & Karen Caton

1441 Harvest Ave SE
Olympia 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Boyer <staynavytom@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 2, 2025 12:14 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: YMCA Briggs
Subject: Parking at Briggs YMCA

I'm writing in opposition of any changes to the parking arrangements for the Briggs YMCA and Briggs Village.

I was a Board member when the Briggs Y was conceived and constructed. At that time, the plan included a large parking lot that would have accommodated the parking needs for a new super market (Safeway) with any vacant parking spaces available for Y users. That parking lot was to be just north of the Briggs Y. The land is still an undeveloped lot. The parking spaces on the Y property were specfically designed to limit the amount of paved area with the agreement to use the Safeway lot for over flow parking. The current parking situation now puts many cars on the narrow public streets and puts our users in jeopardy from traffic.

Please dig into your files to review the approved planning and development agreements for the Briggs Y. Do not make our parking situation worse than it is. Ironically, we built the Briggs Y in some measure as a response to our member's complaints that there was no parking at our historic downtown Y.

Tom Boyer
A Gun gives you half of God's Power.
Use your guns responsibly.

Jackson Ewing

From: Kyle Cronk <cronkk@ssymca.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 1:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Comment on Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 Amendments

Dear Members of the Olympia Planning Commission,
As the President and CEO of the South Sound YMCA, I write to you regarding the proposed amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code 18.05, particularly those affecting the urban village development plans.

The Y actively supports initiatives that promote sustainable growth and development within our community. We recognize the pressing need for increased affordable housing density to address our city's housing challenges and fully support the Commission's efforts in this regard.

However, we cannot support the proposed zoning changes as presented by the applicant.

Is a zoning change necessary?
The core argument of the applicant in requesting these zoning changes – that commercial development, specifically a grocery store, is not economically viable – is at best, a manufactured opinion. The study, which both City staff and this commission is relying on for this decision, contains outdated information, numerous flaws, errors, and omissions, and was commissioned and paid for by the applicant.

We recommend prior to a decision that either the applicant commissions an *actual* current market study with input from local stakeholders *or* allow local stakeholders to commission a market study at their cost that will be considered with equal weight by the Commission.

The centrally located grocery store is essential
We believe that not only is a small grocery store commercially viable as a centerpiece of Briggs Village, but that it is critical to the value and sustainability of the entire project. Consistent with the Olympia Strong Plan, the existence of the grocery store *enhances* affordable housing options by reducing dependency on vehicles through consolidated overflow parking for the entire village and reduced traffic to essential services, improving health outcomes by reducing food deserts & encouraging a sense of belonging by providing more gathering opportunities.

We recommend the Commission preserve in the zoning a requirement that a centrally located grocery store no smaller than 10K square feet [not including alcohol] be built.

Changes to zoning now make it much more challenging for Master Plan and other changes later in the process.
This almost certainly makes the interests of the developer overrepresented when compared to that of local citizens and business owners.

We recommend that included in any decision the Planning Commission makes asks the Hearing Examiner that a thorough parking analysis be conducted by City staff that clarifies the status of the overflow parking identified in the 2014 Master Plan, including the 48 YMCA-designated stalls as part of the grocery store development we believe the developer is obligated to provide.

Conclusion
The South Sound YMCA remains committed to supporting our community's growth and well-being. We believe these recommendations will provide a balanced approach to urban development, aligning increased housing opportunities with essential community services. We appreciate the Commission's consideration of our comments and look forward to contributing to Olympia's vibrant future.

Thank you for your attention and dedication to making Olympia a better place for all its residents.

Sincerely,

Kyle Cronk
President/CEO
South Sound YMCA
E: cronkk@ssymca.net
D: 360-918-0311

The Y: We're for youth development, healthy living and social responsibility.
Give To Your Y - South Sound YMCA

To schedule 30 minutes with me follow this link.
https://calendly.com/cronkk/30minzoom

Jackson Ewing

From: Susan Da Pron <dapronfamily@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 3:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Commercial space plan

- The developer's proposed amendments would reduce the commercial space by 45%. That's 45% less commercial space than the City determined in the 2014 Master Plan was necessary to have a successful urban village.

- 45% less commercial space will not support a viable walkable village that will serve the basic needs of the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods.

- The basic needs of residents haven't changed; the commercial space needed to provide for those in a walkable village is just as great as it has ever been.

- The City's code says that the urban village core must support **not just** the Urban Village but also the surrounding neighborhoods. The developer's proposed small commercial center (WITH A MINI-MART) won't do that.

- Reducing the commercial space so drastically abandons the idea of an urban village and converts Briggs Village into a huge housing project.

- Reducing the commercial space so drastically breaks the City's promise to residents of the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods that the village would have a walkable commercial CORE that would meet basic needs.

David and Susan DaPron unit 312 Village coop

Jackson Ewing

From: soule@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 3:30 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village housing developement

To whom it may concern.

As a resident of south Olympia for many years I believed that this Briggs development would bring needed services to the South end.
We were promised some sort of small grocery store as well as other services. We moved into the Village Co-Op believing we would see some services that would come to the area.
I strongly oppose this change that is being proposed by the Developer. Make them stick by their original promise to provide more services.

Sincerely
Chuck Soule
VCSS Property Committee Maanager

Jackson Ewing

From: Rick Slane <rickslane@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 3:53 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: CityCouncil
Subject: Comment to Planning Commission

To: Jackson Ewing

I watched the zoom meeting of the Planning Commission last Monday. I have the following comments.

The developer's proposed amendments would reduce the commercial space by 45%.
45% less commercial space will not support a viable walkable village that will serve the basic needs of the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods where I live.
Reducing the commercial space so drastically breaks the City's promise of the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods that the village would have a walkable commercial CORE that would meet basic needs.

Richard Slane
1520 Palomino Dr SE Unit 209
360-970-2827
Sent from my iPhone

To the Planning Commission and the City of Olympia Planning Department:

I am writing in opposition to the zoning amendments proposed for Briggs Village. I do not oppose a modest increase in residential units, so long as legitimate concerns can be addressed, but I strongly oppose any reduction in the amount of commercial space required by zoning.

My Background

I am writing in my role as a resident of Briggs Village, but I am an attorney with more than 30 years of experience in real estate, homeowners association, and construction law. I was in private practice for the first 25 years of my career. I joined the Washington State Attorney General's Office in 2020, and one of my concentrations is real estate transactions for the state.

I grew up in Southeast Olympia, with childhood homes in the neighborhoods of Wilderness, Raintree, and Pifer Court. I frequently bicycled by the Briggs Nursery on my way down to the Deschutes River. My wife and I purchased our home on Brighton Way in Briggs Village in 2019, thrilled to be part of a mixed-use community that would eventually include a grocery store, restaurants, services, and shops within walking distance. Homes in Briggs Village were so in demand that we made an offer above asking within three days of the listing.

Briggs Village is a Package

Before 2004, Southeast Olympia was almost entirely single-family housing. The Briggs family proposed to change that by building a mixed-use "urban village," which would (a) provide much-needed housing diversity, density, and commercial activity to southeast Olympia, and (b) allow the Briggs family to make more profit through multi-family housing and commercial development. The approved Briggs Village plan was always a package; there was never an expectation that all of the parcels would be equally profitable. The grocery store, in particular, was always recognized to be a less-profitable development parcel – but it was also always recognized to be the key to the entire development.

Mr. Gill was aware of all of this when he purchased the Briggs Village LLC in 2015. He is now before the City proposing zoning changes that would allow him to change the package deal by reducing the required amount of commercial space and the required size of the grocery store. In support of his proposal, Mr. Gill argues that he cannot profitably develop the commercial portions of the urban village, particularly the grocery store.

Mr. Gill's argument does not stand up to scrutiny – the actual, objective, data indicates that there is ample demand to support the commercial development required by the applicable zoning and to support a good-sized grocery store.

It is my hope that the Planning Commission, and the City, consider the many cogent comments that have been made in writing and orally in opposition to the proposed changes. To the comments already made, I add the following:

Do Not Conflate "Mr. Gill's Preferred Plan" with "the Market."

Mr. Gill's materials in support of his proposal and City's staff analysis have conflated two concepts that must be kept separate – (1) Mr. Gill's personal development preferences, and (2) the overall "market." The question is whether there is market demand to support a project that meets the zoning code, not whether Mr. Gill wants to build something else. Mr. Gill's subjective preferences tells us essentially nothing about overall market demand for Briggs Village's commercial spaces – that requires actual, objective data and analysis.

The "Market Study" Provided Mr. Gill is Worthless

One of the skills developed over three decades of litigating real estate and construction cases is analyzing expert/consultant reports. For at least the following reasons, the "market study" submitted by Mr. Gill should be ignored – it isn't worth the paper it was written on.

- It is anonymous and relies on anonymous sources. An expert study or opinion is only worth taking seriously if the person(s) who wrote it establishes that he or she is qualified to offer the report, stands behind it with their name and credentials, and the person reading the report can evaluate the qualifications and biases of the writer. There is no way to know how this report came to be, who wrote it, or whose opinions it is relying on. Why is this important? As yourself: What if the broker quoted in the report is already lined up to get the residential listings?
- It does not consider past attempts to market or information from existing businesses. Any study purporting to opine on the marketability of a property should start off with a discussion of marketing efforts to date (e.g., "it was listed on the MLS and other sales platforms from x to y, and the price was successively reduced from a to b, and there were no offers"). Next, a market study should discuss the success or failure of existing businesses (e.g., "existing business are unable to succeed in this location/are thriving in this location."). This study does neither. This information is available – it was either avoided because it didn't fit the narrative, or the market study isn't intended to stand for the proposition it is being used for.
- It cherry-picks the relevant population measurement. The "market study" uses a five-minute drive time for its analysis. This ignores the "15-minute" neighborhood concept that underpins urban villages, and instead uses a metric that, conveniently for Mr. Gill, <u>includes</u> the Tumwater Safeway but <u>excludes</u> the majority of the service area for the Tumwater Safeway. This skews the result – and skews it without disclosure. At a minimum the report should have (a)

included the 15-minute neighborhood concept, and (b) discussed how other drive times would change the analysis.

- Finally, its ultimate conclusion is based on the unsubstantiated opinion of an unidentified broker that for undisclosed reasons the surrounding community would not support a grocery store. There is zero basis for this statement to be given any credibility whatsoever.

Mr. Gill can submit a flawed "market study" if he so chooses, but the City and Commission are under no obligation to give it any credence.

Objective Information Indicates Support for Commercial Development – Including a Grocery Store

The actual objective data available indicates that "the market" will support commercial development. Two related, and objective, data sets support this conclusion. First, despite no marketing, two commercial properties have sold for multiple times their assessed values. Second, the existing businesses in Briggs Village are thriving and profitable.

In addition, I would direct the Commission to review Andrew Peterson's critique of the market study. Mr. Peterson, a trained statistician, was able to tease out objective data from the "market study," and demonstrates that the actual objective data supports the conclusion that a grocery store would easily be supported in this location.

Mr. Gill could sell more properties and let someone else develop them – he just doesn't want to.

The Residential and Commercial Owners and Businesses Relied on the Promise of Briggs Village and are here for the Long Run.

Finally, I would ask the City and the Commission to acknowledge that the residents and the business owners in Briggs Village have relied on the City's support for an urban village. They have committed their resources and substantial amounts of money, and have chosen to make their lives here and make this community work. Mr. Gill, in contrast, is an out-of-state developer who is here simply to maximize his profits – and then leave.

Please reject the proposed zoning changes to the extent they reduce any commercial space requirements. There is no support for the request other than the developer's personal preference – and that should not be enough.

Thank you,

David Merchant

1520 Brighton Way SE
Olympia, WA 98501
808.344.3347

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Ciapusci <tom@ciapusci.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 4:06 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Cc: CityCouncil
Subject: Oppose proposed amendment to the Briggs Village 2014 Master Plan

As a member of Village Cooperative of South Sound, a development within Briggs Village, I write in opposition to the proposed amendments to the 2014 Briggs Village Master Plan. The proposed reduction of commercial space within Briggs Village by nearly 50% represents a shocking abandonment of the promises made to residents of Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods to maintain a model walkable, sustainable community within the greater City of Olympia. Adopting the proposals would send a clear message to residents who are committed to the village and to potential residents of future such projects that the City's stated commitments to partner with residents are hollow.

Tom Ciapusci
tom@ciapusci.com

Jackson Ewing

From: Toni Weaver <weaveroly@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 4:13 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Hi Jackson. Thank you for responding to my earlier email, and I would like to go on record as saying the same message that Betty Bailey has given on this subject. I am in favor of keeping the commercial development like the plan originally stated, and I would like to go on record as saying that. I am a resident of the Village Cooperative of South Sound, which is kitty corner from the YMCA and is the newest residential building in that area. Thank you.
Toni Weaver
1520 Palomino Dr, #222
Olympia 98501
Sent from my iPhone

Jackson Ewing

From: Sally Salzberg <sally.salzberg@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 4:15 PM
To: Jackson Ewing; CityCouncil
Subject: City Planning of Briggs Village

Hello, Councilmembers

The developer's proposed amendments would reduce the commercial space by 45%. That's 45% less commercial space than the City determined in the 2014 Master Plan was necessary to have a successful urban village.

- What has changed that would cause the City to accept a lesser plan?

The basic needs of residents haven't changed; the commercial space needed to provide for those in a walkable village is just as great as it has ever been. A reduction in commercial space will not support a viable walkable village nor will it provide an outlet for small businesses to flourish in the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods. The City's code says that the urban village core must support **not just** the Urban Village, but also the surrounding neighborhoods. The developer's proposed small commercial center (WITH A MINI-MART) won't do that.

- While it is in the Tumwater area, a rather large housing development is in the process of bringing in an additional home owners, so it is in the City of Olympia's best interest to provide neighborhood businesses versus those homeowners stopping somewhere in Tumwater or Lacey for their basic needs. Wouldn't the City of Olympia prefer a means to grow revenue?

Reducing the commercial space so drastically abandons the idea of an urban village and converts Briggs Village into a huge housing project.

- Does the City of Olympia want to be known as a "just get along" city or would you rather be a trendsetter for creating a village environment – one of the first on the West coast?

Reducing the commercial space so drastically breaks the City's promise to residents of the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods that the village would have a walkable commercial CORE that would meet basic needs.

- With all that is happening politically in this country, a city that breaks its promises to its constituency creates tremendous angst and raises citizens' concerns that other promises have also or are about to be overturned or withdrawn.

It is tempting and generally easier to just go along with the golden carrot being waived in front of you. But it takes a *leader with integrity* to live up to promises and successfully move forward toward the future.

- ***Which type of leader are you?***

Sally Salzberg
1520 Palomino Dr. SE, Unit 212
Olympia WA 98501

America was not built on fear. America was built on courage, on imagination and an unbeatable determination to do the job at hand. **Harry S. Truman**
Imagination is everything. It is the preview of life's coming attractions. **Albert Einstein**

Jackson Ewing

From: Eugene & Cindy Epplin <ghecee81@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 4:17 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs village.

I live in Village Co-operative at 1520 Palomino Dr Se.
I would appreciate your efforts to not change the agreement about Briggs Village.

Reducing the commercial space so drastically breaks the City's promise to residents of the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods that the village would have a walkable commercial CORE that would meet basic needs.

Thank you
Eugene Epplin. Unit 107

Comments from Brian Faller

4460 Village Dr SE, Olympia 98501

Submitted to the Planning Commission

Re Amendments to OMC 18.05

March 3, 2025

I urge the Planning Commission not to recommend the proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 to the City Council for the following reasons:

THE PROPOSED SHARP REDUCTIONS IN COMMERCIAL SPACE WILL CONVERT BRIGGS VILLAGE FROM AN URBAN CENTER TO A HUGE HOUSING PROJECT

- The developer's proposed amendments would reduce the commercial space by 45%. That's 45% less commercial space than the City determined in the 2014 Master Plan was necessary to have a successful urban village.
- 45% less commercial space will not support a viable walkable village that will serve the basic needs of the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods.
- The basic needs of residents haven't changed; the commercial space needed to provide for those in a walkable village is just as great as it has ever been.
- The City's code says that the urban village core must support the **not just** the Urban Village **but also** the surrounding neighborhoods. The developer's proposed small commercial center (WITH A MINI-MART) won't do that.

- Reducing the commercial space so drastically abandons the idea of an urban village and converts Briggs Village into a huge housing project.
- Reducing the commercial space so drastically breaks the City's promise to residents of the Briggs Village and the surrounding neighborhoods that the village would have a walkable commercial CORE that would meet basic needs.

THE CURRENT DEVELOPER HASN'T ACTED IN GOOD FAITH TO GET A GROCERY OR DEVELOP COMMERCIAL

- The CURRENT developer bought the Briggs village in 2015 with the obligation to provide a real grocery store and commercial, but hasn't SHOWN us or the city it has done anything to get the grocery or commercial since then.

- Despite the developer's obligation to get a real grocery, the developer hasn't told the city of a single grocery aside from a mini-mart that he has approached to located in Briggs Village.

- We asked the city for all records the city has that the developer has sought a grocery for Briggs Village and NONE were provided. It is abundantly clear that the developer has provided the city **no proof** that he has done anything since he bought the property in 2015 to find an anchor grocery store.

- The developer's architect keeps saying that the developer hasn't been able to get a grocery to come to the village. But he offers **no PROOF.** Just words. **Don't be fooled!** Demand real proof. Not words.

- The only two COMMERCIAL lots that the developer has sold OVER THE LAST TEN YEARS in Briggs Village he sold in 2018 and 2022 for over **two times** and **four times** their assessed values. That is not acting in good faith to develop commercial!

- According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, the Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, property # 37030000020 was purchased from Gill on March 1, 2018 for $1,000,000, but was then assessed for $412,000, and is now assessed at $331,600.

- According to the records of the Thurston County assessor, the developer sold the property north of the Humble Cow (property # 37030000021) in 2022 for $1,445,000. The property was then assessed at $332,500, and is now assessed at $484,200.

COMMERCIAL DEMAND IS STRONG IN BRIGGS VILLAGE

- The real evidence is that market conditions in Briggs Village are strong for commercial.

- The developer's own "anonymous" market study itself says at page 9 **"demand for retail space in the [Thurston County] market is high, with high occupancy across retail centers and landlord's free to negotiate higher rents."**

- The developer's own "anonymous" market study itself indicates at Exhibit 5, on page 9, that Thurston County retail lease rates are high ($20/sf) and that retail vacancy rates are low (less than 2%).

- The few businesses the developer has allowed at Briggs Village (the Briggs Taphouse, the Humble Cow, Fit Life, and Olympia Pediatric Dentistry, etc.) are thriving. Ask the business owners.

- The Starbucks just across the street from Briggs Village has been a phenomenal success ever since it opened about 2018. Just ask the owner!

- The YMCA brings in over 1,000 people a day! Each weekday.

- The only two COMMERCIAL lots that the developer has sold in Briggs Village he sold in 2018 for over **two times** and in 2022 for over **four times** their assessed values.

- Those two sales at extremely high prices show a VERY strong demand for commercial land in Briggs Village.

- Imagine how many commercial businesses would exist in Briggs Village if the developer actually made an effort to sell commercial lots and sold them for their actual values rather than highly inflated values!

CONDITIONS IN BRIGGS VILLAGE ARE VERY DIFFERENT NOW THAN WHEN THE GROCEY STORE DEAL FELL APART IN 2014

- In 2014, very few of Briggs Village residential units had been built. Now over 600 new units of housing (single homes, duplexes, townhouses, large apartment complexes, condominiums, etc.) have been built around the Village core, including the neighboring Village Cooperative, just across Yelm highway from Starbucks.

- That's a huge change from 2014 when the initial deal with Storman's for a 25,000 sf grocery fell apart. At that time the Village was mostly unbuilt and empty.

- The large additional housing around the village core now makes Briggs Village a much more attractive market for a prospective grocer.

- The last owner took its obligation seriously to get a grocer. It offered to Storman's to build and equip the grocery (at a cost of $8-10 million) and then sell it to Storman's after two years. The current developer hasn't approached a grocer, let along offer the grocer an incentive to come to Brigg's Village.

Jackson Ewing

From: Meredith Blundell <merblundell@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 4:31 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Redevolment of Briggs Village

My name is Meredith Blundell and I live at the Village CoOp of South South. To reduce the commercial space at Brigggs village would be a disastrous decision. I moved to this facility counting on the promise from the City of Olympia that Briggs Village would be a neighborhood where I as a 90year old could find businesses and services in my neighborhood. Also Yelm Hwy has large amounts of traffic and more apartments would increase traffic and noise. I strongly plead that this change be defeated Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Joan Halverstadt <halvejoan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:01 PM
To: CityCouncil; Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

I am writing to express my concern about the developers proposal to decrease commercial space in Briggs Village. We currently live in the Village Co-Op on Yelm Hwy and Henderson Blvd. Previously we lived in Ward Lake Heights since 1985. So we have been affected by Briggs Village since its inception.

This change from an Urban Village to less commercial and more housing will defeat the whole purpose of a walkable Urban VIllage. More housing will add to the already dense traffic that we have on Yelm Hwy. More housing will impact the enrollment in our neighborhood schools. And an increase in housing density will affect the environment as well as create more traffic noise and congestion. When we lived in Ward Lake Heights, Ward Lake was known as the cleanest lake in Thurston County. That is no longer true...and more housing will pollute the lake even more!

Additionally we have been waiting over 30 years for these supposed commercial buildings to be developed. Where is the grocery store we were promised by the city? How does additional housing promote the walkable neighborhood and Urban Village promise? What environmental effects will occur with higher housing density?

Our neighborhood doesn't need another mega housing development!! We need the walkable access to businesses that were in the original concept of an Urban Village.

Thank You for your consideration.

Joan Halversradt
1520 Palomino Dr. SE #121
Olympia, WA 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: John Hoover <hooverjohn1945@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:19 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Urban village

My name is John Hoover. I live on the corner of Yelm and Henderson. From the day that Briggs Village became an idea….years ago, My wife and I believed that this was an idea that has supported the city's vision of a walkable community.

And that to me is the main issue. To reduce commercial space allocation, in my mind goes against the city's vision of supporting sustainable and walkable communities. We need commercial development to help all of us walk….not drive.

I simply ask you as a resident to do all you can to help this area become walkable.

Thanks,

John Hoover
Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: MARYANN WEBSTER <websterdma@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:23 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Support for Commercial & Retail Space in Briggs Village

1. The developer's proposed amendments would reduce the commercial space by 45%.

2. 45% less commercial space will not support a viable walkable village that will serve the basic needs of the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods.

3. The City's code says that the urban village core must support NOT JUST the Urban Village but also the surrounding neighborhoods. The developer's proposed small commercial center (WITH A MINI MART) won't do that.

4. Reducing the commercial space so drastically abandons the idea of an urban village and converts Briggs Village into a huge housing project.

Thank you for your consideration and sharing with the City Council.

David H. and MaryAnn Webster, owners in the Village Cooperative across Yelm Highway from Briggs Village

Jackson Ewing

From: Tom Culhane <culhane_tom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 5:40 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Olympia Planning Commission consideration of zoning changes at Briggs Village

Dear Mr. Ewing,

After listening to last week's public meeting regarding the Olympia Planning Commission's consideration of changes to Urban Village zoning requirements, I have some important additions to my email below. Specifically, I urge the Planning Commission not to change any of the current zoning requirements. The needs for the existing requirements are just as valid as when they were first enacted, since they attempt to develop a new type of community paradigm within Olympia. This new paradigm is one that provides a good balance of walkable and rideable features for nearby residents. It is clear from the testimony provided, that the current developer has not tried to make the existing regulations work since it would be more profitable to develop denser housing. Since that is the case, the Planning Commission needs to hold firm, and accept that this developer may need to allow some other developer to do what needs to be done.

Also, I strongly agree with the individual last week who said that it is disingenuous to suggest that the Planning Committee's decision regarding any changes to the current Urban Village zoning requirements are separate from a decision on a specific Briggs Community development plan. We all know that if laxer Urban Village zoning requirements are adopted, then the developer will come along and request similar changes to the Briggs Community Development plan, and at that point it is highly likely the response will be to accept the proposal for higher density housing in the Briggs Community. To suggest that we the public don't understand this is ridiculous and insulting.

Tom Culhane
1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA

From: Tom Culhane <culhane_tom@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:31 PM
To: jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Olympia Planning Commission consideration of zoning changes at Briggs Village

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments aim to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space in urban villages, specifically as they apply to Briggs Village. If this change were to occur it would strain the parking infrastructure at the Briggs YMCA, which is a tremendous asset to the surrounding community.

The original Briggs Village Master Plan created an "urban village" with a variety of housing options and services available in a central location. The plan took into account the needs of both business and residents with regard to infrastructure. It incorporated access to fresh food via a neighborhood grocery store, sidewalks, green spaces, and other elements critical to a healthy and accessible community. Zoning requirements, at that

time, also took into consideration plans to decrease traffic and support a walkable community. This included a strategic mix of residential and commercial space, shared parking plans for commercial properties.

However, all that would change at Briggs Village under the current proposal to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the required commercial space. That is why it is imperative that the Urban Village zoning and the Briggs Village Master Plan not be altered. The proposed changes would lead to fewer services available in Briggs Village and increased pressure on current parking, leading to a less walkable neighborhood. We want to ensure all residents have access to critical services. The changes proposed, would decrease access and lead to development that does not meet our community's needs.

Tom Culhane
1916 Arietta Ave SE
Olympia, WA

March 3 2025 hearing

As I understand, the Role of the PC here is to make a recommendation to the city council.

Thus, I would urge that PC either (1) not recommend that council pass the proposed amendments or (2) recommend that council pass the substitute amendments we submitted to the PC.

The written comments I provided early today give my reasons for not passing the amendments.

I want to add one observation to that. The amount of undeveloped space in the Briggs core we are talking about here is surprisingly small. I measured it using Google maps. If you include the road surface areas, it is 16 acres, but if you measure the dirt, it is only 10 acres.

If 200-300 residential units remain unbuilt and the developer gets to add about 440 units to that, that would make 640 – 740 new units.

This could mean densities of 640-740 units in 10 acres or 64-74 units an acre with commercial on first floor of at least ½ of them. Imagine what this would look like, with only .5 off street parking sp per residential unit. Where will all units and all the cars go? This underscorces to me that we and the PC really don't understand what this proposal would mean on the ground. The planning commission would be ill advised to

recommend a code change to the council, that could turn Briggs Village in total morass.

But If the PC feels inclined to recommend any amendments, we urge that they be our substitute amendments or something like them.

The substitute amendments create an incentive for Gill to deliver the grocery and the commercial now and in additional some affordable housing, in the form of studio apartments. They incentivize Gill because they would reduce the commercial requirement and increase residential units, but only if Gill *first* actually delivers a real grocery store over 10,000 sf and some restaurants or a restaurant and a bakery. He would also have to commit to build at least 15% of the new units at 500 sf or less, which would provide more affordable housing.

We haven't put it in there, but The YMCA parking is also something that could be provide as part of the package.

The bottom line is , If the city now gives Gill the flexibility he wants without any conditions to motivate him, it loses all leverage to get him to deliver. **Our substitute amendments**

aim to provide the incentive to finally get the anchor grocery store and other businesses at Briggs Village that we have waiting for over twenty years. If there is a better way to create an effective incentive, we would welcome that too, but clearly one is necessary.

TO; jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

citycouncil@ci.olympia.wa.us

RE: **Request for consideration of Land Use in Olympia Area**

Briggs Village



We recently moved to Olympia where we reside as residents of the new Village Cooperative at 1520 Palomino Drive SE. Our introduction to the area and our senior living facilities have been a very positive experience. One of the enjoyable experiences includes our walks in the community for exercise and exploration of the landscape. One informative walk is the Kettle View Park with the postings that note the geological history of the area. We certainly have a place in geological time with the lakes, kettles, and glacial tills in our section of South Puget Sound. This area is rich in land features and culture. The one disappointment with our walking journeys is the undeveloped land to the north of the YMCA. As you are aware, the installed infrastructure awaits a new beginning for services for this growing and dynamic area.

As a former history teacher, my research into the development of this area includes the vision of Briggs Village that was very thoughtfully developed and presented in 2010. A significant question remains to be answered **"What happened to the Vision?"** In talking with long-time residents, the excitement of including a shopping area, and recreational opportunities for families continues to be a focal point.

In addition, the plan to maximize additional housing units puts an extensive strain on the roads and facilities that currently exist. One does not need to be a mathematician to note that each new unit brings one or more vehicles to our roads and Yelm Highway and Henderson Avenue are near capacity today…especially at peak travel hours.

To step back for a moment and look at the overall needs of this community would be a positive move for our elected representatives. And consider not only current needs; the enjoyment of the area is important for generations to follow.

The city of Olympia provides a wealth of opportunities to live an enjoyable and healthy lifestyle. Please consider the opportunity to be involved in a plan that would bring the benefits of community to our residents…talking with each other on the pathways…observing our young citizens playing in the parks and recreational settings…walking to stores and shops to support local business.

We thank you for your consideration and your vision of a dynamic Olympia neighborhood,

Doug Ringenbach goldtrek@gmail.com

Barb Dorn summertrek@gmailcom

February 14, 2025

Dear Olympia Planning Commission

Response to Amendments to the OMC 18.05 Related to Briggs Master Planned Villages ffrom Kathy McCormick

I support changes to the code that would result in adding as many new multi-family housing units as possible since this will bolster the desire to build out the Briggs Center. I strongly support changing the code to be as flexible as possible to make up for the loss of expected housing in SE Olympia over the last 15 years. Over 900 addditional units of housing were expected when Briggs UV was planned. The loss of these "rooftops" in the Briggs shopping shed area has made it difficult to build the UV center as envisioned. Commercial/retail viability in dependent on the amount of housing within each given shopping shed area. Changes in land use in SE Olympia from housing zones to parks/open space zones decreased the viability for such uses as even a moderate sized grocery store. The loss of that SE Olympia housing zones utterly changed the equation for commercial built into the 1994/95 UV and UV Master Plan. The proposed changes are absolutely necessary.

Background:
I served as a City Planner for many years both during and after the rewrite of the Olympia Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 1994) to comply with the 1990/91 WA State Growth Management Act. I was the lead on the Urban Village zone designation that was incorporated into the plan. The UV zone and code was contentious from the beginning. It was considered a new concept and some in the surrounding neighborhoods were fearful of how it would develop. Some in the surrounding neighborhods mounted a disinformation/misinformation campaign about the Briggs 100 year old nursery and the family intentions. With direction of the Olympia City Council the planning department expanded on the public information planned. Briggs hired NBBJ architects to illustrate a draft Master plan concept that was incorporated into the plan and additional public information and discussion took place. The result of this effort was the adoption of the image very similar to the Master Plan image adopted and still in use today.

Because of the fear and skepticism - the zoning code adoped in 1994/95 ended up being extremely prescriptive. This was counter to one of the known advantages of an Urban Village master plan – i.e. the evolution of the development as the demand for residential and commercial evolved over time.

The UV code revision process is an opportunity to change some key elements that would allow the 30 year old vision to adjust to today's realities.

Reality 1) Over the last 30 years at least 900 units of possible new housing expected to support the UV commercial center was lost when large portions of SE Olympia was rezoned from housing to parks/openspace and added to the existing LBA Park. With that change and other subsequent changes in the SE area expecations for even a moderate size UV grocery store was lost. The market study done as part of research for the UV code changes indicated a small grocery store (like a SPUDS) looks viable if additional housing units are able to be built.

Reality 2) Since the1990's a housing crisis has emerged. State GMA law has changed to allow a mix of housing types in all zones including single family zones. Olympia's Comprehensive Plan and code

has changed to comply with GMA law as well City and Thurston region goals for sustainable transportation, land use and environmental. Briggs UV is a prime opportunity to add additional apartment housing units so badly needed AND that will support the limited amount of commercial identified in the market study.

Reality 3) The additional height recommendations should be supported to maximize the number of units that could emerge. The combination of these additional units may help to making some small scale commercial viable. The result will be the animated UV center originally envisioned.

Reality 4) Mixed use housing/commercial is always more difficult to build. Staff has recommended maintaining the requirement for ground floor commercial/retail space on the 3 street edges directly facing the actual center area (where it is hoped a small grocery and possibly other commercial could prove to be viable).

I ask that you consider relaxing the ground floor uses in the remainder of the expected multifamily area. As noted in the draft this should at the very least be allowed to be live/work space, or common areas related to the housing development. In my opinion these UV undeveloped outer center blocks around the actual center could be successfully developed without ground floor activity. Consider the Briggs Town Center Apartments (I believe the most recently added Briggs UVmultifamily). Additional multifamily housing using this design would be a fine addition the village and achieve the walkability desired.

I send this to you as I felt it was important for you to understand why this Briggs UV code is so very prescriptive. Some were so fearful that just commercial would be developed that no commercial/retail was allowed untill specific amounts of single family and then multifamily were developed. Given the current circumstances it is well past time to make it possible for the remainder of Briggs UV to build out. I am hopeful that the proposed changes will encouarage this to happen without incurring more time and money process cost. I would rather any additional cost by any developer go into well designed buildings.

Thank you for your consideration and for your dedicated service.

Sincerely

Kathy McCormick
2420 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA

February 18, 2025

Greg Quetin, Chair
Daniel Garcia, Vice Chair
William Hannah
Tammy Adams
Aaron Sauerhoff
Raphael Garcia
Zainab Nejati
Cc: Jackson Ewing, Staff

Olympia Planning Commission

Dear Commission Members:

We are board members of the Friends of Briggs Village, a non-profit corporation organized to assist residents and owners in Briggs Village to obtain answers to questions and seek improvements in Briggs Village. You may hear from our members separately, but we intend to articulate many, if not all, of the concerns raised by the proceeding before you concerning the code for urban villages.

The current developer and owner of unsold portions of Briggs Village is Gordie Gill, the petitioner in the proceeding before you. Shortly after purchasing the property, in approximately 2015, Mr. Gill appeared at a public hearing in Olympia. He assured us that there would be a grocery store, once he had built out enough apartments to make it commercially viable. Three years ago, after no efforts on his part to have an adequate grocery store built, he filed a petition to amend the master plan for Briggs Village to allow him to replace the planned grocery store with a 3500 square foot convenience store (approximately the size of an average 7-11 Store). When many of us who live in Briggs Village objected to this plan, and he was told by planning staff that what he was seeking was a "major amendment" that would ultimately go to Olympia City Council, he withdrew the petition.

Mr. Gill is now seeking to have the definition of "urban village" redefined in preparation for another attempt to modify the master plan for Briggs Village. At no time since he purchased the property, has he sought to meet with us to discuss possible solutions to this problem. For example, despite the fact that he is legally required to hold annual meetings of the HOA to which we belong, he has conducted only one annual meeting since 2018. That meeting was called last Fall only so that he could have a board resolution for tax purposes. The 2 ½ hours of owner comments and complaints at that meeting resulted in a flurry of promises and commitments from Gordie Gill and his local management company, the Management Trust, but none of his promises have been kept.

In 2023, owners and residents became concerned about many trees on several of our streets that were not being properly cared for, and were falling down on cars and sidewalks. We wrote two letters to Gordie Gill asking him to take action on this problem. He never even responded to our letters. Instead, he instructed his agent to advise us that the trees were the responsibility of the individual owners, even though they are in the common space (between the sidewalk and the curb) and the governing documents clearly make it the responsibility of the HOA, which Gordie controls.

We regard this proceeding as yet another attempt by Gordie to game the system, to allow him to build as many apartments as he can while taking no responsibility for the community which he "planned". Perhaps if he lived locally, instead of out of state, he would better understand our needs and concerns and not regard Briggs Village as just another cash machine.

As to the merits of the proposal before you:

First, we would like to discuss the concept of "urban village". According to Wikipedia:

"In urban planning and design, an urban village is an urban development typically characterized by medium-density housing, mixed use zoning, good public transit, and an emphasis on pedestrianization and public space[1][2]

Urban villages are seen to provide an alternative to recent patterns of urban development in many cities, especially decentralization and urban sprawl. They are generally purported to:

Reduce car reliance and promote cycling, walking and transit use

Provide a high level o□sel□-containment (people working, recreating and living in the same area)

Help □acilitate strong community institutions and interaction□"

The above definition describes the reasons why most o□us chose Briggs Village in which to live□ In this time o□human-caused climate change, we wanted to live in a community where we were not so dependent on the automobile□ Having a grocery store within walking distance o□your home makes sense on a personal level and on a global level□

Mr□Gill's proposal aims to severely reduce the area allotted to a grocery store□ It is not coincidental that OMC 18□05□040 lists a grocery store as a required use in an urban village□

Whereas the existing provisions require commercial floor space o□225,000 sq □t or 175,000 sq □t, i□the Village does not contain a grocery store o□at least 35,000 sq □t, the proposal be□ore you would reduce that requirement to a mere 52,500 sq □t minimum□ This reduction severely reduces the commercial core that residents rely upon □or their shopping needs□

The proposal □urther exchanges a requirement o□75 sq □t o□minimum retail floor space per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot □or a flat retail/office combined minimum o□50,000 sq □t□ Considering the current residential units at 810, the existing code would require a minimum o□60,750 sq □t o□retail floor space (not office)□ Mr□Gill wants to add an additional 450 units and □urther reduce the commercial minimum□ Instead o□75 sq □t o□ retail floor space per authorized residential dwelling, there would be a little less than 40 sq □t o□office or retail per authorized unit□This proposal, i□ accepted, would reduce the commercial core to a □ew small shops while increasing the number o□residents who would still need a grocery store and related businesses□ Essentially, his proposal replaces the commercial core with more apartments□

The existing code requires 200 sq □t o□combined office and services floor space per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot□ At 810 units, this

total would be 162,000 sq ft. Mr. Gill would reduce this to a minimum of 52,000 square feet.

At no point is the issue of parking addressed in these changes. Even without the buildout of the central core, the existing businesses and the YMCA all experience overflow parking into the undeveloped area. Where will all these new residents park?

The OMC contemplates a "village green or park" which would be surrounded by the commercial uses. Mr. Gill would surround the village green with more apartments.

The maximum building height in an urban village is three stories. This height is substantial when you consider urban villages are placed contiguous to residential neighborhoods containing mostly single family homes. Mr. Gill proposes four stories around the town center. Why does it need to be adjusted upwards? The taller buildings will affect sightlines within and outside of the urban village. The drafters of the code related to urban villages were sensitive to the need of the Village to fit within residential neighborhoods. Thus, the height limitation of two stories or 35 feet, whichever is less, for perimeter buildings in an urban village. Doesn't the height limitations still make sense? Mr. Gill would eliminate this requirement as well.

There is a requirement in the Code that at least 30 percent of the site in urban villages be open space. This is consistent with the desire to make the Village more pedestrian-friendly. It is a trade-off that the developer accepts in building the urban village. Mr. Gill's proposal would allow rooftop courtyards (presumably only accessible to building residents) to be counted towards the open space requirement. How is this "open" space?

The existing code sets maximum housing density at 24 units per acre in an urban village, with a maximum average density of 12 per acre. This provision was intended to place a limit on how many people would be clustered together. In this age of developing more housing options and buildable sites for all of us, it is important to note that those of us who chose to buy in an urban village have already sacrificed open space in favor of increased density. While we don't necessarily object to some additional housing, we believe it

should not be at the expense o the commercial core, including a grocery store

In support o his proposals, Mr Gill has submitted a “Briggs Village Commercial Market Demand Study” This document was apparently prepared on or about November 17, 2023, and could thereby be considered dated The “key findings” include (1) the population generates $36 8 million annually in grocery spending The source and accuracy o this number is never disclosed, although the study advises that “the Briggs Village development has higher household incomes than Thurston County overall” Further, “the Briggs Village Trade area has a slightly higher senior population relative to the county overall” This seems to contradict the study’s conclusions

But what makes the study completely unreliable is that the authors were apparently unaware that South Sound Village Cooperative (67 units) and Silver Lea Residences (200 units) and Copper Lea Residences (86 units) are just across Henderson Boulevard rom Briggs Village and are part o the buying community at Briggs Village

The study also lists another “key finding” that “[p]revailing sentiment among interviewed brokers and stakeholders with local knowledge o the Briggs Village market suggests that the trade area is not viable or a small grocery ormat and is challenging or retail more broadly” On pages 17-18 o the study, it becomes clear that “prevailing sentiment” is the opinion o one person (who is not disclosed) who is a licensed real estate broker The conclusions o the “study” are based upon an incorrect understanding o the Briggs Village market and the opinion o one broker, who may or may not be aligned with Mr Gill We believe the experience o the ew small businesses that Mr Gill has allowed to open in Briggs Village is very in ormative Those businesses have been very successul since opening and, i asked, would argue that more businesses would also be successul

In conclusion, the City o Olympia is being asked to change the basic concept o an urban village because the developer o the one village to date has ailed and re used to seek tenants to build out the commercial and grocery sections o the village It may be true that there is more money in building and renting apartments or Mr Gill, but that should not give him the right to pick and

choose housing or commercial uses in the face of a well-planned village to which many residents have moved, lured by the promise of those businesses. Mr. Gill's proposals, if accepted, will turn Briggs Village into just another large apartment complex. Residents will be required to drive from a village that was supposed to be pedestrian-friendly to buy groceries and other household items miles away. In this vein, it is worth remembering that one of the goals of the City of Olympia is to reduce emissions that contribute to climate change:

> *Goal No. 1.* **Land use patterns, densities and site designs are sustainable and support decreasing automobile reliance.**
>
> **Olympia Comprehensive Plan**

PL1.6 Provide for a compatible mix of housing and commercial uses in commercial districts and village sites that enables people to walk to work and shopping, supports transit, and includes convenience businesses for residents. Integrate adjacent uses with walkways and bike paths leading from residential areas to commercial districts and neighborhood-oriented businesses.

Olympia Comprehensive Plan

Address Climate Change: The impetus of the sea level rise challenge described above is climate change. Rising global greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to the melting of the polar ice caps, rising sea levels and more frequent extreme weather events. The City of Olympia is committed to working with the public and other regional partners to take actions that will reduce our community's overall greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for changing climate.

Introduction to the Olympia Comprehensive Plan

We submit that maintaining a commercial core and grocery store at Briggs Village will "support decreasing automobile reliance."

Respectfully submitted,

Friends of Briggs Village, a non-profit corporation, by

/S/
Andrew Peterson, President and resident of Briggs Village

/S/
David Merchant, Treasurer and resident of Briggs Village

/S/
Chris Wickham, Secretary and resident of Briggs Village

2/27/25 Substitute Amendments to OMC 18.02 and 18.05

Submitted by Brian Faller, Betty Bailey, Andrew Peterson, Dave Merchant

Residents of Briggs Village and Adjacent Neighborhoods

Applicant's proposed changes are shown in track changes. City Staff responses and recommendations are shown in commentary / revisions. Brigg's Community proposed changes are shown in red and flagged by a comment.

Definitions: 18.02.180.M

Mixed Use Building: A building comprised of ground floor commercial uses with upper story residential units. The ground floor is primarily comprised of commercial use(s), such as retail, office, and personal services. Lobbies and private amenity space serving the upper story apartments (gyms, community space, etc.) can be located on the ground floor of a mixed use building, but such space would not constitute a commercial use as it would be an accessory to the residential use rather than an independent commercial use. The ground floor commercial space associated with a live/work unit would constitute commercial use.

Commented [NF1]: City Staff recommend this new definition to help define what a mixed use building includes/does not include.

18.05.040 TABLES: Permitted, Conditional and Required Uses

TABLE 5.01

PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL AND REQUIRED USES

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
District-Wide Regulations					18.05.050
1. RESIDENTIAL USES					
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(A)
Apartments	C	R	R	R	18.05A.150-.240, 18.05.050(E)
Boarding Homes	C	P	P	P	
Congregate Care Facilities		P	P	P	18.05.050(E)(1)(c)(i)
Cottage Housing		P	P	P	18.05A.330, 18.04.060(H)
Duplexes		P	P	P	18.05A.250-.290
Duplexes on Corner Lots	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(HH)
Group Homes with 6 or Fewer Clients (up to 8 if approved by DSHS)		P	P	P	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Group Homes with 7 or More Clients		C	C	C	18.04.060(K), 18.04.060(W)
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(O)
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		P	P	P	18.04.060(S)
Residences Above Commercial Uses	P	P	P	P	
Short-Term Rental – Vacation Rentals	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(JJ)
Single-Family Residences	P	R	R	R	18.05A.250-.290
Single Room Occupancy Units					
Townhouses	P	P	P	P	18.05A.150-.240 or 18.05A.250-.290, 18.64

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	
2. OFFICES					
Banks	P	P	P	P	18.05.060(A)
Offices – Business	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Government	P	P	P	P	
Offices – Medical	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary Offices and Clinics	C	C	C	C	
3. RETAIL SALES					
Apparel and Accessory Stores	P	P	P	P	
Building Materials, Garden Supplies, and Farm Supplies	P	P	P	P	
Food Stores	R	R	P	P	
Furniture, Home Furnishings, and Appliances					
General Merchandise Stores	P	P	P	P	
Grocery Stores	P	P	R	R	18.05.060(C)
Office Supplies and Equipment					
Pharmacies and Medical Supply Stores	P	P	P	P	
Restaurants			P		18.05.060(A) & 18.05A.095
Restaurants, Without Drive-In or Drive-Through Service	P	P	P	P	
Specialty Stores	P	P	P	P	
4. SERVICES					
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios	P	P	P	P	
Hotels/Motels					

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Laundry and Laundry Pick-up Agency	P	P	P	P	
Personal Services	P	P	P	P	
Printing, Commercial			P	P	
Radio/TV Studios					
Recycling Facility - Type I	P	P	P	P	
Servicing of Personal Apparel and Equipment	P	P	P	P	
5. ACCESSORY USES					
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(B)
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(GG)
Garage/Yard/Rummage or Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P	5.24
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P	18.44.100
Residences Rented for Social Event, 7 times or more per year	C	C	C	C	18.04.060.DD
6. RECREATIONAL USES					
Auditoriums and Places of Assembly					
Art Galleries					
Commercial Recreation					
Community Gardens	P	P	P	P	
Community Parks & Playgrounds	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(T)
Health Fitness Centers and Dance Studios					
Libraries					
Museums					
Neighborhood Parks/Village Green/Plaza	R	R	R	R	18.04.060(T), 18.05.080(N)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Open Space – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
Theaters (no Drive-Ins)					
Trails – Public	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(T)
7. TEMPORARY USES					
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P	
Mobile Vendors			P	P	
Model Homes	P	P	P	P	
Parking Lot Sales			P	P	18.06.060(Z)
8. OTHER USES					
Agricultural Uses, Existing	P	P	P	P	
Animals/Pets	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(C)
Child Day Care Centers	P	P	-P	P	18.05.060(B), 18.04.060(D)
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P	
Conference Centers					
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(I)
Home Occupations (including adult day care, bed and breakfast houses, short-term rental – homestays, elder care homes, and family child care homes)	P	P	P	P	18.04.060(L), 18.04.060(JJ)
Hospice Care	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(M)
Non-Profit Physical Education Facilities	C	C	C	C	
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(U)
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(V)
Radio, Television, and other Communication Towers & Antennas	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(W), 18.44.100

Commented [NF2]: City Staff support requested change to allow but not require a day care center.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
Schools	C	C	C	C	18.04.060(CC)
Sheltered Transit Stops	R	R	R	R	18.05.050(C)(4)
Social Organizations					
Utility Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.04.060(X)
Wireless Communications Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C	18.44

LEGEND

P = Permitted C = Conditional R = Required

18.05.050 General standards

A. Project Approval or Redesignation.

1. Approval. Developments in the Neighborhood Center, Neighborhood Village, Urban Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts shall be reviewed according to the requirements of Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments.

2. Rezoning. Land in a NC, NV, UV, COSC, or district may be rezoned to a residential district (see Chapter 18.58, Rezones and Text Amendments) upon demonstration that the site is not viable for the designated uses due to site conditions, infrastructure or street capacity or--in the case of multiple ownerships--land assembly problems.

3. Interim Uses. The following requirements shall apply prior to approval of a Master Planned Development pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments:

a. Subdivision shall not be allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

b. One single-family home is allowed per existing lot of record prior to approval of a Master Plan.

c. Construction of utilities, roads, and other public infrastructure which is in conjunction with neighboring or abutting projects is allowed prior to Master Plan approval.

4. Pre-existing uses.

a. Any use which was legally constructed prior to August 21, 1995, but which is not a permitted or conditional use under this Chapter, is allowed to continue under the zoning requirements in effect for that use prior to August 21, 1995, (e.g., as a permitted use, conditional use, limited use, special use, non-conforming use, or any other such zoning status, as may be applicable).

b. Any such zoning requirements applicable to said use (e.g., conditions attached to a conditional use permit), which were in effect on August 21, 1995, shall remain in effect for said use until such time as it is discontinued.

B. Project Size.


1. Villages. Urban villages and neighborhood villages shall be no less than 40 acres and no more than 200 acres in size, provided that at least 90 percent of all residences shall be within one-fourth of a mile of the perimeter of the village center. The perimeter of the village center means the boundary of the center identified on an approved Master Plan, consistent with Section 18.05.050(D)(2), Commercial Building--Location.

2. Neighborhood Centers. Neighborhood center developments shall be no less than two acres and no more than ten acres in size.

3. Community Oriented Shopping Centers. Community oriented shopping center developments shall be no less than seventeen (17) acres and no more than 40 acres in size.

C. Village Center.

1. Required Center. Each village and each neighborhood center shall contain a village center with a village green or park (see Section 18.05.080(N), Private and Common Open Space), a sheltered transit stop and, as market conditions permit, businesses, services, and civic uses listed in Table 5.01. (See also Section 18.05.050(D)(2) Commercial Building--Location, and Chapter 18.05A, Design Guidelines for Villages and Centers.)



Village Center

FIGURE 5-1

2. Mixed Use. At least ten percent of the gross floor area of village centers in villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be occupied by residential units contained in mixed residential/commercial buildings. Exceptions to this requirement shall be granted if the applicant demonstrates that compliance is not economically feasible (based upon an independent market study accepted by the City).

3. Buildings Fronting on a Village or Center Green. At least sixty (60) percent of the total ground floor street frontage of the non-residential buildings fronting on a village or center green, park, or plaza shall be occupied by retail uses or professional or personal services. (Also see Section 18.05.080(M)(1) Height--Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens.)

4. Transit Stop. The sheltered transit stop required in 18.05.050(C)(1), Required Center, shall be located and designed in accordance with specifications provided by the City and approved by Intercity Transit.

5. Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction.

6. Location.

a. Separation.

i. Neighborhood village centers and neighborhood centers shall be separated from one another and from urban villages and community oriented shopping centers by at least one half mile.

ii. Urban village centers and community oriented shopping centers shall be separated from one another by at least one mile.

iii. The Hearing Examiner may allow closer spacing if the applicant demonstrates that the trade areas for the centers are distinct (e.g., segregated by physical barriers) or contain sufficient population (based on existing or planned density) to enable the affected centers to be economically viable.

b. Relationship to major streets.

i. Centers in established neighborhoods and neighborhood villages shall be located along collector streets to make them readily accessible for mass transit and motorists and to enable them to be a neighborhood focal point.

ii. Urban villages and community oriented shopping centers shall be located on sites abutting an arterial street. Such sites must have potential for accommodating moderate density residential development (e.g., 7 to 13 or 14 units per acre for COSC or UV districts respectively) and commercial uses scaled to serve households within a one and one-half (11/2) mile radius with frequently needed consumer goods and services.

D. Commercial Building Size, Location, and Type.

1. Size. The total gross floor area of all commercial uses (i.e., those uses specified in Table 5.01 under the general categories "Offices," "Retail Sales," and "Services") in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, community oriented shopping centers shall not exceed the maximum amounts specified in Table 5.02.

TABLE 5.02

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. ~~52~~,500 sq. ft. Min.94,985 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store. ~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	Office and Services Min. 5,000 sq. ft.. ~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development. Min. 52,500 sq. ft. Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

Commented [BC3]: We rejected most of the proposed changes to Table 5.02. However, in Alternative Table 5.02 we accept in substantial part those changes, provided in order for the Alternative Table to apply, the developer must first satisfy the conditions OMC 18.05.055 below. Those conditions are designed to incentivize the developer to provide the grocery store, some restaurants, or a restaurant and bakery, and some studio apartments, which will be more affordable.

Commented [BC4]: Per the City's proposal, we accepted deletion of the maximum 175,000 sf limit for commercial square feet. We added the minimum 94,985 sf since this is the existing commercial minimum contained in the 2014 Master Plan. The proposed 52,500 sf minimum for all commercial is likely too low to support a village that provides necessary goods to surrounding residents within a short distance, including a reasonable sized grocery, shops, and restaurants, as well as offices. However, the developer and the city's replacement minimum of 52,500 sf is set forth in Alternative Table 5.02, and can be made applicable under the terms of proposed OMC 18.05.055 (below).

Commented [NF5]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC6]: We restored the existing text of Table 5.02 to provide a minimum value for retail exclusive of grocery. Assuming 810 units, the minimum floor space for retail (excl. grocery) is 60,750 sf (810 x 75 = 60,750).

Commented [BC7]: No minimum was stated in the original table entry. We added the 5,000 sq. ft. minimum for office/services which is the figure in the 2014 Master Plan. The developer's proposed minimum of 52,500 sf for office/services would leave NO sf minimum for retail or grocery under the developer's proposed commercial including retail minimum of 52,500 sf. In keeping with the City's proposed deletion of a maximum limit, we did not restore the proposed deletion of a maximum based on 200 sq. ft. per the authorized units/dwellings (810 units x 200sf = 162,000 total sq. ft.)

Commented [NF8]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.02 if applicable per 18.05.055

AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	Urban Center
Minimum or Maximum Total Amount of Commercial Floor Space	30,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.	~~225,000 sq. ft., OR 175,000 sq. ft. if the village does not contain a grocery store of at least 35,000 sq. ft.~~ Min. 52,500 sq. ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	100,000 sq. ft.	No Maximum
Minimum or Maximum Retail Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development	~~75 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development, exclusive of a grocery store.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: ~~50,000 sq. ft.~~ 52,500 sq. ft. (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	At least 50% of total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for retail uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.
Minimum or Maximum Combined Office & Services Floor Space	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	5,000 sq. ft. OR up to 20,000 sq. ft., at a rate of 25 sq. ft. per existing or authorized residential dwelling or residential lot within 1/4 mile	~~200 sq. ft. per authorized residential dwelling or residential lot in the development.~~ Retail/Office combined minimum: Min. 52,500 sq. ft. ~~Max. 175,000 sq. ft.~~ (the grocery store does not count toward this minimum)	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 50% of the total floor space.	At least 30% of the total floor space shall be for office or service uses, but not more than 70% of the total floor space.

2. Location.

a. Commercial uses in urban villages, neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, and community oriented shopping centers shall meet the following location requirements. Commercial uses in urban centers shall be exempt from these requirements. (Staff note: these requirements have to do with placing all commercial uses within a block or so of the village green in villages and neighborhood centers. In an urban center, this would be impractical.)

b. Commercial uses shall be contiguous with or across a street from the village or center green/park.

c. Commercial uses shall not extend more than one block or 350 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in neighborhood villages and neighborhood centers.

d. Commercial uses shall not extend more than three blocks or 1,100 feet, whichever is less, from the perimeter of the village green or park in urban villages and community oriented shopping centers.

Commented [BC9]: The alternative table is in substantial part what the developer and the city have proposed. We are willing to have most of these values apply provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in proposed OMC 18.05.055 below.

Commented [BC10]: 52,500 is a very low amount of minimum space to provide for commercial covering retail (including a grocery) and office/services in a viable village center that supports the surrounding residents. This is borne out by the 2014 Master Plan which provides a minimum 30,000 sf for a grocery store and 94,985 sf for commercial. We are willing to accept this minimum provided it does not include the grocery store space.

Commented [NF11]: Applicant requests a new max of 175,000. City Staff recommend no max or retain the 225,000sf max because there is no known reason to limit future commercial should market conditions change.

Commented [BC12]: We increased the minimum to 52,500 sf to be consistent with the Combined Office & Services row below.

Commented [BC13]: For this to make sense, the minimum must be stated as Retail/Office combined, otherwise, there would be no minimum amount of commercial retail space necessary to provide for a grocery and basic retail stores and restaurants. In keeping with the City's proposal, we deleted the maximum.

Commented [NF14]: Staff Comment: Requested language needs further clarification. Is this in addition to the 50,000sf of retail/office? If so, the total commercial minimum would be 102,500. Staff recommendation to rely on commercial total only and remove / eliminate specific requirements for retail, office, and service as it is un-necessary.

e. In an urban village or community oriented shopping center, the Hearing Examiner may allow buildings comprising up to 20 percent of the authorized commercial floor area to extend up to four blocks or 1,500 feet from the perimeter of the village green under the following conditions:

i. The site's configuration or physical constraints (e.g., critical areas or steep topography) necessitate the location of commercial uses beyond the three block limit; or

ii. The proposed location of commercial uses would improve the project design, for example, by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the development (e.g., allowing buildings to screen parking lots from public rights-of-way), by increasing pedestrian accessibility, by allowing shared use of parking lots, or by allowing better integration of uses.

E. Mix and Location of Residential Uses.

1. Mix of Dwelling Types--General. Developments in the Urban Village, Neighborhood Village, and Community Oriented Shopping Center districts must attain a mix of residential uses consistent with Tables 5.03A and 5.03B. Table 5.03A addresses the relationship between single-family and multifamily dwellings in general. Table 5.03B addresses the requirement for a variety of multifamily housing types, based on overall size of the project.

a. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Single-family detached residences, including designated manufactured homes

ii. Group homes with six (6) or fewer clients

iii. Single family residences above commercial uses (e.g., a single residence above a convenience store)

iv. Townhouses

v. Cottage housing

b. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types shall include:

i. Apartments with five (5) or more units per structure

ii. Boarding homes

iii. Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes

iv. Group homes with seven (7) or more clients

v. Multifamily residences above commercial uses (e.g., multiple apartments above retail or office uses)

c. Other residences.

i. For purposes of meeting the required mix as shown in Table 5.03A, the following uses are classified as "other" (i.e., neither "single-family and similar", nor "multifamily and similar"):

(a) Accessory dwelling units

(b) Nursing/convalescent homes and congregate care facilities

(c) Multifamily units in an urban village on the blocks contiguous to the town square.

ii. Such "other" uses are not counted in determining the required proportions of single-family and multifamily dwellings in Table 5.03A. However, such uses shall be counted in the calculation of total dwellings for purposes of Sections 18.05.080(B) Maximum Housing Densities and 18.05.080(C) Minimum Housing Densities, in the manner provided in those sections.

TABLE 5.03A

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	50% ~~50%~~ ~~15%~~	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75% ~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	25%~~25%~~ ~~65%~~	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	50%~~50%~~ ~~85%~~	50%

ALTERNATIVE TABLE 5.03A if applicable per 18.05.055

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center
Single Family and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	60%	~~50%~~ 15%	50%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	75%	75%~~75%~~ ~~35%~~	75%
Multifamily and Similar Dwelling Types			
Minimum percentage of total housing units	25%	~~25%~~ 65%	25%
Maximum percentage of total housing units	40%	~~50%~~ 85%	50%

2. Mix of Dwelling Types--Requirement for Variety.

a. Urban villages, neighborhood villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall achieve a variety of dwelling unit types as specified in Table 5.03B.

b. For purposes of meeting the requirements of Table 5.03B, dwellings shall include the following four types:

i. Single-family detached dwellings (including manufactured housing);

Commented [BC15]: We restored the original percentages used in Table 5.03A. However, we are willing to accept the proposed percentages (with the City's change) under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [NF16]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

Commented [BC17]: We are willing to accept the proposed percentages under Alternative Table 5.03A, provided the developer first satisfies the conditions set forth in the proposed OMC 18.05.050 below.

Commented [BC18]: Per the city's comment below, we have restored 75% for the maximum percentage of total housing units of single family and similar dwelling types.

Commented [NF19]: City Staff recommends retaining a max of 75% as it is unclear why the maximum needs to change.

ii. Townhouses;

iii. Duplexes; and

iv. Triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five (5) or more units per structure.

TABLE 5.03B

REQUIRED VARIETY OF DWELLING UNIT TYPES IN NV, UV, AND COSC

Number of Dwellings in Project	Minimum Number of Dwelling Types	Minimum Percent of Any Dwelling Type used in the Project (See also Table 5.03A)
1-70	2	25%
71-299	3	10%
300+	4	5%

c. Once the requirements of Table 5.03B have been met, other housing types--whether or not specified in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above--may be developed in any proportions within the requirements of Table 5.03A.

Example: Assume a neighborhood village with 400 dwelling units. According to Table 5.03A, at least 240 units (60% of the 400 total), and not more than 300 units (75%) must be single-family and similar dwelling types. At least 100 units (25%), and not more than 160 units (40%) must be multifamily and similar dwelling types.

According to Table 5.03B, the project must include four of the specified dwelling types. The developer chooses to build 240 single-family detached dwellings, meeting the requirement of 60% set in Table 5.03A. The developer also chooses to build 40 townhouse units (10% of the 400 total), 20 duplex units (5%--i.e., the minimum), and 80 units (20%) in triplexes, fourplexes, and apartment structures with five or more units. For the final five percent, the developer chooses to build 20 units of cottage housing, an optional housing type not required in Section 18.05.050(E)(2)(b) above.

3. Intensity of Development. The density of residential uses shall be highest around the village/community center and lowest adjacent to existing neighborhoods.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:

i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and

ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.

b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:

i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and

ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

18.05.055 Incentives applicable to an urban village for completion of a village grocery store and other food amenities and construction of studio apartments.

Commented [BC20]: This section is the incentive section we propose.

A. Alternative Table 5.02, Alternative Table 5.03A, and the items identified in Table 5.05 shall apply and replace the corresponding tables and table provisions with respect to urban villages upon joint satisfaction of the conditions contained in subsections 1 -3, as determined by the city in a public notice of approval issued under subsection 4.

1. A grocery store of at least 10,000 square feet floor space is operational in the mixed-use district that (i) has a proven history of successful operation elsewhere, (ii) states its intent (which need not be legally binding) to operate at the site for at least 10 years, and (iii) sells the common items, including fresh produce, needed for meal preparation that are commonly stocked in grocery stores of comparable size. Any floor space that the grocery store allocates to spirits, wine, and beer shall not count toward the satisfaction of the 10,000 square feet minimum, and during its operation the grocery store

shall maintain at least 10,000 square feet devoted to groceries, not including spirits, wine, or beer.

2. **At least three restaurants are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district or alternatively, at least two restaurants and a bakery are licensed and operating in the mixed-use district.**

3. **The urban village has given the city notice that: (i) it wishes to proceed under this code section;(ii) both subsections 1 and 2 above have been are currently met; and (iii) the urban village agrees to the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

4. **Upon receipt of notice under subsection 3 from a urban village, the city shall issue a notice of approval if it independently finds that subsections 1 -3 have been and are currently met consistent with the terms of this code section, OMC 18.05.055.**

5. **The minimum floor space requirements for a grocery store contained in Table 5.02, the development agreement for the urban village, and/or the master plan for the urban village shall not apply to a grocery store to be constructed pursuant to this subsection A.1.**

B. Every four years after the city has issued the notice of approval provided for under subsection A above, at least 15 percent of the apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued shall be no larger than 500 square feet of floor space. By such date, the urban village shall submit a written report to the city stating whether this requirement has been met. If this requirement is not met at a four-year interval, the city shall not issue any building permits for apartment units and/or dwellings over 500 square feet in the mixed-use area until this requirement is met. Any apartment units and/or dwellings in the mixed-use district for which a certificate of occupancy was issued prior to the notice of approval shall not be counted in determining compliance with the 15% requirement.

A. Drive-through facilities.

18.05.060 Use standards

A. Drive-through facilities.

1. Banks, restaurants, pharmacies, and other businesses that primarily cater to pedestrians or walk-in customers are permitted to have a single drive-through lane.

2. Driveway access for a permitted single drive-through lane shall be allowed only through a common parking lot area in a Village Center, shall not impede direct pedestrian access to the building entry, and shall not be allowed on streets abutting a village green or park in a village center.

C. Grocery Stores. Urban Village (UV) and Community Oriented Shopping Center (COSC) District requirements: The maximum size for a grocery store shall be 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Commented [NF21]: City Staff recommend this change provided the applicant is supported in their request to allow instead of require this use in the village.

18.05.080 TABLES: Commercial Development Standards

TABLE 5.04

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (including mixed commercial/residential buildings)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	None.	None.	
FRONT YARD SETBACK	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	10’ maximum	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(I)(1) 4. 18.05.080(K) 5. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 2. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family dwelling, duplex or townhouse. 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. 18.05.080(K) 3. 18.05.080(L)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 10’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking streets; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	None, EXCEPT: 1. 10’ maximum on flanking street; 2. 20’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district, or a single family, duplex, manufactured home, or townhouse. 3. 15’ minimum + 5’ for each building floor above 2 stories next to other residential district or a multifamily.	1. 50’ minimum setback for agriculture buildings (or structures) which house animals other than pets. 2. Section 18.40.060(C), clear sight triangle requirements. 3. 18.05.080(K) 4. 18.05.080(L)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	30 feet for commercial structures; or	30 feet for commercial structures; or	45 feet;	3 stories, up to 45 feet;	18.05.080(M)

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	OTHER STANDARDS
(Note: One use shall not be considered next to another use or district if a street or road intervenes.)	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures.	45 feet for residential or mixed-use structures; EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	EXCEPT: 35 feet within 100 ft. of R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district.	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories 3 stories	2 stories 3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district. 4 Stories for mixed-use buildings facing the town square. 3 Stories elsewhere in the mixed-use district.	3 stories EXCEPT: 2 stories within 100 ft. of R-4, R-4-8, or R 6-12 district.	18.05.080(M)(10)
MAXIMUM BUSINESS OCCUPANCY SIZE (GROSS FLOOR AREA)	5,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one grocery store may be up to 50,000 sq. ft.	15,000 sq. ft., EXCEPT: one building may be 50,000 sq. ft.	Residential floor area in a mixed-use building shall not be counted in determining the maximum building size.
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	70%; or 85% if at least 50% of the required parking is under the building or in a structure.	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	85%	85%	85%	85%	
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT-WIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS			For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	For retail uses over 25,000 sq ft in gross floor area, see also 18.06.100 (G)	

(Ord. 6517 §16, 2007).

18.05.080 Development standards

A. General. Table 5.04 identifies the basic standards for commercial development (i.e., offices, retail sales, and services uses identified in Table 5.01) in the NC, NV, UV, COSC and districts. Table 5.05 identifies the basic development standards for residential uses in these districts. The reference numbers listed in these tables refer to the list of additional development standards below.

B. Maximum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Maximum Density. The maximum densities and average maximum densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations:

a. The area within streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" shall not be counted.

b. The area of the required minimum open space for the village or center (see Table 5.05) shall not be counted.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The density of a village center (as delineated in a master plan approved pursuant to Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) and the density of the remainder of the project shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. The village center and the remainder of the project shall each comply with the maximum average density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Maximum Densities. The maximum housing densities shown in the top row of Table 5.05 refer to the maximum density of individual project components. The housing density for the overall project, however (i.e., all of the property subject to an approved Master Plan), shall not exceed the maximum average density for the district specified in the second row of Table 5.05. For example, a neighborhood village may contain an apartment complex with 24 dwelling units per acre provided that the average density for the entire development does not exceed 13 units per acre.

3. Convalescent Homes. Convalescent homes and nursing homes containing dwelling units which rely on shared cooking/dining facilities shall count as one dwelling unit for purposes of the maximum density calculation. Independent dwelling units (i.e., containing a bed, bathroom and a kitchen with a sink, stove, and refrigerator) in such facilities, however, shall be counted as individual housing units in the density calculation. The site containing a nursing/convalescent home depending on shared kitchen facilities shall be deducted from the land available for residential development when calculating the maximum density for the village or center. (The excess density shall not be transferred to other portions of the site.)

4. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory dwelling units built subsequent to the initial sale of the primary residence on a lot are not subject to the maximum density limits specified in Table 5.05. In addition, accessory units built on a maximum of 20 percent of a development's lots are not subject to the maximum density requirements, provided they are built prior to the time the primary unit on the lot is initially sold or receives occupancy approval (if built by the owner).

5. Density Bonuses. The maximum housing densities identified in Table 5.05 may be increased as follows:

a. Bonus for restoring degraded sites.

i. At the request of the applicant, the Hearing Examiner may grant a density bonus of up to 20 percent for sites on which damaged or degraded wetlands or stream corridors (e.g., streams and stream banks within the outer limits of the buffer required by OMC 18.32.435) will be restored and maintained according to specifications approved by the City.

ii. Sites proposed for this density bonus shall be posted with a notice describing the proposal and opportunities to comment. Property owners within 300 feet of the site shall be given notice of the

proposal and 15 days to comment. Such notice may be done concurrently with any other notice required by this Code.

iii. Prior to taking action on a request for a density bonus, the Hearing Examiner shall consider:

(a) the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies,

(b) the public's comments,

(c) the expected public benefit that would be derived from such restoration,

(d) the net effect of the restoration and the increased density on the site,

(e) the relative cost of the restoration and the value of the increased density, and

(f) the potential impact of increased density on surrounding land uses, traffic, infrastructure, schools, and parks.

iv. The City may require the developer to provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed restoration and other information as necessary to make a decision on the request.

b. Bonus for low income housing.

i. A density bonus shall be granted for low income housing (see Section 18.02.180, Definitions) at the rate of one additional housing unit allowed for each unit of low income housing provided, up to a maximum of a 20 percent density bonus.

ii. The applicant shall submit to the Department a document approved by the City Attorney stating that the low income housing which is the basis for the density bonus shall remain as part of the development for at least 20 years. This time period shall begin on the date that final inspection of all of the low income housing has been performed. This document shall be recorded, at the applicant's expense, at the Thurston County Auditor's Office as part of the chain of title of the affected parcels.

C. Minimum Housing Densities.

1. Calculation of Minimum Density. The minimum average densities specified in Table 5.05 are based on the entire site, with the following limitations: [Note: Table 5.05 in Section 18.05]

a. The entire site shall be included in the minimum density calculation except streams, wetlands, landslide hazard areas, floodplains, "important habitat areas," and "important riparian areas" and their associated buffers; tracts accommodating stormwater facilities required in compliance with the Drainage Design Manual; existing, opened street rights-of-way; and land to be sold or dedicated to the public, other than street rights-of-way (e.g., school sites and parks, but not street rights-of-way to be dedicated as part of the proposed development).

b. All dwelling units in convalescent homes/nursing homes and accessory units count toward the minimum density required for the site by Table 5.05, in the same manner as provided above in Section 18.05.080(B)(3) Maximum Housing Densities -- Convalescent Homes and 18.05.080(B)(4) Maximum Housing Densities -- Accessory Dwelling Units.

c. The following requirements shall apply to all villages and centers:

i. The minimum residential density of a village center and that of the remainder of a village or center shall be calculated separately from one another.

ii. There shall be no minimum density requirement for a village center other than the requirement for mixed use buildings specified in Section 18.05.050(C)(2) Village/Community Center--Mixed Use

above. The procedures for calculating the required number of units are as provided in Sections 18.05.080(3)(1)(a), (2), and (3) above.

iii. The remainder of a village shall comply with the minimum density requirements in Table 5.05.

2. Average Density. A housing project may contain a variety of housing densities provided that the average density for the entire development (i.e., all of the property subject to a single Master Planned Development approval) is neither less than the minimum density nor more than the maximum density established for the district in Table 5.05. No part of the development, however, may exceed the maximum density established in row one of Table 5.05 (see Section 18.05.080(B)(2) Maximum Densities).

3. Density Allowance for Site Constraints. At the request of the applicant, the Director or Hearing Examiner may reduce the minimum density required in Table 5.05, to the extent the Director or Hearing Examiner deems warranted, in order to accommodate site constraints which make development at the required minimum density impractical or inconsistent with the purposes of this Article (e.g., poor soil drainage, the presence of springs, steep topography (e.g., over 20 percent), rock outcrops, or wellhead protection areas). As a condition of granting a density reduction, the applicant must demonstrate that the minimum density cannot be achieved by clustering the housing on the buildable portions of the site (see Section 18.05.080(F) Clustered Housing).

4. Density Allowance for Natural Features/Habitat Protection. At the request of the applicant, the Director may reduce the minimum densities to the extent necessary to accommodate trees to be retained consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement. (Also see Section 18.05.080(F)(1), Mandatory Clustering.) At the request of the applicant, the Director may also authorize a reduction in the minimum density requirements in order to enable retention of Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 in the Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minimum Lot Size.

1. Nonresidential Uses. The minimum lot size for non-residential uses (e.g., churches and schools) may be larger than the minimum lot size identified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05. Refer to Table 4.01 Permitted and Conditional Uses in Residential Districts, and Section 18.04.060 Residential Districts Use Standards for regulations pertaining to non-residential uses in residential areas. Also see Section 18.04.060(K) Group Homes for the lot size requirements for group homes.

2. Clustered Lots. Lot sizes may be reduced by up to 20 percent consistent with Section 18.05.080(F), Clustered Housing.

E. Transitional Lots.

1. Lot Size. The square footage and width of those residential lots in developments located in the NC, NV, UV, COSC, and districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than 85 percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.

2. Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the NC, NV, UV, and COSC and districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R-4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be the same as the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.

F. Clustered Housing.

1. Mandatory Clustering.

a. Criteria for clustering. The Hearing Examiner may require that the housing units allowed for a site be clustered on a portion of the site to:

i. Protect groundwater used as a public water source (e.g., wellhead protection areas); or

ii. Enable retention of trees (based upon a recommendation by the City's Urban Forester, consistent with Chapter 16.60, Tree Protection and Replacement, Olympia Municipal Code); or

iii. Preserve Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on Map 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

iv. Accommodate urban trails identified on Map 7-1 of the Comprehensive Plan; or

v. Preserve scenic vistas pursuant to Sections 18.20.070 View Preservation and 18.50.100 Scenic Vistas; or

vi. Enable creation of buffers between incompatible uses (see Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

b. Degree of clustering.

i. The approval authority may allow up to a 20 percent reduction in lot dimensions, sizes and setback requirements, consistent with the Uniform Building Code, to facilitate the clustering of the permitted number of dwelling units on the site.

ii. The required clustering shall not result in fewer lots than would otherwise be permitted on the site (at the minimum density specified in Table 5.05), without the written authorization of the applicant.

2. Optional Clustering.

a. Applicants for housing projects may request up to 20 percent reduction in lot sizes, dimensions, and building setback requirements in order to cluster housing and retain land for the following purposes:

i. To meet the criteria listed in Section 18.05.080(F)(1) Mandatory Clustering above; or

ii. To avoid development on slopes steeper than 20 percent; or

iii. To preserve natural site features such as rock outcrops or topographical features; or

iv. To otherwise enable land to be made available for public or private open space.

b. The approval authority may grant such requests if the approval authority determines that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.

G. Lot Width.

1. Measurement. The minimum lot width required by Table 5.05 shall be measured between the side lot lines at the point of intersection with the minimum front setback line established in Table 5.05.

2. Varied Lot Widths. The width of residential lots in the NC, NV, UV and COSC districts shall be varied to avoid monotonous development patterns.

a. No more than three (3) consecutive lots, uninterrupted by a street, shall be of the same width. This requirement does not apply to townhouses.

b. Lot widths shall be varied by a minimum of six (6) foot increments.

c. The minimum lot widths specified in Table 5.05 may be reduced by six (6) feet for individual lots to provide variety, provided that the average lot width for the project is no less than the minimum lot width required by Table 5.05.

3. Minimum Street Frontage.

a. Each residential lot, other than for townhouse and cottage housing, shall have a minimum of thirty (30) feet of frontage on a public street.




FIGURE 5-2

b. EXCEPTION: the City may allow the street frontage to be reduced (creating a flag lot) to the minimum extent necessary to enable access to property where public street access is not feasible (e.g., due to physical site conditions or preexisting development) or to protect environmentally Critical Areas (see Chapter 18.32 OMC).

c. Subdivisions, short subdivisions, binding site plans, and lot line adjustments creating flag lots (with street frontages of less than thirty (30) feet) are subject to the following conditions:

i. The project shall be designed to minimize the creation of flag lots; and

ii. Adjoining flag lots shall share a common driveway wherever possible; and

iii. All driveways accessing flag lots shall be designed to allow fire truck access to within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the residence(s) on the lot(s), unless alternate forms of fire protection approved by the Fire Department are provided (e.g., sprinkler systems); and

iv. The area of a flag lot which is less than thirty (30) feet in width shall not be considered part of the minimum lot area required in Table 5.05.

H. Front Yard Setbacks.

1. In the NV, NC, UV, and COSC districts, front yard setbacks for residential uses may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet under the following conditions:

a. When the garage or parking lot access is from the rear of the lot; or

b. When the garage is located at least ten (10) feet behind the front facade of the primary structure on the lot; or

c. When the driveway will be aligned to provide at least a twenty (20) foot long parking space between the sidewalk edge (closest to lot) and the garage.

2. Such setback reductions shall not be allowed where they would result in a setback of fifty (50) percent or less than the setback of an existing dwelling on an abutting lot fronting on the same street. (See Design Guidelines, 18.05A.280, Garage Design.)

I. Maximum Front Yard Setbacks.

1. Proportion of Structure to be Built Within Setback.

a. At least thirty (30) percent of the front facade of the primary residential structure on the lot must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Table 5.05.

b. At least seventy (70) percent of the front facade of buildings fronting on a village or center green, park or plaza must be on or within the maximum front setback line specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

2. Exceptions to the Maximum Front Yard Setback Standard. The following are exempt from the maximum front yard setbacks specified in Tables 5.04 and 5.05.

a. Parcels with physical site constraints. The approval authority may allow larger setbacks than required by Tables 5.04 and 5.05 to accommodate steep or difficult topography, views, rock out-crops, environmentally Critical Areas, or trees designated for preservation.

b. Sensitive and high impact uses. The approval authority may allow greater front yard setbacks for nonresidential uses such as schools, nursing homes, public facilities, or utilities which may be sensitive to traffic noise or emissions, or warrant greater separation from adjoining property due to their potential impacts on adjoining land uses.

c. Flag lots, (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

d. Wedge-shape lots. (See Section 18.02.180, Definitions, Lots).

e. Dwellings which front on an arterial street or arterial boulevard.


J. Side Yard Setbacks.

1. Reduced Side Yard Setbacks. A side yard building setback shall not be required for one (1) side of a residential lot provided that it meets the following conditions:

a. If the distance between the proposed dwelling and property line is less than three (3) feet, the applicant shall provide evidence of at least a three (3) foot wide maintenance easement recorded with the deed of the applicable adjoining lot. Such easements shall provide access for the owner of the applicable lot (with a side yard setback of less than three (3) feet) to maintain the exterior of the wall and roof within three (3) feet of the side property line.

b. Side yard setbacks shall not be less than five (5) feet along a property line adjoining a lot which is not approved for reduced setbacks (e.g., a conventional lot with two (2) five (5) foot wide side yard setbacks) or less than ten (10) feet along property lines which abut a public rights-of-way.

2. Setbacks from Trails and Bike Paths. The minimum side yard setback adjoining a public bike path or walkway shall be ten (10) feet.



Zero Lot Line Housing
FIGURE 5-3

K. Measurement of Setbacks. Setback width shall be measured from the outermost edge of the building foundation to the closest point of the applicable lot line.

L. Encroachment into Setbacks.

1. Required setback areas shall be kept free of any building or structure higher than thirty (30) inches.

2. EXCEPTIONS: The buildings and projections listed below shall be allowed in the portion of the setback not contained in a utility, access, or other easement:

a. Accessory structures, including accessory dwelling units, may be located in a required rear yard and/or in the rear thirty (30) feet of a required interior side yard; however, if a garage entrance faces the rear or side property line, it shall be setback at least ten (10) feet from that property line.

b. Cornices, window sills, bay windows, flues and chimneys, planters, and roof eaves may project two (2) feet into the required yard area.

c. Marquees and awnings for commercial uses.

d. Fences in compliance with the fence height requirements specified in OMC 18.40.060.D Fences.

e. Swimming pools, hot tubs and satellite dish antennas may be placed in the rear or interior side yard setback area.

f. Up to fifty percent (50%) of a rear yards width may be occupied by a dwelling (primary residence or ADU) provided that the structure (foundation) is located at least ten (10) feet from the rear property line. For purposes of this Section, the rear yards width shall be measured in a straight line between the side property lines at the point of intersection with the rear property line.

g. Signs in compliance with OMC 18.43.




FIGURE 5-4

M. Height.

1. Buildings Fronting on Village/Center Greens or Plazas. Buildings in villages and community oriented shopping centers which front onto the required park, green or plaza (see 18.05.080(N)(2) Private and Common Open Space--Villages, and Community Oriented Shopping Centers) shall be at least two (2) stories in height. This requirement does not apply to food or grocery stores.

2. Commercial/Residential Transitions. Commercial buildings abutting lots designated for single family residential use shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height, whichever is less.

3. Roof Projections. The following structures may exceed the height limits specified for the district in Table 5.05 by eighteen (18) feet, provided that such structures do not contain floor space:

a. roof structures housing elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building;

b. fire or parapet walls;

c. skylights;

d. clock towers;

e. flagpoles;

f. chimneys;

g. smoke stacks;

h. wireless masts;

i. T.V. antennas;

j. steeples; and

k. similar structures.

4. Tall Buildings. In the NC, NV, UV, and COCS districts, buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height must comply with the following requirements:

a. The proposed building shall not be located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center. Public rights-of-way adjoining the village or center property boundary shall count toward this separation requirement. Exceptions to this provision shall be granted where topography, stands of trees (designated for retention and approved by the City's Urban Forester), or other site features block the visibility of the section of the building above thirty-five (35) feet in height from existing or potential residential areas (zoned and available for residential use) adjoining the site; and

b. Existing evergreen trees, which the City's Urban Forester determines do not pose undue risks for proposed site improvements or public safety and are appropriate for their location at their mature size, are retained where possible to help screen the building from the view of residents of dwellings abutting the property.

5. Places of Worship. The height of churches and other places of worship may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05 provided that the side yard width equals at least fifty (50) percent of the proposed height of the place of worship (including spires and towers).

6. Free-Standing Ornamental Structures. Free-standing ornamental structures such as clock towers, sculptures, monuments or other similar features approved as part of a master plan (see Chapter 18.57, Master Planned Developments) shall not exceed 60 feet in height. These structures shall be located in the village center (see Section 18.05.050(C), Village/Community Center) and shall not contain signage.

7. Radio and Television Transmitting and Receiving Towers. The height of radio and television transmitting and receiving towers may exceed the maximum building height allowed in the district, subject to approval of the Hearing Examiner consistent with Section 18.04.060(Z).

8. Water Towers. Water towers may exceed the height limits specified in Table 5.05.

9. Perimeter Buildings. Except as otherwise provided in Section 18.05.080(M), Height, buildings located within one hundred (100) feet of the boundary of the village or center shall not exceed two (2) stories or thirty five (35) feet, whichever is less. This requirement shall not apply to the UV mixed-use district.

10. A building height waiver may be granted at project entries and along arterial or major collector streets within a Master Planned Community (NV, UV, and COSC) where slopes exist that would cause less than desirable height of building to width of street ratio (a ratio less than 1:4 building height to street width) not to exceed the permitted building height as measured from the fronting street edge.

N. Private and Common Open Space.

1. Development of Open Space.

a. Open space required by Table 5.05 shall be devoted to undisturbed native vegetation, landscaping, and/or outdoor recreational facilities. Driveways, loading areas, maneuvering space and parking lots shall not be considered part of this required space.

b. Required open space shall not be covered with impervious surfaces, except for walkways, tennis and basketball courts, swimming pools, or similar recreational uses which require an impervious surface.

c. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase the impervious surface coverage limits specified in Table 5.05 by up to five (5) percent to accommodate the walkways and recreational uses listed above (see also Chapter 18.36, Landscaping and Screening).

2. Villages and Community Oriented Shopping Centers.

a. Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas

and type of access will be determined during the Master Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers (see Chapter 18.32, OMC).

b. Neighborhood villages, neighborhood centers, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers must contain a neighborhood park or "green" between one (1) and four (4) acres in size located in the village or community center. This park, green, or plaza shall have an average slope no greater than five (5) percent; adequate drainage to allow active use in summer; and a width and length of no less than one hundred and fifty (150) feet.

3. Cottage Housing Developments.

a. A minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of private, contiguous, usable, open space shall be provided adjacent to each dwelling unit. No dimension of this open space area shall be less than ten (10) feet.

b. A minimum of fifteen hundred (1500) square feet or two hundred (200) square feet per unit, whichever is more, shall be provided in common open space (e.g., available for the use of all residents of the cottage housing development). This open space shall be contained in a contiguous area with no dimension less than thirty (30) feet. Such open space shall be sufficiently level (e.g., less than five (5) percent slope) and well drained to enable active use in summer.

4. Multifamily Housing.

a. In neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers, parcels or sites accommodating multifamily housing (e.g., triplexes, fourplexes, and larger apartment buildings) shall contain at least thirty (30) percent open space. However, such multifamily housing within one hundred (100) feet of a neighborhood park, green, or public or common open space, which is at least ten thousand (10,000) square feet in size, shall only be required to retain fifteen (15) percent of the site in open space. Impervious surface coverage requirements shall be adjusted accordingly. ~~Rooftop courtyard areas can be used in the calculation of open space requirement.~~

b. At least fifty (50) percent of the open space required in 18.05.080(N)(4)(a) above shall be available for the common use of all residents of the multifamily housing.

c. Common open space shall be contiguous with the housing site (e.g., not separated from the dwellings by streets or barriers that impede pedestrian access) and shall be sufficiently level (e.g., five (5) percent average slope) and well drained to allow active use in summer. No dimension shall be less than fifteen (15) feet.

18.05.080 TABLES: Residential Development Standards

TABLE 5.05

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	24	24 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	24	18.05.080(B)
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	12, or the lowest abutting zoning density district, whichever is greater.	13	14 but none if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.	13	18.05.080(B)

Commented [BC22]: Rooftop courtyards are not open or visible to the public so should not count as open space.

Commented [NF23]: City Staff support. No other commercial zone has a maximum density, and this incentivizes increased units, however it is inconsistent in context of the remainder of the chart.

Commented [BC24]: These changes should apply only if the city has issued a notice of approval under 18.05.055 A.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (in units per acre)	7	7	7	7	18.05.080(C)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	3,500 sq. ft. = zero lots Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard. 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 5,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,000 sq. ft. = other	18.05.080(D) 18.05.080(E) 18.05.080(F) 18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 80’ = duplex	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	50’ EXCEPT: 30’ = cottages 40’ = zero lots 16’ = townhouses 70’ = duplexes 80’ = multifamily	18.05.080(G)
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	20’ EXCEPT: 10’ with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	18.05.080(H) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK	25’	25’	25’	25’	18.05.080(I) 18.05.080(K)
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	20’	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	15’ EXCEPT: 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots; 20’ with alley access.	20’ EXCEPT: 15’ for multifamily; 10’ for cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots.	18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.05.080(E)(2)
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	5’ EXCEPT: 10’ along flanking streets; 6’ on one side of zero lots; 3’ for cottages.	18.05.080(J) 18.05.080(K) 18.05.080(L) 18.40.060(C), Clear Sight Triangle
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35’ EXCEPT: 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	35’ EXCEPT: 25’ for cottages; 16’ for accessory buildings.	18.05.080(M)
MAXIMUM ABOVE GRADE STORIES	2 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	50%	50%	50%	50%	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	70%	70%	70%	70%	18.64 (Townhouses)
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	1 acre	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	18.05.080(N)

Commented [NF25]: City Staff does not support these changes. Mixed use buildings would be treated as commercial. This amendment would incentivize apartment only (no mix) in the commercial core.

Commented [NF26]: City Staff supports the concept, but a mixed use building is treated as commercial and must comply with commercial height standards. This section only applies to residential only buildings which should be required to include ground floor retail for additional height.

Commented [NF27]: City Staff does not support this change because it does not incentivize mixed use. Mixed use buildings are allowed additional height/stories.

Commented [NF28]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use. A mixed use building would be allowed additional coverage.

Commented [NF29]: City Staff does not support this change as it does not incentivize mixed use buildings. A mixed use building would already be exempt from open space requirements.

DISTRICT	Neighborhood Center	Neighborhood Village	Urban Village	Community Oriented Shopping Center	ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

Jackson Ewing

From: Stacey Plumley <staceyaplumley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 3:10 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed changes to Urban Village

Hi Jackson,

I live at 1539 Bellerive Way SE in Briggs Village. I have concerns about the Briggs Village developer's request to modify the definition for Urban Village in the zoning code.

I'm opposed to reducing the minimum amount of commercial space from 175,00 sf to 52,000 sf. The developer claims that commercial isn't viable right now but existing commercial businesses in Briggs appear to be doing very well. Other nearby commercial businesses, like the Safeway in Tumwater and the Vics/Spuds shopping center, are always busy. Even if commercial isn't viable currently, the market could change. An urban village should be a true mixed use development with restaurants, shopes, offices, multifamily and single family homes, not just a bunch of apartments.

I'm also opposed to increasing residential density for urban villages:

- Don't change the current ratio of single family and multifamily homes from 50% min single family/50% max multifamily to 15%/85%.
- Don't increase residential density by allowing buildings facing the town square to be four stories instead of the maximum of three stories.
- Don't eliminate the maximum housing density requirements (currently, 24/acre).
- Don't let rooftop courtyards count for the required min. of open space for multifamily sites. Open space should be accessible for everyone to use.

I don't see changes proposed that would benefit communities for the increased density such as, requiring a percentage of subsidized housing units, or smaller, more affordable units. What will developers be required to give back to the community for making a higher profit on increased density?

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Best,
Stacey Plumley

March 3, 2025

RE: Amendments to 18.05 OMC

Dear Chair Quetin, Vice Chair Garcia, and Commission Members Hanah, Adams, Saurhoff, Garcia, and Nejati,

I am commenting on the changes to code amendments to the Urban Village Development Code. I testified at the public hearing on February 24, 2025. These are my revised remarks.

I was on the Olympia Council when the concept, policies and development code were adopted in the mid 90s. At that time this concept was a fairly new idea in Washington. In Olympia it was very controversial. Neighborhoods surrounding the Briggs site protested vociferously. They voiced fears that multifamily housing and commercial near their neighborhoods would detract from the value of their homes and the urban village would be a low-income neighborhood. Because of this, the council adopted very restrictive policies and regulations, and as a result the urban village has slowly developed over 30 years. While the council thought it was time to introduce this form of development to Olympia, we had little experience or knowledge of how to make this a reality. We hoped that if the concept and regulations were in the comprehensive plan it would happen.

I am therefore supportive of the changes to allow for more multi-family housing and another story or housing in the village core. The urban village did not develop as low-income neighborhood that surrounding residents feared. It is generally a middle-class neighborhood. Adding more multi-family to the neighborhood would provide Olympia residents with more housing choices that might be more affordable. While it might be ideal for current residents for the urban village to develop as originally planned, I wonder if not modifying the development code would cause a delay in the build out of the urban village as a whole and the urban core in particular similar to what happened when the council in the 90s adopted a prescriptive code. Reducing the size of the grocery store seems realistic in light of two large grocery stores within a mile of the village. I do hope the Master Plan requires a small grocery store. More housing in the village's core could add to the viability of a grocery store. I have a small grocery market in my neighborhood that is thriving. It is heartening to see how attitudes toward mixed uses and multi-family housing have changed.

Listening to the testimony, I also wonder if the large parking lot could be organized in such a way to make more parking available to the YMCA, a county-wide destination.

Thank you for your service to the Planning Commission. In my view, it is the City's most important advisory committee. I know your service is also time consuming. You are lucky to have dedicated and hard-working staff.

Thank you for considering my comments. Please enter them in the record on this issue.

Best regards,

Holly Gadbaw

1625 Sylvester Street SW

Olympia, WA 98501

(360) 754-9401

Jackson Ewing

From: Thom Drozd <ctnyut@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 12:09 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

The developer's proposed amendments to the 2014 Master Plan are contrary to the original idea of a successful urban village. A viable walkable village that will serve the basic needs of the Briggs Village and the immediate neighborhoods.

Current our area has many housing types: single family, apartment, duplex. With units still for rent. Increasing the housing units is not consistent with the original master plan. Units are still available because of increasing rents. The near by Tumwater area has several developments of single family homes. An Aldi type grocery store could fix well into the commercial space.

Please do not let the developer modify the Briggs Village master plan.

V/R
Thom Drozd
1520 Palomino Dr SW
Olympia WA 98501
(Village Coop Of the South Sound)

Jackson Ewing

From: Dawn Seymour <dawnseymour@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 3:50 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Support for commercial/retail space for Briggs Village Community

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I would like to strongly urge that another market study be done to see what commercial and retail additions would be sustainable for our community. Adding more residential rooftops without those resources is not fair to current and future residents and does not hold the developer accountable for commitments made that drew people to this neighborhood in the first place. Big grocery stores or big brand retailers likely won't be drawn here but there is potential for smaller commercial and retail
possibilities that should be considered.
Thank you for your consideration.

Dawn Foreman
1520 Palomino Dr SE, #104
Olympia WA. 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: Eika Petermann <eikapetermann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 5:54 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs Village March 3, 2025 Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Jackson,

Thank you to you and your team, once again, for hosting the planning meeting. They are not easy meetings and I appreciate the time and thought you and your team members put in especially after working all day. I joined a little late to make comments but wanted to forward them to you in writing.

I understand that the zoning and master plan concepts must be adhered to, but they are also very confusing and, as Nicole pointed out, seem to compete with each other at times.

I find it ironic that while this is supposed to be a ***walkable*** urban village, we spent so much time talking about parking. This will not be a walled off community where only residents will be able to walk everywhere. Rather, the fact that parking is such an issue means that people from all over Olympia and outlying places such as Yelm and Shelton are coming to visit businesses in Briggs Village. Briggs Taphouse has a running club that meets Thursday evenings and the parked cars snake all the way through the undeveloped area. These people are also potential customers for any commercial undertaking.


This all leads me to believe there is plenty of sustainable commerce for commercial space to be developed. I'm not sure which we are trying to achieve first, commercial or residential. Either way, build it and they will come.

I'd like to see a process that removes as many obstacles as possible to the potential of this urban village. I don't oppose the 4-story buildings, if they are located around the perimeter of the town center. Parking needs to be addressed as stated numerous times. If Spud's has a letter of intent, why hasn't that been acted on?

I've lived in Briggs Village for eleven years now and the things that brought me here were the grocery store, walkability, etc. I had visions of my daughter being able to work at the grocery store while she was also attending a school within walking distance. She is now a college graduate and I see Briggs Village becoming a retirement village before the urban village concept is truly acted on.

Thank you for your time!

Eika Petermann
EdenSpa Wellness
eikapetermann@gmail.com
360.790.5032
FarmHouse Fresh Affiliate
Le Mieux Cosmetics Affiliate



RECEIVED
FEB 26 2025
COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT DEPT.

Feb 25, 2024

Tim Smith, Interim Director
Department of Community Planning and Development
City of Olympia
Box 1967
Olympia, WA 98501

Dear Tim:

I am writing to express concern about what appears to be inadequate training of a member of your staff.

This evening's Planning Commission meeting was unnecessarily difficult for the members and for the public. Much of this was, in my opinion, attributable to the primary staff person assigned to provide support to the meeting. The following problems occurred:

1) There was inadequate notice that the "meeting" was a public hearing on amendments to the development code. First, the meeting agenda did not say "public hearing. Second, notice was not provided to affected neighbors in the notice perimeter. The Commission addressed this shortcoming by extending the hearing to their next meeting, and I expect proper notice to be provided.
2) The developer's representative (Glen Wells) was "on-screen" throughout the meeting as though they were a member of the Planning Commission. Mr. Wells did not abuse that status by participating out of order, but it was still offensive that he got to be "in the room" and the rest of us got to sit out in the rain.
3) At one point, the staff person inappropriately interrupted a member of the public during their very limited period to speak, on a misplaced perception of an issue of decorum. This was almost laughable, as the individual who was speaking is a recently retired Superior Court judge, who probably knows more about decorum than the rest of us attending the meeting combined.
4) The time required to elevate people to "panelist" ate up a lot of the time of the Commission and the Public. People should be elevated <u>in advance</u> of their turn to speak; that's the way the Port and County Commission do this, and I don't think I've ever seen a member of the public abuse that status.

I'm confident that these problems can be addressed and resolved. The public deserves better service than they received tonight.

Sincerely,

Jim Lazar
1907 Lakehurst Dr. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Project 24-0313

To Jackson Ewing, Associate Planner

Response to the State Environmental Policy Amendment OMC 18.05 Urban Villages

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amendment proposals. We believe the SEPA checklist and the supplemental sheet for nonproject actions submitted for the policy related to urban villages is inadequate and/or does not describe a logical conclusion in several sections based on the proposed amendment. The recent amendment is proposing policy changes without providing any reasoning to why the existing policy is not adequately providing sustainable development and environmental protection. This action seems to be premature as Briggs Urban Village is not complete and is the only proposed urban village in Olympia.

It is our understanding that the amendments will allow for:

- Increased multifamily housing
- Removal of a maximum density limit
- Removal of a commercial space per residential unit ratio
- Setting a new standard of commercial space based on acreage of urban village
- Increasing commercial structures from 3 to 4 stories
- Removing a daycare requirement
- Setting a minimum size for a grocery store

Specific concerns we see as inadequately addressed with the amendment proposal

Section – Water 3A & B

How can there be no impact on surface and ground water discharge if the proposed amendment is to increase multi-family housing and remove density limits? Increased density would result in some change.

This same questioning of the logical “of no change or no impact “is not addressed in the following sections

Section -Land and Shoreline Use- how many people would reside and work in the completed project. There must be a change in all the projections for future proposals.

Section -Housing Change will occur on all future projects in 9a, 9b, and 9c

Section- Aesthetics-Change will occur on the tallest proposed structure as the proposal allows structures up to 4 stories instead of 3 stories.

Section – Transportation-Removal of maximum density limit must result in change and likely increase vehicular traffic.

Of additional concern is the proposal to change the basis for determining commercial square footage based on the size of the proposal. There is no relationship between the proposed standard to the number of residential units and the commercial structures proposed for sustainability support.

Again, the questions are what is causing this change and how is this standard an improvement over the existing standard? The proposed amendments will change proposals in the future the DNS does not answer any change or the impact of increasing or deceasing sustainable development and environmental protection.

Any information to help us and the public understand the city's basis for these decisions on sustainable development would be appreciated.

Thank you

Mary and Bruce McDonald

mcdonaldbm@hotmail.com

BGWP

Bean | Gentry | Wheeler | Peternell PLLC

James Randall
jrandall@bgwp.net
Licensed in Washington
Reply to Olympia office

March 12, 2025

VIA EMAIL jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

City of Olympia
Attn: Jackson Ewing

Re: Supplemental Written Comment on Zoning Code Amendments related to the Urban Village Zone (OMC 18.05)

Dear Mr. Ewing:

As I indicated in my previous letter, my firm represents the South Sound Young Men's Christian Association ("SSYMCA"). I write to reiterate SSYMCA's objection to the proposed amendments to OMC 18.05 and more specifically to address certain comments Mr. Gill made ostensibly in response to questions at the continuation of the Public Hearing which occurred on March 3, 2025.

Mr. Gill indicated that Ms. Burgess or Mr. Wells had arranged for a parking agreement to resolve SSYMCA's parking concerns. This is not correct. No such agreement is in place. Moreover, SSYMCA has had no contact from Ms. Burgess, Mr. Wells or Mr. Gill in that regard.

SSYMCA has been involved in the Briggs Development since its inception. SSYMCA believes in the original vision of a walkable urban village where residential is mixed with commercial uses creating a vibrant, healthy, and walkable community. SSYMC provides an assortment of services to the community and fits perfectly into that vision.

Briggs Village has crept along slowly toward achieving that vision, weathering two recessions, an ownership change, and a global pandemic in that process. Market conditions have changed over time, and they will almost certainly change again.

The proposed amendments to OMC 18005 will fundamentally change that vision.

SSYMCA remains committed to the original vision and believes that it would be a mistake to approve these amendments which would reduce the commercial presence, reduce the benefits of walkability and materially alter what the residents thought were buying into.

Yours very truly,

BEAN, GENTRY, WHEELER & PETERNELL, PLLC

James Randall
Attorney at Law

JR:srw

cc: Kyle Cronk, SSYMCA

Option 1: add section 5 below to OMC 18.05.050 F.

F. Development Phasing.

1. Intent. It is the intent of this Section on development phasing to achieve a mix of land uses throughout the buildout of villages and centers; to allow sufficient flexibility to enable development of viable commercial centers; and to ensure that the residential development of villages and centers is as vigorously pursued as the commercial development. For purposes of meeting the requirements of this Section on development phasing, the following terms shall be interpreted as follows:

a. "Completion of development" shall mean:
   i. final plat approval in the case of lots for individual single family, townhouse, or duplex dwellings (i.e., one main building per lot), and
   ii. passage of final inspection for all other residential and commercial development.
b. Percentages of authorized development refer to:
   i. percentage of authorized dwelling units for residential development, and
   ii. percentage of authorized gross floor area for commercial development.

2. Commercial and residential. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, residential development shall be phased to precede commercial development as follows:

a. At least five percent of the total authorized residential development must be completed before the first commercial development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of commercial buildings comprising up to ten percent of the authorized commercial floor area.

b. Upon completion of 15 percent of the total authorized residential development, approval may be granted for construction of buildings comprising up to 40 percent of the authorized commercial floor space.

c. When 30 percent of the total authorized residential development has been completed, approval may be granted for construction of the remaining authorized commercial floor space.

3. Multifamily and single family phasing. In villages and community oriented shopping centers, multifamily development shall be phased relative to detached single family development as follows:

a. At least 15 percent of the total authorized detached single family development must be completed before the first multifamily development may take place; whereupon approval may be granted for construction of up to 40 percent of the authorized multifamily units.

b. Thereafter, approval may be granted for construction of an additional one percent of the authorized multifamily units for every additional one percent of the authorized single family development completed.

Examples:

16 percent of the single family development; 41 percent of the multifamily development

25 percent of the single family development; 50 percent of the multifamily development

50 percent of the single family development; 75 percent of the multifamily development

4. Child Day Care Center. If a child day care center is a required use, a site shall be provided once 75% of the residences have been constructed.

5. Grocery store. In an urban village, an operational grocery store of at least 12,000 sq. ft. of floor space shall be provided no later than once the 75% benchmark described below is met. Satisfaction of the 75% benchmark shall be determined as follows: (1) if a definite number of residential units is set in a development agreement or the current master plan, the benchmark is reached when at least 75% of the units have been constructed; or (2) if (1) does not apply, the 75% benchmark is reached when one or more units have been constructed on lots/parcels constituting at least 75% of the acreage on which residential units may be constructed. Provided, for an urban village existing prior to this provision taking effect, such grocery store shall be provided no later than once 150 residential units are constructed after this provision take effect. Such grocery store shall sell the common food and grocery items, including produce, in quantities similar to grocery stores of comparable size.

Option 2: add section 5 below to OMC 18.05.050 F.

5. Grocery store. In an urban village, an operational grocery store of at least 12,000 sq. ft. of floor space shall be provided no later than once the 75% benchmark described below is met. Satisfaction of the 75% benchmark shall be determined as follows: (1) if a definite number of residential units is set in a development agreement or the current master plan, the benchmark is reached when at least 75% of the units have been constructed; or (2) if (1) does not apply, the 75% benchmark is reached when one or more units have been constructed on lots/parcels constituting at least 75% of the acreage on which residential units may be constructed. Provided, for an urban village existing prior to this provision taking effect, such grocery store shall be provided no later than once 150 residential units are constructed after this provision take effect. Such grocery store shall sell the common food and grocery items, including produce, in quantities similar to grocery stores of comparable size.

a. If the urban village demonstrates for each extension sought that it is making substantial progress toward providing such grocery store and that such store will likely be provided within eighteen months of the applicable deadline, the city may grant up to three six-month extensions to the applicable deadline for providing the grocery store.

b. If such grocery store is not provided within the applicable deadline as may be extended, the city shall not issue any approvals required for residential units, until the operational grocery is provided.

c. A sizable grocery store being a critical element for a successful urban village, the city will require that any application to reduce the minimum size of the grocery store be supported by submitting compelling evidence that the urban village has made extensive good faith efforts for at least a two-year period to obtain a grocery store of at least 12,000 sq. ft by offering an attractive site and reasonable terms and by engaging qualified commercial brokers paid by commission with expertise in grocery store or similar commercial projects. Such submittal shall at a minimum include supporting statements from one or more such brokers that detail their extensive efforts made for at least a one-year period to obtain such a grocery store, and attach copies of all electronic or paper documents relating to proposals and/or offers to or from prospective grocery providers and copies of the brokerage agreements.

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 5:54 PM
To: Nicole Floyd
Cc: 'Betty Bailey'; 'Becky Brewer'; Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Shorter simpler OMC grocery fix

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Nicole, thanks for your detailed response below re the process. It gives me a better understanding of your view of the current process and the role of your office.

As you know, in its letter to the City Council re the OMC 18.05 amendments, the Planning Commission recommended that the Council: "Explore or identify a way to prioritize or incentivize commercial development that serves the village intent – i.e. a grocery store is an essential service of a livable/walkable village."

Our objective is to provide the council an option that addresses this point. Of course, we don't want to provide a technically flawed option to Council. You have already provided some helpful feedback advising that it may be problematic for us to propose language that relies upon a unit count metric for phasing a grocery store. I took that to heart and modified our draft to remove reference to unit count.

In my last email request for feedback on our draft language, I failed to make clear that we aren't asking you to endorse the policy in the draft language. Rather, we are asking for feedback on whether you believe the draft language would be workable and effective to address the Planning Commission's recommendation quoted above, if the city council were to adopt something like our language. Your input on that would of course be quite helpful, given you are one of the most knowledgeable persons about the city planning codes.

With respect to our objective to establish a phasing requirement for the grocery store, you advise that may be better done in the Master Plan due to the detail of our language. I have a couple of thoughts, questions, and concerns in response.

First, one of the main problems our proposed language is intended to address is that the OMC has no phasing for the *most critical use* in an urban village, a sizable grocery store. (It does have a phasing element for day care centers, which are clearly a lower priority.) We want to make sure that all urban villages have a phasing requirement for the grocery store, so the problem that arose here of the grocery being put off at Briggs Village isn't repeated at other urban villages. Similarly, the Planning Commission wanted to make sure that all urban villages have a commercial minimum requirement, and thus recommended one be added to the OMC, rather than deferring that requirement to the Master Plan stage.

Second, I am not aware of how a grocery store phasing requirement would as a practical matter be added at the Master Plan stage. I have read through a 111 page document I obtained from the city's website entitled Amended Briggs Village Master Plan Development, March 2014. But I did not see a place where a grocery phasing requirement would go in the Master Plan. Where do you envision it would go? I located a "Phasing Plan" for landscaping starting on page 101, but did not find a general phasing plan. The only semi-prescriptive language I found was on pages 1 and 2. Perhaps there are be other parts to the Master Plan beyond the 111-page document I read. Are there? If so, would you please email them to me, or identify what they are so I can request them.

Third, I am concerned that at the Master Plan stage, there may be limited legal opportunity to add a grocery store phasing requirement. I read the city's master planning code, OMC 18.57. My impression is that a grocery phasing requirement could be added by the hearing examiner if she/he believes it was needed to carry out the intent of the urban village code. But since there is no such phasing in OMC 18.05 for the grocery, but there is for day care centers, one could argue that the OMC for urban villages does not intend for any grocery store phasing. On that ground, the hearing examiner might decline to add grocery store phasing, even if they believed it was needed. Also, the City Council in acting in a quasi-judicial capacity in reviewing the hearing examiner's recommendation, may likewise have limited authority to add a grocery phasing requirement in the Master Plan where it is not required in the OMC. The Council appears limited in review to addressing matters "in conflict with the City's adopted plans, policies and ordinances." OMC 18.57.080 D.3. So absent support for a grocery phasing in those sources, the Council may be limited in adding one during a master plan review. No such limitation would apply when it acts in a legislative capacity by amending OMC 18.05.

Thanks again for all your help and thoughtful input. I'm sure you have some good insights as to my comments here, and I look forward as always to reading them.

Best regards, Brian

From: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Monday, April 7, 2025 10:17 AM
To: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Cc: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>; Becky Brewer <beckybrew@gmail.com>; Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Shorter simpler OMC grocery fix

Hey Brian,

I truly appreciate how much time you are putting into this. Its commendable. I continue to think the level of detailed phasing you want addressed would be better placed in the Master Plan. Nevertheless, it appears you really want to add language to the Zoning Code and to do so, you may want to consider where we are at in the process. Your focus at this point should be on communicating with the City Council. You can do that through Staff by sending us comments intended for them. Here are some clarifications as to where we have been/are at now:

1) The applicant (Gordie Gill) applied for an amendment to the OMC. This is not a City /Staff initiated application. Staff's role is to review the submittal and provide input to the Planning Commission about if the request complies with the Comprehensive Plan.

2) Planning Commission's role was to consider public input and determine if they wanted to forward the applicants requested revisions to the Council. They did, but with some modifications.
    a. Staff's role was to answer questions and provide information as requested by the Commission.

3) Council will soon be evaluating the Planning Commission's draft. They will have an opportunity to make changes as they see fit.
    a. Staff's role is to present the Planning Commission's recommendation. All public comments will be available for them to review.
    b. Council would have to direct Staff to make changes to the Planning Commission draft at this point. They would need to decide:
        i. That phasing requirements are appropriate/necessary.

ii. That those requirements belong in the zoning code as opposed to the master plan
iii. That the revisions you have drafted are what they want to see in code.

Staff will be preparing a packet to the Council that includes all comment letters presented to Planning Commission and those that were submitted after the hearing, such as your proposed draft language. Council will review that packet and ask Staff to respond to the various things they want further addressed. Staff's role is limited to what was asked of us by the applicant, what Planning Commission did and then (now) what City Council asks of us. The revisions you are suggesting are not something the applicant requested, nor what the Planning Commission recommended. Staff cannot bring them into the conversation, only Council can. I understand it is a primary concern of the surrounding neighborhood but as Staff, we have to be careful to stay within our roles and responsibilities. I hope this helps you better assess how to present your recommendations to Council.

We are always here to give you information and answer questions. We can/will forward comments to Council at your request.

Please let me know if you have further questions about this process.

Nicole Floyd, AICP

Planning Manager|City of Olympia
601 4th Ave E.|Olympia, WA 98501
Ph: 360.570.3768|Fax: 360.753.8087
Web: olympiawa.gov

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2025 9:12 AM
To: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Betty Bailey <bettybaileyproperties@gmail.com>; Becky Brewer <beckybrew@gmail.com>
Subject: Shorter simpler OMC grocery fix

Nicole, please review this new version of the grocery fix. It is a shorter and simple and "no total unit count" version.

We really value your feedback so we can make this as effective and as fair as possible.

Thank you, Brian

Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Jared Mason-Gere <jmasongere@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Re: Proposed Briggs village masterplan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good Morning, Jackson- thank you for your reply email and the information you've provided. I have had a chance to dig into this matter a bit further. It is embarrassing, because it is not the way I like to operate, but I would like to either have my comments stricken or revise them. I was responding to information I received that shared one perspective on the proposed plans and its perceived or anticipated impact on an institution I care about a great deal. However I have learned a bit more and I believe the proposal could actually be helpful in taking Briggs Village additional steps toward the original vision. Improving the ease of growing new grocery and other retail or dining amenities in that area would be a real boon to the southeast Olympia and Tumwater communities and set a vision for more smart planning in Olympia.

Thanks, and sorry for the multiple communications.

Jared

On Thu, Feb 20, 2025 at 3:31 PM Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

> Good afternoon,
>
> Thank you for taking the time to provide comment on this proposal. I have received you comment letter and have added it to the project record. These comments will be provided to the Planning Commission for review prior to the upcoming public hearing which is scheduled for February 24th, 2025.
>
> You will also be added to the party of record list and will receive all public notices regarding these amendments and Briggs Village.
>
> The current Master Plan requires a minimum of 94,985 square feet, based on units approved in Briggs. This amendment would be reducing the required commercial to a minimum of 52,500 square feet. The city staff does not support changing the maximum allowed commercial square footage of 225,000 square feet. This means an urban village could have between 52,500-225,000 square feet. These numbers come from reviewing the other village types and picking a range in the middle that would provide the most flexibility.

The goal of the amendments is to increase housing density allowances and height limits in the core, to spur the intended commercial development. Requirements for a commercial core fronting the village square will not be removed from the code requirement. Additionally, the requirements for a grocery store in “urban villages” will not be removed. City staff is recommending a more flexible range to allow the vacant land to develop with market demands.

The plan will still need to meet the intent of the code OMC 18.05. A commercial core around the town square with a grocery store. The amendments proposed are mainly to allow flexibility to the plan, not abandon the goals of the village. The hope would be that market conditions shift, and additional offices and retail locate to the village.

If these proposed changes to OMC 18.05 move forward a public process will occur to amend the Briggs Master Plan. This process is where specifics around the size of the required grocery store size, YMCA parking, along with all other aspects of the Master Plan will be reviewed. This future process will include the following:

- Notice of application to all residents in Briggs Village.
- Community information meeting.
- Comment period.
- Public hearing with hearing examiner.
- Public hearing with City Council for final approval.

Best regards,

Jackson Ewing | Associate Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development Department

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

(360) 570-3776

jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

**All correspondence to and from this address is a public record*

From: Jared Mason-Gere <jmasongere@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 8:37 PM
To: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Proposed Briggs village masterplan

Greetings- I'm writing with concerns about proposed changes to the Briggs Village Master Plan. Olympia is already, in opinion, a very oddly laid out town with a lot of bifurcated and separated neighborhoods without good access to groceries, neighborhood bars, coffee shops, etc. It is largely very car dependent. It strikes me as very shortsighted to exacerbate that and reduce the opportunity to create more mixed use in locations that would support it. I also believe Olympia is a difficult place to navigate and a difficult place to park. It also has a shortage of community gathering spaces, fitness centers, etc, so I have a lot of concern about decisions that could reduce access to those thriving community and fitness centers that do exist. I hope you will work hard to support existing facilities and encourage expansion of more mixed use, walkable neighborhoods with more easily accessible "third places" and start over on the revisions to the Briggs Village plan.

Thank you

Jared Mason-Gere

1918 Mark St., Olympia

Jackson Ewing

From: Mary Chapman <mmchap99@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2025 7:29 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Briggs changes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good evening, Jackson—-

As a resident of the Briggs area, I am concerned about the following changes you are proposing to the Briggs area, specifically:

* no daycare facility
* a more limited grocery store area
* fewer YMCA parking spots

I am thinking that people who moved into that area are counting on those amenities, and now would feel unhappy, or much worse, with the knowledge that Olympia is adjusting the parameters of the area at this point. Young families, in particular, might be hard hit if they were planning to use a local daycare and to shop locally for more than pizza and beer. I personally am worried that the Y parking is going to become even more difficult to find. I am not sure how you pencil out those adjustments and still feel good about the job your department is doing.
Many thanks for listening to my concerns—- mary miller chapman

Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Franklin Wilson <fawil2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 4:01 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 related master planned villages.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr Ewing:

My wife and I write to protest the proposed Amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code 18.05 related master planned villages as recently communicated by Tressa Pagel, Program Specialist for the City of Olympia as follows:
File Number: 24-0313
Proposal: Amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) title 18.05 specifically to "urban village" development standards. These amendments would result in increased multifamily housing allowances in urban villages; Removal of maximum density limits; Removal of required commercial square footage per residential unit in village; setting a new range of minimum and maximum commercial space feet based on acreage of an Urban Village; Increase in allowed number of stories for commercial structures facing the town square from three to four stories; and removing the requirement of a daycare.

Let me be clear, Mr. Ewing: **we are not protesting these proposed changes as applied to any *future* planned villages in the City of Olympia.** What we protest is the notion that these proposed changes should be imposed retroactively to the Briggs Village development in which we have owned property for the past six years and in which we now live. **We chose to live in Briggs Village according to the development plan as it is, not as it might be.** Ours is a *prima facie* argument that **the rules governing an urban development may well change for any *future* developments, but not for an established development in which residents have already invested their money based on the City's own approval of an established plan.**

Ergo: The City of Olympia ought not violate or alter in any way the stated rules governing already existing urban villages within the City's boundaries, but should by all means alter as the City sees fit the zoning rules for any future urban developments in Olympia. As an old quarter-miler, I can tell you that I would have complained vigorously if after the beginning of a race it were announced that we were running 660 yards instead of 440. You simply can't change the distance once the race has begun. The notion is preposterous. Change the future, but not the past.

Sincerely,

Franklin A.Wilson
1526 Brighton Way SE
Olympia, Washiongton 98501

Jackson Ewing

From: tjburns7@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, March 14, 2025 1:43 PM
To: Jackson Ewing
Subject: Proposed Amendment to the Brigg's Urban Village

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To Whom it may Concern:

My name is Tom Burns and I have lived in Sten Village (several blocks from the Briggs Property) for the better half of fifty years. When the Briggs Urban Village was proposed over 25 years ago the planned development was to create mixed park space, residential and commercial services, including a Market where folks could go to get fresh food. The idea was to develop a sustainable community where folks could live and work within the Village and have access to a bus line to commute to work limiting car traffic and congestion. The idea was a "walkable community".

Having been a member of the Briggs YMCA since it opened close to twenty years ago, I have found an increase in traffic within the network of streets within the Village as well as limited parking for Folks at the YMCA and adjacent businesses. The proposed amendment to the Village will drastically alter the intent of the original plan by increasing vehicle traffic, increase pressure on current parking and decrease access to the current facilities that now exist. In summary, the proposed amendment will simply be an Urban Sprawl compromising the quality of life that we as residents envisioned in the original plan for the Briggs Village and our nearby community.

I urge the City of Olympia to deny the proposed amendment to increase the number of residential units while decreasing the commercial space within the Village.

Sincerely,

Tom Burns

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 1:40 PM
To: Nicole Floyd
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Briggs units count

Nicole, thanks for your detailed reply. Could you please clarify what you mean by saying a unit is allocated.

Does this mean that applications have been file to approve the plans for a unit and/or to approve its construction?

Meaning that the city has received 810 applications, such that all 810 units are allocated?

If that is the case, how many units have been allocated to the Mixed Use District beyond the 32 (?) units already constructed in the district?

I appreciate that you don't know the number of units that have certificates of occupancy, but do you have a sense of the number of units of the 810 that remain to be constructed? The phasing section in OMC 18.05.050 F has multiple references to the units "constructed." Does the permit unit monitor that? Jackson I believe estimated about 200-300 units of the 810 had not yet been constructed. Is that figure a reasonable estimate?

The reason we want to know that units constructed, is that for our phasing proposal for the grocery store we want to know if 75% of the units have been constructed, which is the same metric that is used for the daycare center in OMC 18.05.050 F.4. We want to make sure Gill will be given sufficient time to get the grocery store done, once a phasing time requirement is established.

If 75% if the units have already been constructed, then under that metric to phase the grocery Gill would have no time to provide grocery. Thus, if 75% is already done or close to it, we would instead propose he do the grocery before constructing the next 150 units, which should give Gill 3-4 years to provide the grocery.

What are your thoughts on that approach? Is it reasonable?

Many thanks. Best, regards, Brian

-----Original Message-----
From: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Cc: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Briggs units count

It's not really an easy number to track down because every unit has been accounted for in the Master Plan. From a planning perspective, were focused on "allocated" not built. This is primarily because we are wanting to make sure what we approve does not exceed the totals and to do that, we look at what we have allocated. This means that as long as each project we receive is consistent with the unit counts identified on each specific property within the master plan,

then we know the total 810 will not be exceeded. We would update that allocation if we retain the unit max with the master plan amendment.

I do not know exactly how many units have received a final certificate of occupancy. This would be a tedious task to determine and if you really want this number you may want to submit a public records request because I think it would be quite time consuming to count each one up. I am also somewhat unclear on what purpose it would serve. Another approach would be to ask to review all the building permits applied for...but not all permits are approved and some buildings require multiple permits. For example, the preliminary plat approval for the Brigg's West subdivision accounts for 46 single family residences. The lots have been partially developed, but the units themselves have not yet been placed onto those lots - no building permits have been applied for. From a compliance with the 810 max perspective, I would count them as accounted for. Only once they got final occupancy would they show up in a records request as having received a final occupancy approval.

I am sorry I am not better able to assist in the precise number you are wanting. Its an oddly complicated question in which we do not have an easy way to provide you with an answer.

Nicole

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 1:32 PM
To: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Briggs units count

Nicole, could you please help me get the latest count from Jackson of the number of units of the original 810 that have been built. About 3 weeks ago Jackson in an email informed me that as best as he could say at that time about 200-300 of the 810 had not been constructed. I've asked him a number of times since if that has changed, or is still his best estimate, but haven't been able to get a response. Could you please check this out, and have him or you get back to me.

I'd really appreciate it as this is important information.

Thank you, Brian
Sent from my iPad

Jackson Ewing

From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 1:40 PM
To: Nicole Floyd
Cc: Jackson Ewing
Subject: RE: Briggs units count

Nicole, thanks for your detailed reply. Could you please clarify what you mean by saying a unit is allocated.

Does this mean that applications have been file to approve the plans for a unit and/or to approve its construction?

Meaning that the city has received 810 applications, such that all 810 units are allocated?

If that is the case, how many units have been allocated to the Mixed Use District beyond the 32 (?) units already constructed in the district?

I appreciate that you don't know the number of units that have certificates of occupancy, but do you have a sense of the number of units of the 810 that remain to be constructed? The phasing section in OMC 18.05.050 F has multiple references to the units "constructed." Does the permit unit monitor that? Jackson I believe estimated about 200-300 units of the 810 had not yet been constructed. Is that figure a reasonable estimate?

The reason we want to know that units constructed, is that for our phasing proposal for the grocery store we want to know if 75% of the units have been constructed, which is the same metric that is used for the daycare center in OMC 18.05.050 F.4. We want to make sure Gill will be given sufficient time to get the grocery store done, once a phasing time requirement is established.

If 75% if the units have already been constructed, then under that metric to phase the grocery Gill would have no time to provide grocery. Thus, if 75% is already done or close to it, we would instead propose he do the grocery before constructing the next 150 units, which should give Gill 3-4 years to provide the grocery.

What are your thoughts on that approach? Is it reasonable?

Many thanks. Best, regards, Brian

-----Original Message-----
From: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Cc: Jackson Ewing <jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Briggs units count

It's not really an easy number to track down because every unit has been accounted for in the Master Plan. From a planning perspective, were focused on "allocated" not built. This is primarily because we are wanting to make sure what we approve does not exceed the totals and to do that, we look at what we have allocated. This means that as long as each project we receive is consistent with the unit counts identified on each specific property within the master plan,

then we know the total 810 will not be exceeded. We would update that allocation if we retain the unit max with the master plan amendment.

I do not know exactly how many units have received a final certificate of occupancy. This would be a tedious task to determine and if you really want this number you may want to submit a public records request because I think it would be quite time consuming to count each one up. I am also somewhat unclear on what purpose it would serve. Another approach would be to ask to review all the building permits applied for...but not all permits are approved and some buildings require multiple permits. For example, the preliminary plat approval for the Brigg's West subdivision accounts for 46 single family residences. The lots have been partially developed, but the units themselves have not yet been placed onto those lots - no building permits have been applied for. From a compliance with the 810 max perspective, I would count them as accounted for. Only once they got final occupancy would they show up in a records request as having received a final occupancy approval.

I am sorry I am not better able to assist in the precise number you are wanting. Its an oddly complicated question in which we do not have an easy way to provide you with an answer.

Nicole

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Faller <brianfaller@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 1:32 PM
To: Nicole Floyd <nfloyd@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Briggs units count

Nicole, could you please help me get the latest count from Jackson of the number of units of the original 810 that have been built. About 3 weeks ago Jackson in an email informed me that as best as he could say at that time about 200-300 of the 810 had not been constructed. I've asked him a number of times since if that has changed, or is still his best estimate, but haven't been able to get a response. Could you please check this out, and have him or you get back to me.

I'd really appreciate it as this is important information.

Thank you, Brian
Sent from my iPad

OMC 18.05 Amendments

Grocery Store

OMC 18.02.180 – Definition of 'Food stores'

"Stores primarily engaged in selling food and beverages for home preparation and consumption. It includes grocery stores; meat and fish markets, including freezer provisioners; fruit and vegetable markets; candy, nut, and confectionery stores; dairy products stores; retail bakeries; wine and beer shops; liquor stores; and miscellaneous stores specializing in items such as spices, coffee, or health foods. As an accessory use, a food store may also sell prepared products for on-site or off-site consumption."

OMC 18.02.180 – Definition of 'Grocery store'

"Grocery store means a subcategory of food store which is primarily engaged in the retail sale of a wide variety of fresh foods, packaged foods and household supplies for preparation and consumption in the home."

"Food Stores" and "Grocery Stores" are both permitted uses in the Urban Village (Table 5.01). If the City's intent is to provide the developer with the flexibility to allow multiple individual Food Stores or a single Grocery Store to meet a new minimum 9,200 SF requirement in light of continued market uncertainty, the most straightforward way to do that since the definition of "Food Stores" includes "Grocery Stores" would be to make "Food Stores" a Required Use totaling that square footage, leaving "Grocery Stores" as a Permitted Use. The Applicant suggests the following proposed amendment:

Amend Table 5.01 to make "Food Stores" an "R", with the following explanatory footnote added:

"The 9,200 SF required minimum Food Stores can be met either through a single Grocery Store or through multiple individual Food Stores as defined in OMC 18.02.180 which total a minimum of 9,200 SF."

Village Green Construction

OMC 18.05.050.C.5 provides: "Village Green or Plaza. The required village green or plaza shall be constructed before more than fifty (50) percent of the commercial space is under construction."

This provision does not need to be modified with the text amendment; however, to address the City's concerns, the Applicant will agree as part of the proposed Master Plan Amendment to construct the Village Green (except for the clocktower) in conjunction with the next phase of residential development (80 apartments, 12,000 SF commercial) whether

or not the 50 percent commercial space trigger is met. The Applicant proposes to install the clocktower element when the overall project is 90% complete.