



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Monday, January 28, 2013

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 9 - Commissioner Roger Horn, Commissioner Paul Ingman, Commissioner Agnieszka Kisza, Commissioner James Reddick, Commissioner Rob Richards, Commissioner Amy Tousley, Chair Jerome Parker, Vice Chair Judy Bardin, and Commissioner Larry Leveen

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

Chair Parker announced that the Commission will not entertain comment on the Comprehensive Plan Update as they are in the Final Deliberation stage.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Parker announced the City Council will be holding a hearing on February 5 regarding the emergency ordinance they adopted last December, which establishes setbacks and stepbacks for buildings in High Density Corridors. If - after the hearing - they decide to maintain the emergency ordinance for the 12 months from adoption, the item will come before the Planning Commission as a work plan item after March.

Chair Parker announced the implementation plan will be discussed by the Land Use & Environment Committee on Wednesday, January 30 at 5:30 p.m.

Associate Planner Amy Buckler announced the General Government Committee has extended the deadline for applications to the Planning Commission, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Design Review Board, Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee, and the

Utility Advisory Committee until February 22. They will conduct interviews for the Heritage Commission and Arts Commission on February 19.

Commissioner Leveen asked if the Council will be conducting interviews for outgoing commission members. Ms. Buckler will find out.

Ms. Buckler clarified the March 26 City Council Agenda Item regarding the Planning Commission's recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan is intended to be a status update and opportunity for Council to provide guidance on the timeline for receiving the transmittal. The Council is not expecting a report on the Commission's specific recommendations.

5. QUESTION TIME

There were no questions.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

13-0084

Final Deliberations on the Comprehensive Plan Update

- Attachments:**
- [1. Final Deliberation Schedule](#)
 - [2. Procedure for Final Deliberations](#)
 - [3. OPC Sponsor Proposals](#)

Chair Parker clarified that at each meeting List B items will be addressed following the List A topic scheduled for that night.

Topic A1: Connectivity. Including PT4.21 in the July Draft.

The Sponsor, Chair Parker, reviewed his proposal and issues underlying the topic.

Commission Discussion:

- Support for the proposed amendments, and public process.
- Concern about developed areas versus undeveloped areas, specifically, new land sub-divided relating to new street connectivity.
- New language being proposed should include the word "will."
- Concerned about comments made by the public. How are we assured in this language that the public has parity with the City in making these decisions?

Senior Planner Sophie Stimson spoke to the proposed revision to Policy PT4.21, outlined on page 31 of the packet. The purpose of the

revision is to clarify who would provide the analysis. The reason for the policy is to include a step within the development review, including the hearing examiner process, to explain why the connection is being requested. This policy was intended to apply only to full street connections - connections for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. In other places, connections are opposed so that people can use the right-of-way for other activities.

Commission Discussion:

- There are many benefits to pedestrians and bikes when full connections are provided.
 - Often the community is not aware of a development project impacting street connectivities until the project is well underway.
 - The SEPA notice outlines the impacts. Hopefully people don't wait to file a SEPA appeal. SPRC agendas and yellow boards are also forms of public notification.
 - Mitigation items help to slow transportation or reduce the impact of vehicle use and help protect other users of the street, such as bulb-outs, pedestrian crossings.
 - Consider including "such as" - Trying to find the Appendix that has the list of planned connections.
 - It would be surprising if a street connection were not opposed. Maybe it has something to do with the process.
 - For other decisions, we look at what the impacts are.
 - Suggestion would be to always run through the analysis when it comes up, whether it is opposed or not.
- As sponsor, Chair Parker advocates for the language regarding connectivity that is currently in the 1994 Plan, Policy T3.20, with some language regarding a notification process for affected neighborhoods. He outlined the following reasons - #9 speaks to "effectiveness of proposed traffic-calming measures" whereas the staff amended changes to the July Draft refers only to the identification of potential mitigation measures. - existing language refers to balancing benefits versus costs or reasons for or against. - rather than using the staff statement "pursue all street connections" prefer the statement "consider street connections." - existing language refers to the major concern diverting cross-town arterial traffic to existing neighborhoods.

Commission Discussion:

- Randee Wesselman responded to an earlier question regarding street connectivity with the following -
- Trying to get away from analyzing every street connection. It takes lots of staff time to reiterate.
- A majority of the connections being discussed are Neighborhood

Collector or Local Access streets, which are intended for neighborhood circulation. The intent is not to divert truck traffic through neighborhoods.

- Can't say there won't be trucks or large vehicles that will want to go through, but City tries hard through design, traffic-calming devices, etc., so that it would not be convenient.

- Still concerned about the public participation piece of this. Once the development review process begins, how much outreach has been done with the public?

- Mr. Wesselman provided an example, Decatur Street. It's fully the intent of the City to have a public process if the City were to pursue connections outside of a development.

- There is currently pretty strong language regarding connections in the 1994 Plan. How is the newly proposed language an improvement in staff's mind?

- Ms. Stimson: Street connectivity emerged from the Traffic Mobility Strategy as one of the most important things to mitigate impacts of growth. In the past, the City has done the same analysis over and over again with no result. The new policy proposes a more objective set of measures to determine if the connection will bring about the set of values the community wants. It could be that after analysis that the street connection is found to be effective or not. Objective set of measures, backed up by data, public process and good design will still occur.

- Mr. Leveen suggested the Planning Commission may not see the flaws in the bullet points in the 1994 policy, whereas staff works with it consistently.

- Suggest asking staff to come-up with another option that merges the 1994 policy with the proposed language.

- Of course we want the connectivity, but the new language does not consider pedestrian safety and noise. Favors old language.

- Analysis should come first, resulting in favor or opposition. Newly proposed language seems backwards.

- Differences between 1994 and revised language. County is dropped, and developer is picked up. Why is this?

- Ms. Simpson: Developer added that the onus of analysis would fall on them, so this clarifies that it would fall on the developer or City. Removing the "County" is not intended to exclude the County, they are an implied factor as applicable within our review process. - Likes 4.21. Supports staffs' ideas, but pedestrian safety is important and should be added.

Commissioner Leveen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bardin, to adopt the revised PT4.21 policy on the bottom of page 31, but include points #7 and #9 from the 1994 Plan, as well as noise impacts and impacts on bicyclist and pedestrian safety. Commissioner Horn added a friendly

amendment to add the word "County" after "City". Commissioner Reddick added a friendly amendment to remove the phrase "pursue all street connections." The motion failed by a vote of 4 to 5. Commissioners Tousley, Leveen, Horn and Parker voted yay. Commissioners Ingman, Bardin, Kizza, Richards and Reddick voted nay.

- Commissioner Ingman voted nay because there should be a baseline for analysis in order to understand what the impact of the change will be. He would like to see assessment of neighborhood livability.

- Commissioner Richards voted nay because doesn't agree with the word "oppose." Should be changed to "propose." He believes the issue should involve a public hearing.

Commissioner Leveen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tousley, to approve revised PT4.21 with points #2, #7 and #9 from the 1994 Plan, with #2 amended to include bicyclists. Commissioner Kizza made a friendly amendment to include noise impacts and air pollution on another line, and the amendment was accepted. Commissioner Bardin requested a friendly amendment to change the word, "pursue" to "consider," and the amendment was not accepted.

Commission Discussion:

-The City does not calculate carbon footprint for projects.

- It does not make sense to include heavy trucks on local access streets.

-Staff confirmed that policy language in the Comprehensive Plan that directs there be a public hearing may not result in the intended affect. It could be interpreted to read, "*if there was a hearing...*" The Municipal Code is the regulatory tool that determines whether a public hearing is required or not. Currently, when street connections occur in the context of subdivisions, a public hearing is required; but street connections associated with apartment complexes may not always require a public hearing.

- Staff also confirmed that if the City was pursuing a street connection - not associated with a private development permit - there would be a series of meetings, and the City Council would make a choice to have a public hearing or not.

- The Commission decided not to add "at a public hearing" after "other stakeholders."

The main motion passed by 6 votes, with Commissioners Tousley, Reddick, Horn, Leveen, Richards and Parker voting in

favor. Commissioners Ingman, Bardin and Kiswa voted nay. The following is the language that passed:

"PT 4.21 Pursue all street connections. When a street connection is proposed, the developer, City, or County will analyze how not making the street connection will impact the street network. This information will be shared with the neighborhood and other stakeholders before any final decision is made. At a minimum, this evaluation will include:

- Impact on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists**
- Impact on directness of travel for emergency - public, - and commercial-service vehicles**
- An assessment of travel patterns of the larger neighborhood area**
- An assessment of traffic volumes at the connection and at major intersections in the larger neighborhood area**
- Identification of major topographical barriers or environmental constraints that make a connection infeasible**
- Involve the neighborhood and other stakeholders in the identification of potential mitigation measures for the new connection**
- Bicycle and pedestrian safety**
- Noise impacts and air pollution**
- Likelihood of diverting significant cross-town arterial traffic onto local neighborhood streets**
- Effectiveness of proposed traffic-calming measures."**

Chair Parker moved to other proposals regarding connectivity on page 28 of the packet. He directed the Commission to page 40 of the July Draft, which states the majority of the users of the Decatur connection would be people from the neighborhood. However, there is a highly documented public comment that included information about a license plate survey done several years ago. This survey determined 76% of the cars using Fern Street - when it was open - were from out of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Horn moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingman, to strike the paragraph in Appendix A on page 40 of the July Draft [under the title "Decatur Street and 16th Avenue Connections"] that starts with "The majority of users ..." The motion passed with 6 votes, with Commissioners Ingman, Parker, Horn, Reddick, Richards and Bardin voting in favor. Commissioner Leveen and

Kisza voted nay. Commissioner Tousley abstained.

Commission Discussion:

- Proposal is for Appendix A to include language that bollards to allow for emergency vehicles should be considered as an alternative to full vehicle connections.
- Read a majority of the testimony to say that there should be no connection until the West Olympia Access Study is complete.
- Can't accept "and as a permanent alternative to a full vehicular connection."
- Decatur is currently a nice bike and pedestrian connection, with bollards.
- The one at 16th Avenue has a fence across it, but easily used by bikes and pedestrians. Can appreciate the proposal, but do we need language for every possible contingency.
- Parker withdraws proposed language regarding use of bollards.

Chair Parker explained his proposal to revise the connection described on pages 41-42 of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft under "Kaiser Road and Black Lake Boulevard Connections." He proposes the language state the street will be open to emergency vehicles, bikes and pedestrians, but not vehicles.

- What is the rationale for having two connections so close together?
- Staff: The two connections serve two different purposes. Kaiser Road extension to Black Lake Boulevard is a major collector street serving sub-area through-traffic, as compared to the neighborhood collector serving the local Park Drive/Park Heights residents.
- Developments being considered there have considered a connection through Kaiser Road.

Commissioner Ingman moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, to adopt the language on the screen [changes to Appendix A of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft, pages 41-42 under the title, "Kaiser Road and Black Lake Boulevard Area Connections. "] The motion passed by 8 votes, with Commissioner Reddick abstaining. The following is the language that passed:

"New street connections are expected to occur as more growth occurs in the area of Black Lake, Kaiser Road and US-101. A connection from Kaiser Road to Black Lake Boulevard is planned, south of US-101, creating a new north-south corridor parallel to Black Lake Boulevard. Consistent with standards, this new 2-lane major collector will include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, street trees, and lighting and will be designed with curves to slow vehicle speeds.

~~A neighborhood collector street connection is also planned between Kaiser Road and Park Drive. Both connections will add needed connectivity to the area, serving different functions in the street network. Both connections should be pursued and may be built independent of one another. The connection between Kaiser Road to Park Drive will not be a substitute for the connection between Kaiser Road and Black Lake Boulevard.~~

If at some future time Kaiser Road is extended to Black Lake Boulevard, extension of Park Drive to Kaiser Road may be considered in order to provide access for bicycles, pedestrians, and emergency vehicles.”

Commission Discussion:

- Concern that when these properties do develop, there will be some challenges. Hope that the subarea plan for this area will address this.

Commissioner Parker explained his proposal for Appendix B to the Transportation Chapter. Appendix B does not list Park Drive as a connection because this list is for Arterials and Major Collector Streets only. His proposal is to add the 16th and Fern connections there because those would be done along with the Decatur connection. He also proposes adding a footnote in Appendix A that these connections would not be made until completion of West Olympia Access study .

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to edit Appendix B [on page 46 of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft] to include the 16th Ave SW & Fern St connection, and add a footnote in Appendix A that these connections would be made contingent upon completion of Phase 2 of the Olympia West Access study. The motion passed by a vote of 8, with Commissioner Kizza abstaining.

Chair Parker encouraged Commissioners to submit B-List proposals as soon as possible. He clarified that after the A-Topics each night, the Commission will move forward with deliberations on B-List topics, in order as listed.

Values and Vision Subcommittee Proposal

Chair Parker explained the Subcommittee's Proposal:

- Break current Olympia's Vision into two different chapters - an Introduction, then a Vision Chapter - almost word for word, but with edits.
- Create a structure to link values to visions and visions to goals and policies. Values will be linked to each chapter.

- Keep the Sustainability Goal 1, and PO1.1 in the Olympia's Vision Chapter. Remove policies PO1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 as these are way too specific to be overarching policies.
- This is a working document that still contains gaps. The Committee has not yet disbanded.
- Look at Utility Master Plan because it probably contains vision statements. Amy Tousley will pull this language out and provide it to the Subcommittee.
- Commissioner Ingman - Urge Commissioners to identify the top 3-4 major challenges we face as a community. The ones listed in the July Draft may not be the correct ones, or may not be enough.
- New information has been provided that wasn't available when the July Draft was published. Needs to be updated, cleaned up.
- Appeal to other Commissioners to provide comments.
- Subcommittee should meet again, and incorporate other Commissioner's comments.
- A lot of Master Plans have overarching visions or goals.

Acquiring and Preserving Land. PN2.1 in the July Draft.

Commissioner Kizza explained her proposal on page 49 of the packet.

Planner Ray described intent of the proposal in the July Draft. The purpose was to set the stage for a future process to identify what the priorities for prioritizing and acquiring land would be. She clarified the policy is included under a goal that states, "Natural resources and processes are conserved and protected ..." so the policy in question is geared toward acquisition for those purposes. It was not intended to include acquisition of land for transportation purposes, for example.

Commission Discussion:

- The policy in the July Draft doesn't seem well defined.
- Concern: Is the intent to set priorities across different disciplines? Planner Ray responded that the process has not yet been defined. Intent is for efficiency, and a stronger focus on environmental benefits.
- There is a related policy in the Utility Chapter regarding access to the shoreline.
- Why is a specific Comp Plan policy needed for this? Assume this would be done at a staff level. Although makes sense to provide some direction to staff. What is the need?
- Planner Ray explained that right now different departments are doing land acquisition for various different needs. Perhaps all departments should be doing this in a shared way. Commission should consider whether this is the way to go.
- Look for opportunities, but don't necessarily be constrained by these

- priorities. Don't shackle together if doesn't provide a benefit.
- Doesn't shackle departments together, it gives departments a shared set of priorities.
- Consider whether sponsor's proposal too prescriptive.

Commissioner Parker will submit some language to staff for consideration by the Commission to go under PO1.1. PN2.1 will remain focused on the Natural Environment.

13-0087

Format for Planning Commission's Recommendation 'Transmittal' to City Council on the Comprehensive Plan Update

Chair Parker described anticipated details regarding the Commission's transmittal to City Council:

- The Planning Commission recommendation will be an amended version of the July Draft reflecting any changes or additions recommended by the Commission. It will include change boxes indicating how the Commission recommendation differs from the 1994 Plan.
- The April Draft public comment response document will be updated to include July Draft public comments and how April and July Draft public comments were addressed by the Commission.
- A separate document will be provided that are not language changes in the Plan, but Planning Commission recommendations to the Plan before formal submission such as an index, graphics changes and editing not for substance by stylistic consistency.
- The staff summary report of public comment responses will be amended and include Planning Commission responses to the same public comments. Chair Parker asked who would be responsible for revising the report with the Commission responses.
- The Planning Commission transmittal letter to the Council will include minority comments and recommended items for the Commission's 2014 Work Plan.
- Staff may submit to the Council comments on Commission changes in the Plan that may conflict with other City policy or provisions in the Growth Management Act.
- Before March 26, the Commission should determine when their recommendation will be ready for the City Council.

Commission Discussion:

- The full transmittal for the Commission most likely will occur in April. Some Commissioners' terms are ending at the end of March. Commissioner Tousley asked when individual letters from Commissioners will be needed to accommodate the time line. Chair Parker will discuss the time line with Councilmember Langer.
- Planning Manager Stamm suggested for the March 25 Council

meeting, the Commission may be asked the delivery time line in order for the Council to proceed with their own schedule of review.

13-0088 Public Comment during Final Deliberations

Attachments: [Rules of Procedure for City of Olympia Advisory Bodies](#)

This item was not addressed.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

13-0045 Approval of December 3, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [1. Draft minutes](#)

Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, that the minutes be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

13-0083 Approval of January 16, 2013 Planning Commission Vision & Values Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [1. Draft Minutes](#)

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, that the minutes be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

13-0089 Approval of July 9, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [1. Draft Minutes](#)

Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Leveen, that the minutes be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

8. REPORTS

Chair Parker announced the Leadership Team met to discuss the transmittal process, which he outlined earlier this evening. Commissioner Bardin added that the Leadership Team hoped to meet with Councilmember Langer to discuss the transmittal.

Commissioner Horn spoke with the Mayor about the long-term

investment strategy. The Mayor apologized that he has not responded, but due to the homeless issues he has not had time to fully consider the Commission's recommendation. The Council's Finance Committee meets on February 12 to discuss their work plan for the year.

Commissioner Leveen announced the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) is talking about the application process for pathways grant program. They are thinking about ways to improve this process. He appreciates our planning and zoning after visiting Panama City. He also thanked Commissioner Parker for his work on the connectivity policy.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Accommodations