

**Catherine McCoy**

---

**From:** John Tanasse <tanassechiro@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 10:24 AM  
**To:** jayelder@comcast.net; Catherine McCoy; Gretchen Van Dusen; Mike Swarthout; Garner Miller; Cari Hornbein; jenny edwards; friddle@ci.olympia.wa.us  
**Cc:** Tiffany Tanasse; John Tanasse  
**Subject:** 924 State St., Tanasse Mixed Use Building, Owner Perspectives

Dear Neighbors and Community,

We are writing to offer our perspectives on the project that is currently in process at 924 State St., known as Tanasse Mixed Use Building.

We are a family of five, John, Tiffany, Olivia, George, and Frances. This year, the kids span elementary, middle, and high school. We have been long time Olympia residents. We have been a part of the Holiday Hills neighborhood on the southeast side which we are sad to leave.

Some of you may be familiar with our family business, Tanasse Chiropractic, at 1303 4th Ave. E., an 1889 structure just a few blocks up the street. We are just entering our 14th year here. Upon our purchase of the building, we provided a whole lot of TLC to its restoration. From rot removal, repurposing original materials and jacking the south end up 6 inches, to restoration and repair of the original fir floors which were covered by liquid nails and industrial carpet, and tilt up of the of the original concrete retaining wall along 4th Ave., the spirit returned to the building. Recently, we have added a fresh new paint job and garage roof rebuild. We have taken pride in the location, and have enjoyed growing flowers and providing services here. Please do come by and have a look.

We love Olympia. We are have a long term vested interest as residents, community members, and as business owners in Olympia's vitality. We continue to participate as volunteers, board members, students, and active citizens where we live and work.

We have followed closely a trend of increasing challenges faced by the city including worsening drug use, homelessness, urban disrepair, and closing businesses. These kinds of challenges are not unique to downtown Olympia. Our close neighbors in Portland's Pearl District, Seattle's Belltown, and Tacoma's Downtown, have all met these challenges in similar ways and have effectively revitalized their urban areas by a single means. People moved in, not out. They work, reside, play, eat, entertain, bank, and shop within the city. Vancouver B.C. sets the standard in this regard. This is what makes for thriving cities and towns.

We are urbanists at heart, and would like to be a part of a movement of people living in this city. Olympia is a unique town with its own flavor. Its flavor is eclectic. From its people, and employment base, to its architecture and style, Olympia is eclectic through and through. There are all different colors, shapes and sizes, old next to new, big next to small, and red next to blue. It works!

We have taken particular interest in State Street since we initiated this project 4 years ago.. State Street matches the zoning requirements needed as a professional, multi family zoned urban corridor and is close to our current location. It is our intention to invest in State Street, thereby adding value to the area and contributing to the goals set forth above and by the city to increase urban density. We are taking a risk and moving our family downtown at a time when not many are moving their families to State Street to participate in revitalizing downtown. We will be able to work, live, care for our aging parents, and a brother with Downs Syndrome (at a future date), all under the same roof. We will eliminate two cars between two

families and the footprint that goes with it. Yes, the building is a modern design, and as such, will be eco-friendly, reduce our energy usage to a fraction of the current three separate locations that we occupy. We will cut our family living area in half, and total roof area by three.

State Street, as we have observed, is currently a street of mixed use, business, residential single family, and multi family, with a variety of building sizes and styles, not unlike other areas in Olympia. Also, there are many examples of new, modern development in juxtaposition to historic buildings such as the new Olympia City Hall next to Ramblin Jack's, the Eastside Apartments next to the Knox Building and next to a small bungalow on 7th Ave., and the Washington Center next to the old capitol building. In thriving cities, this contrast can be seen at almost any block. We can even see it between Quince and Pear on State, with the Muffler shop, R.L. Ray Violin, Thurston First Bank, East Olympia Healing Arts and with the duplex adjacent to 924. We have an urban corridor that is appropriately slated for growth, and includes specific parameters for that to happen for the health of the city.

Prior to property purchase and design development of our building, we did extensive feasibility review. We have been up front since the beginning with our intention of building a modern structure large enough to meet our needs. It is unfortunate that the time and resource investment to this point in the project has taken place prior to meeting addressing the kinds of neighborhood concerns that have surfaced. This was not what we had anticipated as a part of our plan to participate in civic improvement.

While it remains our intention to contribute to Olympia's improvement and vitality in meaningful ways, we understand that this may not match the vision of the city shared by some in neighborhoods nearby. As we move forward, we hope that we can all appreciate the differences and diversity in Olympia as the city evolves.

In closing we would like to leave a snippet from an article published in an architectural journal a few years back that says: "After all, isn't this what makes cities great: the juxtaposition of different architectural styles, different lifestyles, and different points of view all coexisting, creating unexpected dynamic contrasts?"

Respectfully,

John and Tiffany Tanasse

**Catherine McCoy**

---

**From:** Matt Haugh <matt.haugh@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 20, 2014 3:58 PM  
**To:** Catherine McCoy  
**Subject:** Input on project at 924 State ST

Dear Ms. McCoy,

I am writing to comment on the proposed mixed-use project at 924 State ST.

I am an Evergreen graduate and long time resident of Olympia. My wife (who was born here) and I have an 11-year-old son in public school, and we look forward to him graduating from Olympia High School in 7 years.

Since 1988, when I first entered Evergreen, I've watched the progressive decline of downtown Olympia with an increasingly heavy heart. Shuttered businesses, graffiti, homelessness etc. are killing our community, inhibiting growth, and making downtown Olympia a largely hostile place to socialize or transact business. But there is reason to hope for a brighter future for downtown, and mixed-use development holds the key.

I travel a great deal for both work and pleasure, have spent time in nearly every sizeable city in the United States and Canada, as well as large swaths of Europe. In my experience, the best cities embrace a broad mix of uses and architectural styles, and the higher the density, the safer and more vibrant neighborhoods tend to be.

The proposed commercial / residential project at 924 State ST presents the city of Olympia and the surrounding neighborhood with a excellent opportunity to embrace mixed use urbanism at its finest in a way that can help establish State Street as a commercial anchor, while shielding the historic Bigelow neighborhood, both literally and stylistically. A modern edge helps traditionally distinctive neighborhoods preserve their unique look, and I strongly urge the city to resist the temptation to enforce residential-based sameness in a commercial corridor.

Furthermore, this project is funded, and will be inhabited for business and personal use, by a family with deep roots in Olympia equal to our own. They are committed to revitalizing our struggling downtown, and are putting considerable money behind their vision for a better quality of life for all of the citizens of Olympia. If more families moved their businesses and homes into downtown, we'd see a renaissance in Olympia in very short order.

This project has my full and enthusiastic support, so much so that we would even consider moving our family into the new building.

Please don't hesitate to call me if I can answer any questions about my support of this project. I would be happy to attend public meetings to express my support as well.

Matt Haugh (and family)

125 22<sup>nd</sup> AVE SE

Olympia, WA 98501

360.754.4567

**Catherine McCoy**

---

**From:** John Tanasse <tanassechiro@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 21, 2014 8:58 PM  
**To:** Catherine McCoy  
**Subject:** Fwd: In support of your project

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Kris Fransen" <kkfransen@gmail.com>  
Date: Apr 16, 2014 8:47 PM  
Subject: In support of your project  
To: <tanassechiro@gmail.com>  
Cc:

Hi John and Tiffany:

We live in the Bigelow neighborhood on Bigelow Avenue west of Puget Street. We have followed some of the activity surrounding the mixed-use building you plan to build, and we want you to know we completely support your project.

More human-scale development, more residents, and more "eyes on the street" are what we need for this city to overcome its current challenges and ensure it will remain a vital community. Compact neighborhoods with combined living, shopping, and working opportunities are what make it possible for us to walk, bicycle, ride transit, and drive less...better for everyone. We agree that diversity in all aspects is what makes our communities vital, interesting, and healthy. Compact neighborhoods with complexity of design are inviting, not threatening.

We have told both Jay Elder and Catherine McCoy that we support your building. Paul was able to go to the meeting Tuesday night, I'm sorry I had a conflict. If I had been there I would have openly supported you and your project.

We think you are courageous to do this...you are right, not many people move their families to State Street. You will be a pioneer! We hope that more residents will recognize your success and follow suit!

We wish you the best and, in advance, we welcome you to the neighborhood!

Kris Fransen  
Paul Plein  
1104 Bigelow Avenue NE

Catherine McCoy, LEED AP  
Community Development and Planning  
601 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. E.  
Olympia, WA 98501-1112



May 8, 2014

RE: Tan~~n~~asse Building on State St.

*First, I wanted to point out that there is an error on page 3 of the Site Plan. Quince St. is labeled as Pear, so you have two Pear streets on the map. Sorry if this is already known.*

Here is the input I would like considered regarding this project:

It is great that someone is putting a live/work building up in Olympia. Reducing traffic and the pollution it causes are important.

I see that the plan makes room for bicycle parking and storage. Another nice plus.

This is currently an empty lot, there is no question about taking down an older house.

By utilizing live/work space, we get a building that will be monitored virtually all the time by its very nature. That's a plus that you don't get in regular commercial projects. Additionally, upkeep and amenities such as plants would, I think, be kept in better condition.

It seems that taller buildings as allowed on State St. would act to buffer traffic noise from State St. that would otherwise flow into the adjacent residential neighborhood. As a main arterial in central Olympia, State will be getting more and more traffic over the years.

I understand that the height of the building is a concern of neighbors in regards to the amount of sun that would reach their yards. But unless there is a tree height limit in the city, a person could build a one-story house on this lot, plant trees that can reach hundreds of feet right along the back property line, and that would also affect the light reaching the corresponding property.

As for the building façade, it is trendy and modern, which can give a nice eclectic vibe to a major street. It does not replace a nice old building. (I love our old buildings). If I look across the street, I see an industrial automotive business, and it's not pretty. That we have someone willing to invest in a nice building when they have to look at THAT?! Well then, grab that opportunity while you can!

The set-back of this building includes green space between the building and the sidewalk. This will help soften the look, and make the street view more pleasant than if it were cement up to the sidewalk. THAT (cement to the sidewalk) should not be allowed, for any building. It adds to an overabundance of harsh materials, producing glare and heat.

I also understand that there is to be a "green roof" of some sort. EVERYTHING from now on should have to have green roofs. We need to mitigate the effect of concrete and asphalt in our human environs. The expanse of these materials in cities leads to "heat islands" which we cannot afford. The use of green roofs would also help reduce run-off.

(Along with the beneficial impact green roofs can have, are alleys able to be paved with more porous material like some of our sidewalks are?)

It is important to use our existing city structure. Density in town will help save money on having to extend and maintain infrastructure. Density will preserve our rural and wild lands that surround the metropolitan area. One has only to look at last summer's heat maps, where we were the only cool spot, to know that we have something very important to preserve here in the Northwest.

Thank You,



Maggie Reardon



**Comments to Olympia Design Review Board: Tanasse Mixed Use Building CPD File # 14-0025**

**May 15, 2014**

**From: Karen Messmer and Jim Lazar (As individuals, not representing any groups or organizations.)**

It appears that this property has had this zoning designation for a number of years. It fits the intent of the zoning district:

*Provide a transitional area, buffering residential areas from more intensive commercial uses. Development within this district should be compatible with residential uses and generate low vehicular traffic characteristic of less intrusive uses. Provide for a compatible mix of office, moderate to high-density residential and small-scale commercial uses, in order to provide opportunities for people to live, work, and recreate in a pedestrian-oriented area. OMC 18.06.020.B.9.*

This project is a model of the kind of development envisioned for corridors where we have frequent transit service. Because chiropractic patients may have mobility problems, being on a major transit corridor may allow them to use scheduled transit service, avoiding the much higher cost of paratransit service.

The work/live concept means no commuting at all for these working professionals. The best way to mitigate traffic congestion is to wake up near where you work, shop, and play. This proposal addresses these, and there are plenty of places to shop, recreate, and engage in social interaction in the immediate vicinity.

Bicycle parking

There are Long Term bicycle parking spots provided as required by code and this is good. Employees may ride to work, reducing parking needs and they need dry secure parking.

The Short Term bicycle parking is planned, as required. At the front door the awning above may need to be wider to provide complete rain coverage considering wind and rain conditions and height of awning. Also consider that entry area furniture can conflict with the usability of the bicycle parking and unless strictly required, may not be needed.

Other design comments

The building does not appear too massive or out of scale for an urban corridor. I do not expect the edges of this corridor to be retained completely in older historic homes. State Avenue has a significant number of buildings of differing age and design. This building has an interesting design, but the Board may want to consider some detail options to soften the appearance. At this stage of detail, the vegetation appears to take care of some of that.

The flat roof allows for maximizing the use of the property and achieving a density of both office and residential use. This design uses the space available very efficiently.

The color – I will leave that to the design review board – you are the caretakers of these details.

In summary, this project is a great addition to our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.



**Catherine McCoy**

---

**From:** Barb LaForge <blaforge5@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 12, 2014 10:12 AM  
**To:** Catherine McCoy  
**Subject:** Tanasse

Dear Ms. McCoy

I am writing in support of the Tanasse project. My husband and I have lived in the Bigelow neighborhood for 38 years. While we live in a home built in 1937 there is nothing particularly historic about it. We have a duplex and an eightplex across the street, two more eightplex's down the alley and a 64 plex at the bottom of our street (Eastside). I have always viewed State St as commercial even though there are still a sprinkling of residences. I am thrilled that someone wants to not only invest in the area but actually live in the neighborhood. I am excited by the prospect of a contemporary architectural design. And while the color would not be my choice it is certainly heads above Duane's black houses which pepper our Eastside neighborhoods.

As a current Bigelow neighborhood board member (treasurer) I know that there is a letter writing campaign against this project. It is for this reason I write to let you and your committee know that not everyone in the neighborhood opposes this project. If you need more letters of support I can enlist like minded folks to write letters.

Sincerely,  
Barbara and Ray LaForge  
605 Eastside St NE  
Sent from iPhone



August 8, 2014

Catherine McCoy  
Associate Planner, City of Olympia  
Olympia City Hall  
601 4th Ave E  
Olympia, WA 98501

Ms. McCoy,

I would like to submit for the record that not all the residents of the Bigelow Neighborhood are opposed to the Tanasse mixed use building located at 924 State Ave. (Project 14-0025)

Although my home at 1024 Bigelow is not as close to the project as my fellow dissenting neighbors on Olympia Avenue, I also value the historic nature of our neighborhood. I feel that the buildings on 4<sup>th</sup> and State Avenues are most likely to be businesses and not all businesses can be housed in historic old homes that fit in with the other homes in the area. I do not object to a mixture of older houses and more modern-looking buildings in this part of town.

I have attended some, but not all of the meetings, and it appears that Mr. Tanasse has done all he can to comply with the laws and codes of the city. I appreciate his plan for his building to house his business and residence and think this approach would make him an active member of our neighborhood. I'm sure he has made a considerable investment so far toward this project and hope that he is able to continue with his plan.

I know my neighbors are concerned with the precedent this might set for future building in the neighborhood and I would definitely not welcome any high-rise (over 3 stories) buildings in the area. Perhaps these residents can have a voice in the future development of the State and 4<sup>th</sup> corridor without punishing Mr. Tanasse by blocking his building.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jean Brady". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and address.

Jean Brady  
1024 Bigelow Ave NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

August 12, 2014

To: Olympia Planning & Development Dept.  
P. O. Box 1967  
Olympia, WA 98507-1967

Barbara & Ray LaForge  
605 Eastside St. NE  
Beth Doglio & Edward Cates  
1029 Bigelow St. NE

RE: Tanasse Mixed Use

Dear Olympia Planning,

We are writing in support of the Tanasse project. We are long time members of the Bigelow Neighborhood and Barbara LaForge currently serves on the board of directors for the neighborhood association as well as past president. We are excited about the prospect of the diversity of design and thrilled with the prospect of new neighbors wishing to invest in our neighborhood. This project is in a business corridor conforming to the goal of urban infill.

One only needs to travel to Seattle or Portland to see examples of old and new architecture, side by side. This has been the norm in Europe for many years. I feel that the opposing neighbors are fearful of change and suspect if Tanasse were proposing a replication of a more conventional historic design there would be no protest.

Within our site line we have 3 eight unit apartment buildings, a 64 unit apartment building as well as numerous duplexes. Most of the homes on our block are NOT historic. Some of our views have been blocked by new structures or additions and none of these projects have been challenged.

We wish the Planning Department to know that the dozen neighbors protesting this project do not represent many of the Bigelow Neighborhood's other 60 neighbors.

Thank you,  
Barbara and Ray LaForge  
Beth Doglio  
Edward Cates M.D.

We endorse comments from other adjacent neighbors made on the "nextdoor" site.

- It will actually discourage development of Downtown, because the 4th/State hill has better views, is a healthy neighborhood already, and is probably cheaper to build on.

**4th and State is not a neighborhood. 4th and State is an arterial corridor lined almost exclusively with offices and small retail. There are relatively few residential homes on 4th & State between Ralphs and downtown. The traffic makes these streets undesirable locations for single-family homes. This is exactly the type of place suited to taller, mixed-use buildings. However, Bigelow Historic Neighborhood is a healthy neighborhood that abuts the 4th & State corridor, and some residents have resisted development of State Avenue because it could affect their views. Downtown and the eastside hill offer different opportunities. Opening one will not necessarily discourage the other. By this argument, we should also eliminate taller buildings east of Ralphs and on the west side.**

- It will encourage the destruction of well-maintained historic properties on these hills in favor of higher-profit high-rises

**Again, where are these "well-maintained historic properties"? I urge everyone to drive up and down 4th & State and take a look. If there are homes, buildings, or specific blocks worth preserving, these should be called out in the plan. If you simply take a "google maps street view" tour down State from Ralphs, you will see what I mean. Most of the buildings are small, single-story structures built in the 50s through 70s and converted to commercial uses.**

- It will eliminate public views from State Avenue, and nearby streets, of the Capitol, Black Hills, downtown and the bay

**Zoning for taller buildings does not mean the street will turn into a tunnel with 70' walls. This is the same thinking that drives people to cut down all the trees on shoreline properties unnecessarily. Buildings and trees can frame views as much as they obscure them. In fact, much of upper State is lined with 50' tall trees already. Do THEY eliminate views? Let's see some artist renderings of what the street and views would look like.**

**When a tall building is erected, it does eliminate PRIVATE views from nearby buildings. No doubt some homeowners would be affected. This does not mean that public views while walking, driving or cycling down State will be destroyed. If there are specific viewsheds that should be preserved, these could be identified in the comp plan.**

- It promotes destroying one type of successful housing, and replacing it with another, which has no guarantee of success

**Again, I believe there is very little housing on 4th or State. I would like to see a map of how many actual homes would be affected.**

- These high-rises will shade current housing, and block private views. This transfers home equity dollars out of current homeowners' pockets and into those of developers, who will capitalize on these views in the form of higher rents.

**It is true that private views will be affected, and if I owned an affected home I would probably protest, too. Public policy decisions always hurt some people and help others; it is unavoidable. The question is, do the public benefits of the policy change justify the impacts? There is no guarantee when someone buys a property that its value will increase, or that future development will not affect its value. As an investment, real estate is a gamble just like any other investment.**

I also own an historic home, and I want to point out that historic buildings and modern development can coexist successfully, as anyone who has been to Rome can attest. If we want to minimize sprawl and increase the community tax base, development will have to occur in the city. Let's not throw out the baby with the bathwater. I think it would be better to find ways to retain the elements we value in the existing neighborhoods through strategic measures that also accommodate higher densities.

Douglas Goslin from Upper Eastside 28 Jul

Very well thought out Ben. As a home owner in the Upper East Side, I encourage development that promotes 'density' to stop suburban sprawl. **I have seen Olympia's fear of tall buildings prevent the city from growing over and over again. For every condensed living building not allowed in Olympia 'in town' there is a new housing development in the once forested land out to Yelm highway or clear out to Evergreen college. And every business space for an in town small business that is taken away pushes everyone out to the strip malls in Tumwater or Lacey, etc.**