

OLYMPIA HEARING EXAMINER RECOMMENDATION Community Planning & Development 601 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue E. – PO Box 1967 Olympia WA 98501-1967 Phone: 360.753.8314 Fax: 360.753.8087 cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us www.olympiawa.gov

October 25, 2016

Greetings,

## Subject: Cushing Rezone Case# 16-0045

The enclosed **corrected** recommendation of the Olympia Hearings Examiner, hereby issued on the above date. The Examiner's **corrected** recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council. Review of this **corrected** recommendation by the Council has not yet been scheduled. When initial Council consideration of this **corrected** recommendation has been scheduled, notice will be provided to all parties directly receiving this letter.

Please note that the accompanying **corrected** recommendation is **not** the final decision of the City of Olympia. Accordingly, this **corrected** recommendation is not appealable. The City Council will determine what process to use for considering this **corrected** recommendation.

Please contact the City of Olympia, Community Planning and Development Department, at 601 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue E or at PO Box 1967, Olympia, WA 98507-1967, by phone at 360-753-8314, or by e-mail at <u>cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us</u> if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Suki Bell-Sullian

Suki Bell-Sullivan Office Specialist III Community Planning & Development

1	BEFORE THE CITY OF OLYMPIA HEARINGS EXAMINER
2	IN RE: ) HEARING NO. 16-0045
3	FINDINGS OF FACT
4	Applicant. ) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, ) DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION ) TO CITY COUNCIL
6 7	APPLICANT: Alicia Elliott 6326 Cedar Flats Road SW Olympia, Washington 98512
8	REPRESENTATIVES:
9	Jeff Synder
10	218 1/2 4th Avenue W., Suite E Olympia, Washington 98501
11	
12	<b>SUMMARY OF REQUEST</b> : Rezoning of three parcels along Cushing Street NW, located just south of Harrison Avenue from R6-12 to HDC-3.
13	PROJECT LOCATION:
14	123 and 135 Cushing Street NW, Olympia, Washington, 98502, Parcel Nos. 85003701300, 85003701500 and 85003701700
15	
16	SUMMARY OF DECISION:
17 18	The Hearing Examiner recommends to the City Council that the Cushing Street properties be rezoned from Residential 6-12 Units per Acre to High Density Corridor 3.
	DESCRIPTION OF SITE
19	The subject property includes two historic homes located on Cushing Street NW a short distance south of Harrison Avenue and just and fill the located on Cushing Street NW a short
20	distance south of Harrison Avenue and just east of the Harrison/Division Street intersection. All adjoining properties to the west and north are commercial properties abutting either Division
21	residential properties. The subject properties are therefore at the
22	commercial and residential neighborhoods.
23	The two existing residences are both found on the City's Historical Register: The
24	property at 123 Cushing Street NW is referred to as the "McIntyre House". It was constructed in the 1890's and was continuously used by the McIntyre family for the next century. The
	[Corrected] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Recommendation to City Council - 1CITY OF OLYMPIA HEARING EXAMINER 299 N.W. CENTER ST. / P.O. BOX 939 CHEHALIS, WASHINGTON 98532 Phone: 360-748-3386/Fax: 748-9533

residence at 135 Cushing Street NW is known as the "Adams House". It was constructed by John Adams around 1900. Mr. Adams immigrated from Finland and was employed for many years by the City of Olympia. In the 1960's this residence was converted into a triplex.

The owner of these properties has gone to considerable effort to maintain these historic properties. The owner has also acquired several adjoining parcels on the west half of the block abutting Division Street, and has used a portion of these properties to construct a community park/gathering center/farmer's market.

The property's current zoning of R6-12 is intended primarily for residential use but it also allows for a small amount of commercial use. The Applicant seeks to rezone the property to High Density Corridor 3 in order to convert the use of these historic buildings into a small restaurant and five-room lodging house.

There has been no public opposition to the requested rezoning.

## **<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u>**

Prior to the public hearing I undertook a site examination of the subject properties and the surrounding blocks. 12

The public hearing commenced at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, October 10, 2016, in the Council Chambers in City Hall. The City appeared through Michelle Sadlier and Tim Smith of 13 the Planning Department. The Applicant, Alicia Elliott, appeared in person along with her representative, Jeff Snyder. Only two other members of the public were present but only one 14 provided testimony. A verbatim recording was made of the public hearing and all testimony was 15 taken under oath. Testimony from the City was received from Ms. Sadlier and Mr. Smith. Testimony from the Applicant was received from Mr. Snyder. In advance of the hearing 16 Michelle Sadlier prepared a Staff Report (Exhibit 1) which includes several attachments. No additional exhibits were received prior to or during the hearing. 17

Ms. Sadlier confirmed that City Staff recommends approval of the change in the site's zoning to HDC-3. Ms. Sadlier believes that the request satisfies all five requirements of OMC 18.59.050(a) - (e) for rezone approval. More specifically, Ms. Sadlier believes that the change in zoning will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; will maintain public health, safety or welfare; is consistent with Development Regulations; will result in compatible adjacent zoning districts and that there are adequate planned or existing public facilities and services.

Ms. Sadlier recognizes that, although there has been no public opposition to this requested rezone, there is a question as to its consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan. More specifically, the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map identifies the subject property as being within an area designated as Low Density Neighborhood. This land use designation is inconsistent with a zoning designation of High Density Corridor 3. This problem is overcome, however, by the Comprehensive Plan's recognition that zoning designations may

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[Corrected] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Recommendation to City Council - 2

deviate from the Future Land Use Map by up to two hundred feet. Within two hundred feet of the subject property, along both its west and north boundaries, are areas designated as "Urban Corridor" on the Future Land Use Map. A zoning designation of HDC-3 is consistent with the land use designation of Urban Corridor. In other words, the City's Comprehensive Plan provides for some measure of flexibility when determining whether a zoning designation is consistent with the Plan's intended land use and that, relying on this flexibility, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map.

Apart from this issue of consistency with the Future Land Use Map there is no other significant issue relating to its approval; the City's Planning Commission has voted unanimously to recommend the rezone; City Staff recommends its approval; and there has been no public opposition.

Ms. Sadlier adds that it is important to remember that even if the subject properties are rezoned to HDC-3 the buildings themselves remain protected under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. Thus, while rezoning may provide for a longer list of potential uses for these buildings it will not dramatically affect their appearance or the surrounding grounds and outbuildings. As a result of their historic recognition only minimal changes to the buildings and surrounding spaces will be permitted; the buildings historic character must be retained and preserved; and any deteriorated historic features must be repaired rather than replaced. Rezoning thus allows these buildings to be put to greater use but not at the expense of eliminating their historic character.

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Ms. Sadlier completed her testimony by reviewing the five requirements for rezoning set forth in OMC 18.59.050 and explained why the rezoning satisfies each requirement, all as set forth more fully in the Staff Report.

Following Ms. Sadlier's testimony Jeff Snyder spoke briefly on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Snyder supported the positions taken by City Staff and added that rezoning will provide the necessary incentive to ensure that these historic buildings are well maintained.

Only two members of the public were present and only once asked to testify. Robin Healy, who lives nearby on Decatur NW, simply wished to express his strong support for the rezone.

Again, the proposed rezoning has the unanimous support of the City Planning Commission, City Planning Staff and the public. I therefore recommend approval of the rezoning and make the following Findings/Conclusions with respect to the five rezoning criteria found in OMC 18.59.050:

1. OMC 18.59.050(a). The rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan including the Future Land Use Map. As noted above, the Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as Low Density Residential. This land use designation is not consistent with a

25

[Corrected] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Recommendation to City Council - 3

zoning designation of HDC-3. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes, however, that properties within two hundred feet of another land use designation may be appropriate for that other land use. The subject property is bordered on both the north and west by areas designated as "Urban Corridor" 'in the Future Land Use Map. The site is well within two hundred feet of areas west and north designated as Urban Corridor. HDC-3 zoning is fully compatible with the Urban Corridor land use designation. The rezoning is therefore consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

The Staff Report, commencing at page 5, contains Findings relating to the project's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. City Staff finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan including: GL1 as well as PL1.2 and PL1.6; GL11 together with PL11.3 and PL11.4; GL13 including PL13.5 and PL13.7; GL3 including PL3.2 and PL3.6; and GL5 including PL5.5 and PL5.8. The Hearing Examiner has reviewed those proposed Findings and adopts them as his own Findings of Fact and concludes that the proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

OMC 18.50.050(b). The rezone will maintain the public, health, safety or 2. welfare. As noted in the Staff Report at pages 7 and 8, a rezoning to HDC-3 is unlikely to result in any substantial redevelopment of the parcels due to their current historic preservation 11 designation. Improvements to the properties for commercial uses must be made within the confines of the historic preservation regulations. As a result there will be greater incentive to 12 restore and maintain these historic properties.

13

14

Existing roads and public transportation options, as well as sewer, water, solid waste, and emergency services have all been deemed adequate by City Staff. I therefore conclude that the rezone will maintain the public health, safety or welfare.

15 16

17

18

OMC 18.59.050(c). The rezone is consistent with other development 3. regulations that implement the Comprehensive Plan. As already noted, any modifications to the existing buildings must be in accordance with the Historic Preservation Regulations found in Chapter 18.12 OMC. These regulations will ensure the historic integrity of the buildings even when converted to commercial uses. I therefore conclude that the rezoning is consistent with Development Regulations.

19

20

21

22

OMC 18.59.050(d). The rezone will result in a district that is compatible 4. with adjoining zoning districts. All properties to the north and west of the site are already zoned HDC-3. The rezoning is compatible with these adjoining properties. At the same time any future development of the site for commercial use will be required to be compatible with the residential properties to the south and east. I therefore conclude that the rezoning will result in compatible adjacent zoning districts.

23

OMC 18.59.050(e). Public facilities and services existing and planned for the 5. area are adequate and likely to be available to serve potential development allowed by the 24 proposed zone. As previously noted, currently available facilities and services are adequate for the intended use of these properties. Water, sewer, solid waste, fire and other emergency 25

[Corrected] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Recommendation to City Council - 4 .

services are already provided to the site. The existing street network and transportation 1 alternatives adequately serve the site, especially when considering when future uses must 2 maintain the historic integrity of these properties. I therefore conclude that public facilities and services existing and planned for the area are adequate and likely to be available to serve potential development allowed by the proposed zone.

The first three of these requirements, OMC 18.50.050(a) through (c) are mandatory requirements for rezone approval, while compliance with subsections (d) and (e) is optional. Nonetheless, I conclude that the requested rezone to HDC-3 complies with all five requirements, (a) through (e).

DATED this  $\underline{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}^{44}$  day of October, 2016.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mark C. Scheibmeir City of Olympia Hearing Examiner

[Corrected] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Recommendation to City Council - 5