

CITY OF OLYMPIA HEARING EXAMINER

STAFF REPORT

Hearing Date: Thursday, January 8, 2009

Case: South Puget Sound Community College Master Plan

File Number: 08-0095

Representative: South Puget Sound Community College
Ed Roque, Dean of Capital Facilities
2011 Mottman Road SW
Olympia, WA 98512

Type of Action Requested: The applicant is requesting approval for a Conditional Use Permit for the long-term construction and locations of future buildings to the South Puget Sound Community College campus adding approximately 600,000 square feet to the campus with approximately 7,500 full-time students.

Project Location: 2011 Mottman Road SW

Legal Description: On File with Community Planning and Development

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Residential Single Family (R 4-8)

Zoning: Residential Single Family (R 4-8)

SEPA Determination: A SEPA Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance was issued on December 18, 2008.

Public Notification: Public Notification was issued on or before December 18, 2008, to the property owners within 300 feet, posted on the site, and published in *The Olympian*, in conformance with Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 18.78.020.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

Site Area: Sound Puget Sound Community College encompasses approximately 102.7 acres of land.

Existing Uses: South Puget Sound Community College Campus

Surrounding Land Uses:

The campus is bounded by Mottman Road to the north, Crosby Boulevard to the east, Somerset Hill Drive to the south, and both residential and commercial developments to the west.

Application Proposal and Background Information:

South Puget Sound Community College (SPSCC, or the College) applied for and was conditionally approved as a college in 1984 under the name of the Olympia Technical Community College (OTCC). The Board of Adjustments (BOA) case number 856/858 provided the College with specific conditions based upon a Master Plan proposal of the College (See Attachment O). Included in the OTCC approval, the Master Plan of the College identifies the names and locations of buildings to be constructed, provided conditions of approval, and outlines the needs of the College. The College has constructed a large portion of the identified buildings from the original Master Plan but has now requested a new Master Plan to better outline the forecasted needs of the College.

The College had asked the City about updating their original Master Plan so that the new buildings proposed in the future would not be required to be reviewed under the Conditional Use Permit process on an individual project basis. Since the City does not have a process which outlines Master Plans, other than in Urban Villages, it was determined that their request for an updated Master Plan could be facilitated via a conditional use permit.

As part of the Master Plan proposal, the College is proposing to locate a building in two different jurisdictions, Olympia and Tumwater. The jurisdictional lines are defined by the existing parcel boundaries. To remedy this issue, the College requested the City of Tumwater to de-annex the parcel located in the Tumwater jurisdiction to the City of Olympia. The request went before the Tumwater City Council and was subsequently denied.

I. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

General Requirements

Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 18.02.100 states, "No land shall be subdivided or developed for any purpose which is not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, any zoning ordinance or other applicable provisions of the Olympia Municipal Code." Also, the Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), Section 1.030 states, "the Engineering Design and Development Standards shall govern all new construction and modification of transportation facilities, frontage improvements, storm drainage facilities, and utilities located or proposed to be located in the city rights-of-way or public easements, whether occurring under permit or franchise."

Specific Regulations and Requirements

OMC 18.48.020(A) Conditional Use Approval

"Hearing Examiner approval certain uses, because of their unusual size, infrequent occurrence, special requirements, possible safety hazards or detrimental effects on surround property and other similar reasons, are classified as conditional uses.

These uses may be allowed in certain districts by a Conditional Use Permit granted by the Hearing Examiner. Prior to granting such a permit the Hearing Examiner shall hold a public hearing, unless otherwise provided for in this code, and determine that all applicable conditions will be satisfied. If the conditional use proposed in a

residential zone exceeds 5,000 square feet in floor space, it must also be reviewed by the Design review Board.”

18.48.040 Additional Conditions

“The Hearing Examiner or Site Plan Review Committee, as applicable, may impose additional conditions on a particular use if it is deemed necessary for the protection of the surround properties, the neighborhood or the general welfare of the public. The conditions may:

- A. Increase requirements in the standards, criteria or policies established by this title;
- B. Stipulate an exact location as a means of minimizing hazards to life, limb, property, traffic, or of erosion and landslides;
- C. Require structural features or equipment essential to serve the same purpose set forth in B above;
- D. Impose conditions similar to those set forth in items 2 and 3 above to assure that a proposed use will be equivalent to permitted uses in the same zone with respect to avoiding nuisance generating features in matters of noise, odors, air pollution, wastes, vibration, traffic, physical hazards and similar matters;
- E. Ensure that the proposed use is compatible with respect to the particular use on the particular site with other existing and potential uses in the neighborhood;
- F. Assure compliance with the Citywide Design Guidelines, Unified Development Code Chapter 18.20, as recommended by the Design Review Board.”

18.04.060.W Public Facilities, Essential.

- 1. Classification of Essential Public Facilities. Essential public facilities shall be classified as follows:
 - a. Type One: These are major facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one (1) county. They include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities; state correction facilities; and colleges.
 - b. Type Two: These are local or interlocal facilities serving or potentially affecting residents or property in more than one (1) jurisdiction. They include, but are not limited to, county jails, county landfills, community colleges, sewage treatment facilities, communication towers, and group homes. [NOTE: Such facilities which would not have impacts beyond the jurisdiction's boundary would be Type Three facilities.]
 - c. Type Three: These are facilities serving or potentially affecting only Olympia. In order to enable the City to determine the project's classification, the applicant shall identify the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare, or emissions.

2. Notification. Prospective applicants for Type One or Type Two essential public facilities shall provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:
 - a. At least ninety (90) days before submitting an application for a Type One or Type Two essential public facility, the prospective applicant shall notify the affected public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposed project. This shall include identification of sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and the opportunities to comment on the proposal. Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete without proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a local newspaper of general circulation. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least ninety (90) days prior to submission of the application. [NOTE: The purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternative sites for major facilities before the project sponsor has made a siting decision. The Thurston Regional Planning Council may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdiction(s) with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this ninety (90) day period.]
3. Critical Areas. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable, unmitigatable, significant adverse impact on Critical Areas.
4. Proximity to Arterials. Essential public facilities which are expected to generate more than five hundred (500) motor vehicle trips during the hour of peak traffic generation shall be sited within one-fourth (¼) mile of a highway or arterial street served, or planned to be served, by mass transit.
5. Analysis of Alternative Sites. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:
 - a. An evaluation of the site's capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;
 - b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
 - c. The site's relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger;
 - d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites which meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also generally describe proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts; and
 - e. A description of the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.

Board of Adjustments Conditions of Approval Case Number 856/858 (See Attachment O)

1. "Prior to the commencement of site clearing or grading, OTCC (Olympia Technical Community College) shall present to the Olympia Site Plan Review Committee a detailed site plan showing:
 - a. A perimeter landscape buffer of a minimum of 30 feet in width, which is comprised of native vegetation whenever possible and densely planted evergreen trees to screen the adjacent properties from the OTCC campus.
 - b. A 100-foot natural buffer along each side of Percival Creek within the OTCC property.
 - c. Internal and external street, sidewalk and utility construction standards in sufficient detail to determine compliance with the City of Olympia Development Standards and Fire Department standards.
 - d. Intercity Transit requirements for bus pull outs, ingress and egress to the site, and curve radii for ease of maneuvering within the campus.
2. A detailed temporary erosion control plan, which identifies the specific mitigating measures to be implemented during construction to protect Percival Creek from erosion, siltation, landslides and deleterious construction materials, shall have been reviewed and approved by the City's Department of Public Works and Environmental Review Officer prior to the commencement of construction. The City staff shall review said plan with, and incorporate mitigating measures recommended by, the Washington State Department of Fisheries prior to plan approval. The temporary erosion control plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction of the development.
3. A detailed stormwater control system plan, which adheres to the recommendations of the Percival Creek Drainage Basin Study (adopted by Resolution M-1006), shall have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the commencement of construction. The design of said system shall take surrounding existing and expected development into consideration. Said plan shall provide for on-site detention/retention of stormwater, and incorporate a permanent petroleum products separator system. A maintenance program for the storm drainage system, which assigns responsibilities and identifies maintenance activities and schedules, shall be a component of the stormwater control plan.
4. OTCC shall enter into a formal agreement with the City of Tumwater to participate in the installation of a traffic signal at Decatur and Mottman Road and in the upgrading of Mottman Road.
5. OTCC shall acquire an access permit from the City of Tumwater prior to construction of access to the R.W. Johnson Boulevard.
6. OTCC shall fence the north and south property lines abutting residential subdivisions on the west side of Percival Creek so as to prevent pedestrian or vehicular traffic from leaving the campus or entering the campus through the subdivision.

7. Campus development shall occur in basically the same configuration as depicted on Exhibit "A" attached hereto; provided that Building RC and C shall be restricted to two stories because of their close proximity to the southern property line.
8. This Conditional Use Permit shall be reconsidered at a public hearing if:
 - a. The gross square footage of the buildings exceeds 480,000 square feet or the height of any of the buildings exceeds the lesser of 3 stories or 45 feet.
 - b. The internal roadway configuration is altered resulting in a reduction of the exterior buffer areas around the perimeter of the campus, or the creek crossings are relocated to a steeper or unstable area.
 - c. The landscaped and/or buffer areas are reduced along the perimeter of the campus or the creek.
 - d. The estimated student population is increased beyond the 3,600 FTE predicted.
 - e. The playfield is changed to include night lighting and night activities requiring the lighting.
 - f. The distance between the exterior boundary of the subject property and any proposed building is less than 100 feet."

City of Tumwater Variance Requirements (Attachment Y)

As stated earlier, the proposed Master Plan details a project that straddles the jurisdictional line between Olympia and Tumwater. In addition, the two jurisdictions have different zoning classifications, the City of Olympia's zoning classification is Residential Single Family (R 4-8) and the City of Tumwater's zoning classification is General Commercial (GC). According to Tumwater Municipal Code (TMC) 18.22.050.D.3, the setback of a structure located in the GC zone adjacent to any residential district shall provide a setback of twenty feet.

Because of the requirements for the setbacks, the applicant has prepared a variance request to eliminate the setback requirement for the proposed building. In keeping with the interlocal agreement (Attachment D), the applicant has submitted a City of Tumwater Variance request which is processed through the City of Olympia. The variance criteria for the City of Tumwater are as follows (specific sections of the code omitted – See Attachment Y for a complete code section):

TMC 18.58.030 Hearing

1. Upon the filling of an application for a variance permit, the hearing examiner shall set a time and place for a public hearing to consider the application.
2. A written notice of any public hearing shall be mailed to all property owners as listed on records of the Thurston County assessor within a three-hundred-foot radius of the external boundaries of the subject property. In addition, notice shall be published as least ten days prior to the hearing in at least one newspaper of general circulation within the city and shall be posted in a conspicuous place at or near the location of the proposal. Each notice shall include the time, date, place, purpose of the hearing, and location of the subject proposal.

TMC 18.58.040 – Granting-Findings required.

- A. A variance may be granted, after investigation, provided all of the following findings of fact exist:
1. That special conditions exist which are peculiar to the land, such as size, shape, topography, or location, not applicable to other lands in the same district, and that literal interpretation of the provisions of this title would deprive the property owners of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties similarly situated in the same district under the terms of this title:
 2. That the special conditions and circumstances are not the result of actions of the applicant:
 3. That the granting of the variance requested will not confer a special privilege to the property that is denied other lands in the same district:
 4. That the granting of the variance requested will not be materially detrimental to the public fare or injurious to the property of improvements of the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated; and
 5. That the reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of the variance, and that the variance, if granted, would be the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land.
- B. In no event may a variance be granted if it would permit a use that would not be permitted as a primary, accessory or conditional use in the district involved.

TMC 18.58.060 – Specific property restriction

Any variance permit, if granted, shall pertain only to the specific property for which the application was made. Such granted variance does not apply to any other property he/she may control.

City of Tumwater Conditional Use Permit Requirements (Attachment Z)

According to TMC the requirements for conditional use permits in the City of Tumwater are located in TMC 18.56. Specifically, TMC 18.56.260 outline the requirements for Essential Public Facilities.

18.56.260 Essential public facilities siting process.

- A. The following uses are considered essential public facilities and shall require a conditional use permit as indicated in each individual zone. Additionally, the siting process outlined in Section 18.56.260(B) shall be followed.
1. Airports
 2. Terminal facilities
 3. State education facilities

4. Large scale state or regional transportation facilities*
 5. Prisons, jails and other correctional facilities
 6. Solid waste handling permit as indicated in each individual zone. Additionally, the siting process outlined in facilities.
 7. Inpatient facilities including substance abuse facilities (including, but not limited to, intensive inpatient facilities; long term residential drug treatment facilities; recovery house facilities.)
 8. Mental health facilities (including but not limited to congregate care facilities; adult residential treatment facilities; evaluations and treatment centers)
 9. Sewage treatment facilities (not including individual or community wastewater treatment systems.)
 10. Emergency communication towers and antennas.
 11. Secure community transition facilities.
- B. Essential public facilities identified as conditional uses in the zoning district shall be subject, at a minimum, to the following requirements.
1. Essential public facilities classified as follows:
 - a. Type One. Multi-county facilities. These are major facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one county. These facilities include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities, such as regional airports; State correction facilities, and State educational facilities... In order to enable the City to determine the project's classification, the applicant shall identify the proposed service area of the facility and the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare emissions, or other environmental impacts.
 2. Provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:
 - a. Type One and Two facilities. At least ninety days before submitting an application for an affected public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposal, identify sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and identify opportunities to comment on the proposal. Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete in the absence of proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least ninety days prior to the submission of the application. It is expected that an Environmental Impact Statement may be required for most type one and type two facilities in accordance with the SEPA environmental

review process. The Thurston Regional Planning Council may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdictions with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this ninety day period. (Note: The purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternatives for major facilities before the project sponsor has made their siting decision).

- b. Type Three facilities. Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the City's standard notification requirements for conditional uses.
3. Should any of the above-listed facilities be proposed to be sited in the City, they should be consistent with the intent of the underlying zoning of the proposed site.
4. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for lineal facilities, such as highways, where no feasible alternative exists (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(a)).
5. Major public facilities which generate substantial traffic should be sited near major transportation corridors (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(b)).
6. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:
 - a. An evaluation of the site's capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such a size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services:
 - b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
 - c. The site's relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger, and
 - d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites which meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts.
 - e. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.
7. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other City regulations.

II. ANALYSIS

Planning

The Planning Division of the Community Planning and Development Department has reviewed this Conditional Use Permit request for a determination of conformance with the Olympia Municipal Code (Title 18), the Board of

Adjustments Approval (See Attachment O), and the City of Tumwater Municipal Code (Title 18).

Board of Adjustments (BOA) Conditions of Approval (Attachment O)

The Board of Adjustments Conditional Approval (Case 856/858) approved the College as a Master Plan development. The conditions of approval are used as requirements for any proposed development located on the College property. If a proposed development stays consistent with the conditions of approval and with the Master Plan layout, then a project can proceed with an administrative approval.

According to Condition #8 of the BOA decision, the College must reconsider their Conditional Use Permit if specific conditions or maximums are changed or increased. In this case, the proposal is to increase the gross square footage of the buildings and increase the estimated student population.

In this case, the Master Plan application has been reviewed with all conditions of approval of the BOA decision and it has been determined that with the conditions listed below, this project meets, exceeds, or mitigates all requirements and conditions.

Requirements for Schools

OMC 18.04.060.CC, provide for certain requirements to apply to all academic schools subject to conditional use approval. Colleges are also subject to these requirements when located in a residential district. Below are the requirements and how the requirements have been met or mitigated.

Requirement Category	Requirements to be Met	Proposal to Meet/Mitigate the Requirement
Site Size	1 acre per 100 student	102.7 acres for proposed 7,500 students (exceeds this minimum requirement)
Outdoor Play Area	2 sq. ft. of open space for every 1 sq. ft. of floor area	92 acres of open space, 46 acres proposed (exceed minimum requirement)
Building Size	80 sq. ft. of gross floor area per student	600,000 sq. ft required, 1,000,000 sq. ft. proposed (exceeds minimum requirement)
Screening	Any portion of the site, which abuts upon a residential use, shall be screened.	An existing 30 foot buffer is required as part of the BOA decision and is proposed to be maintained

Portables	Up to 10 portables permitted without a C.U.P.	No portables proposed.
Building Expansion	Expansions up to 10% are permitted, over 10% a C.U.P. required.	Expansion is greater than 10%, C.U.P. required.

Development Standards

Zoning Development Standards for this project require review against both the BOA approval and the OMC, Section 18.04, Table 4.04. Below is a detail of the required development standards, the requirements to meet the standards, and what is being proposed/mitigated for the proposed Master Plan.

Development Standard	Development Standard Requirement	Proposed
Maximum Housing Density	8	N/A
Maximum Average Housing Density	8	N/A
Minimum Average Housing Density	4	N/A
Minimum Lot Size	See OMC 18.04.060.CC-1 acre per 100 students	102.7 acres (exceeds the minimum requirement)
Minimum Lot Width	50 feet	The campus exceeds this requirement
Minimum Front Yard Setback	20 feet	All buildings exceed this requirement
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	20 feet	All buildings exceed this requirement
Minimum Side Yard Setback	5 feet	All buildings exceed this requirement
Maximum Building Height	See OMC 18.04.080.I.4- Maximum of 60 feet in height w/ a 100 foot setback from adjacent residentially zoned properties	All buildings will be required to meet this requirement, shall be reviewed at the time of Land Use Application

Parking Requirements

The City of Olympia parking requirements are outlined in OMC 18.38.100 – Table 38.01. According to the table there are no specific requirements to be met, meaning, that a parking study is required to determine the parking needs of the College.

As part of the application, the applicant has provided a parking study to evaluate the forecasted needs of the College (See Attachments N&P). From this analysis, it is recommended that the College provide 0.22 parking spaces per student (headcount, not FTE). Further recommended by the study, a summary of the automobile parking ratio should be reevaluated every ten years. The recommended ratio of 0.22 parking spaces per student (headcount, not FTE) has been reviewed and approved by the City in past projects at the College. Further, City staff agrees that this ratio should be reevaluated every ten years to ensure consistency with the forecast and goals of the College.

Bicycle Parking Requirements

OMC 18.38.100 – Table 38.01 outlined the requirements for both short-term and long-term bicycle parking standards. Further, OMC 18.38.220 outlines specific requirements for the location and construction of these facilities. According to the table the College is required to provide one long-term bicycle parking stall for every five vehicle parking spaces (minimum of 2) and provide one short-term bicycle parking stall for every five vehicle parking spaces (minimum of 4).

The analysis provided in Attachments N recommends three conditions: 1. The minimum requirements for new facilities of at least two long-term spaces and 4 short-term spaces should be retained for future development phases; 2. The number of long-term spaces required for SPSCC may be reduced by 50 percent to one space per 10 automobile spaces, long-term spaces should be secure and sheltered from the elements; 3. The number of short-term spaces provided should equal 20 percent of the automobile spaces provided, short-term spaces should be covered and close to a building entrance.

To summarize the report, the applicant is requesting that only the minimum requirements for short-term and long-term parking should be required. Further, an exception of a 50% reduction for long-term spaces may be utilized.

City staff has reviewed the request to reduce the required number of short-term and long-term bicycle parking requirements and has determined that we cannot recommend approval of the request due to a lack of process. The OMC does not provide provisions for a project to reduce the number of bicycle parking stalls.

Tumwater Variance

As mentioned above, the applicant has submitted a variance request for a reduced setback to allow for a building to be located upon the site. Buildings 1 and 7 of the Master Plan are shown as crossing property lines which are also jurisdictional lines. Considering that the Interlocal Agreement (Attachment D), remedies the issues of dual jurisdictions, the basic development standards are needed be address. The following are the variance requirements for the City of Tumwater with the City of Olympia's responses to those requirements:

1. That special conditions exist which are peculiar to the land, such as size, shape, topography, or location, not applicable to other lands in the same district, and that literal interpretation of the provisions of this title would deprive the property owners of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties similarly situated in the same district under the terms of this title:

Staff Response: City staff concurs with the applicant. This proposal has special conditions pertaining to the use as it relates to setback requirement associated with the use. Traditionally, setbacks help mitigate noise, lights, and aesthetics for incompatible uses. In this case, the College and its accessory uses are not considered incompatible uses.

2. That the special conditions and circumstances are not the result of actions of the applicant:

Staff Response: City staff concurs with the applicant. One could argue that the location of the buildings proposed in both jurisdictions is a result of the applicant choosing to locate the buildings in those locations. However, the applicant has put a good faith effort into avoiding impacts to critical areas by the proposed locations. Further, the applicant has put a good faith effort into coordinating an effort to de-annex the existing parcel located in Tumwater to the City of Olympia which was denied by the Tumwater City Council.

3. That the granting of the variance requested will not confer a special privilege to the property that is denied other lands in the same district:

Staff Response: City staff concurs with the applicant. The granting of this variance request would not confer a special privilege to the property that is denied other lands in the same district.

4. That the granting of the variance requested will not be materially detrimental to the public fare or injurious to the property of improvements of the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated; and

Staff Response: City staff concurs with the applicant. This variance request will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare because locating a higher educational facility on the site benefits with welfare of the public, County and state-wide. The surrounding property is already established as a College and further expansion of the College will not be injurious to the property.

5. That the reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of the variance, and that the variance, if granted, would be the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land.

Staff Response: City staff supports the variance request by the applicant for the location of Buildings 1 and 7 of the Master Plan as being the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land. The location of the buildings prevent impacts to surround critical areas, a boundary line adjustment or lot consolidation will remove the property line from being located underneath the building, and the proposed use as a higher educational facility is permitted via a conditional use permit in each jurisdiction and zoning district.

Olympia/Tumwater Conditional Use Permit

In conformance with the Interlocal Agreement (Attachment Z), this project was reviewed against the City of Tumwater's Conditional Use provisions, TMC

18.56.260, as well as OMC 18.04.060.W. City staff has determined that this project meets the requirements outlined in OMC 18.04.060.W and TMC 18.56.260.

Engineering

The Engineering Division has completed the review of the SPSCC Master Plan/Conditional Use Permit request for a determination of conformance with: OMC 12.02.020 - Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) – adopted by Ordinance No. 6321, and amended by Ordinance No. 6453; OMC Title 13 – Storm and Surface Water Utility, Section 13.16.017 – City of Olympia Stormwater Manual, 2005, adopted by Ordinance No. 6345 regarding the following:

Water – The City of Olympia has capacity for the proposed Master Plan and anticipated growth capacity increase from 4250 to 7500 full time equivalent student count. Further analysis and verification and any associated mitigation will be assessed for each proposed development application as received.

Sewer – The City of Olympia has capacity for the proposed Master Plan and anticipated growth capacity. Further analysis and verification of on-site sanitary sewer and lift station capacity for the College's assessed sanitary sewer requirements and any associated mitigation will be assessed for each proposed development application as received.

Streetside Improvements in General – The City of Olympia has capacity for the proposed Master Plan and anticipated growth. Further analysis of streetside improvement types and locations as well as traffic impact analysis requirements will be assessed for each proposed development application as received. A short section of Mottman Road improvements near Percival Creek was previously deferred according to section 2.070.B1, 2, and 4 of the Standards. The College has been cooperating with the City Public Works Department on securing funding for the further improvement of Mottman Road.

Access to Developments – Analysis of access to proposed development will be assessed for each proposed development application as received.

Storm Drainage - Analysis of stormwater capacity and requirements as well as thresholds for redevelopment of existing on site stormwater systems will be assessed as each development application is received. Redevelopment of existing on site stormwater systems shall comply with the 2005 Stormwater Manual when the threshold for redevelopment occurs. Each proposed project must comply with the 2005 stormwater manual requirements at the time of application.

It appears to staff the proposed soccer field in Basin 5 includes a subsurface drainage system. Subsurface drainage systems are considered an impervious surface for WWHM modeling purposes and are required to be modeled using the criteria outlined in Volume III, Appendix-C. At the time the project is proposed stormwater mitigation will be required for its land cover and associated runoff. The College has paid a fee in lieu for stormwater detention. It is staff determination the college would retain credit for the detention it has paid

for. In previous stormwater scoping meetings it was determined that the College would determine the volume of credit which has been paid by reviewing historical documents. This volume would then be added to the basin it was paid for and modeled as if it existed. This should be taken into consideration and used in the modeling of the appropriate future development.

The Engineering Division recommends vesting of the Long-Term Master Plan/Conditional Use Permit to the 2005 Stormwater Manual.

Solid Waste – The design of solid waste/recyclables collection facilities will conform to current City standards.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Land Use Approval and/or other development approval from the City of Olympia (or Tumwater as applicable) shall be obtained prior to construction or development pursuant to this Master Plan. Such development review shall be subject to further environmental review in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act including analysis and mitigation of transportation system impacts.
2. Analysis of stormwater capacity and requirements as well as thresholds for redevelopment of existing on site stormwater systems will be assessed as each development application is received. Redevelopment of existing on site stormwater systems shall comply with the 2005 Stormwater Manual when the threshold for redevelopment occurs. Each proposed project must comply with the 2005 Stormwater Manual requirements or subsequent standards applicable when development is proposed.
3. The building heights for developments that occur between 30 feet and 100 feet from the property line shall meet the height requirements of 35 feet in height and 2 stories.
4. The natural buffer along each side of Percival Creek at any area shall be 200 feet.
5. The long-term and short-term bicycle parking standards are required for each proposed project and shall be analyzed at the time of Land Use Application.
6. It appears to City staff that the proposed soccer field in Basin 5 includes a subsurface drainage system. Subsurface drainage systems are considered an impervious surface for WWHM modeling purposes and are required to be modeled using the criteria outlined in Volume III, Appendix-C. At the time the project is proposed stormwater mitigation will be required for its land cover and associated runoff.

7. The College has paid a fee in lieu for stormwater detention. The College will retain credit for the detention it has paid for. In previous stormwater scoping meetings it was determined that the College would determine the volume of credit which has been paid by reviewing historical documents. This volume would then be added to the basin it was paid for and modeled as if it existed. This should be taken into consideration and used in modeling of appropriate future developments.
8. The proposed parking ratio of 0.22 automobile parking stalls per student (headcount, not FTE) is approved. This parking ratio shall be reevaluated every 10 years.
9. With every future Land Use application, an analysis of off-site parking shall be required for adjacent neighborhoods and along public streets. The required analysis shall recommend mitigation for any impacts that may be caused by off-site parking.
10. Proposed buildings 1 and 7 are proposed across existing property lines. A Boundary Line Adjustment or Lot Consolidation shall be completed to create a lot where a structure does not lie across property lines.
11. The College is required to have this Master Plan reviewed by the Olympia Hearing Examiner every 10 years to ensure consistency with the Master Plan. However, note that the Master Plan shall not be considered as expired after 10 years.
12. The Master Plan is subject to the Interlocal Agreement (Attachment D) for any portions of the campus Master Plan that is located within the City of Tumwater City limits.
13. The review of critical areas as defined by OMC 18.32 will be determined upon reviewed at the time of Land Use Application for all phases of the Master Plan.
14. Each proposed phase meeting or exceeding the thresholds of OMC 18.100 are subject to Design Review before the Design Review Board.

Submitted By: Brett Bures, Associate Planner,
on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee.
(360) 753-8568, bbures@ci.olympia.wa.us , Fax: (360) 753-8087

Date Prepared: December 31, 2008

Attachments:

- A. General Land Use Application dated 6/18/08
- B. Conditional Use Permit Application dated 6/18/08
- C. SEPA Checklist dated 6/18/08
- D. Interlocal Agreement date signed by City of Olympia 9/23/08, and date signed by the City of Tumwater 9/30/08
- E. SEPA Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance and Notice of Public Hearing issued 12/18/08
- F. SEPA Lead Agency Determination letter date-stamped 6/18/08
- G. Overview and General Descriptions summary date-stamped 6/18/08
- H. Plan Set consisting of sheets titled: SPSCC Existing Campus; SPSCC Known or Suspected Critical Areas Wetlands & Streams; South Puget Sound Community College Long-term Master Plan and Vicinity Map date-stamped 6/18/08
- I. Recommended Automobile and Bicycle Parking Supply date-stamped 6/18/08
- J. Hydrologic Analysis date-stamped 6/18/08
- K. South Puget Sound Community College Sanitary Sewer System Memo date-stamped 6/18/08
- L. South Puget Sound Community College Minimum Density Calculation Update dated 6/2/08 with Tree Report attached dated 11/21/03.
- M. Student Full Time Equivalent Student Data and Calculations date-stamped 6/18/08
- N. Building Area and Parking Matrix date-stamped 6/18/08
- O. Board of Adjustments Conditional Approval for OTCC dated 2/23/84
- P. Parking Expansion Study dated 12/10/2003
- Q. Wetlands Inventory for the South Puget Sound Community College dated October 1998
- R. Wetlands Inventory for the South Puget sound Community College dated November 2002
- S. Wetland Analysis Report of the South Puget Sound Community College Expansion Project dated March 2008
- T. Percival Creek Correspondence with Department of Fish and Wildlife (2007)
- U. Unnamed Stream – 1998 Report Excerpts and Correspondence Regarding Type
- V. City of Tumwater Variance Application date-stamped 10/24/08
- W. Letter to Brett Bures from Sara Coccia subject titled Variance Application date-stamped 10/24/08
- X. Variance Exhibit Plan Set (consisting of sheet Ex-1 and Ex-2 and sheet A-2.1) date-stamped 10/24/08
- Y. City of Tumwater Municipal Code Section 18.58 dated 12/18/08
- Z. City of Tumwater Municipal Code Section 18.56.260 dated 12/31/08