

**CITY OF OLYMPIA HEARING EXAMINER
STAFF REPORT**

Hearing Date: November 26, 2018

Case: South Puget Sound Community College Health and Wellness Center Expansion (Building 31)

File Number: 18-1869

Applicant: South Puget Sound Community College
Dexter Johnson, Director of Capital Facilities
2011 Mottman Road SW
Olympia, WA 98512

Representative: James Hill, RA
KMB Architects
906 Columbia St SW
Olympia WA 98501

Project Location: 2011 Mottman Road SW

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Low Density Neighborhood

Zoning Designation: Residential Single Family (R 4-8)

SEPA Determination: SEPA DNS Issued on October 30, 2018

Public Notification: Notice of Application and Public Meetings, May 11, 2018
Notice of SEPA DNS and Public Hearing, October 30, 2018

Requested Action: Conditional Use Permit approval to expand an existing health and wellness building, Building 31, on the South Puget Sound Community College campus from approximately 21,300 square feet to nearly 40,000 square feet. Building 33, in the same health sciences cluster, is proposed to be demolished to provide area for the Building 31 expansion. The purpose of the expansion is to renovate existing classrooms and locker rooms in the building, provide a new gym and exercise facility, and provide a main communal space in the building for students. Student enrollment and employee capacity are not expected to increase as a result of the building expansion, and as such, no new parking facilities are proposed.

SPRC Recommendation: Approval, subject to conditions identified at the end of this report.

Staff Contact: Catherine McCoy, Associate Planner
Ph: 360.570.3776
Email: cmccoy@ci.olympia.wa.us

I. BACKGROUND

The South Puget Sound Community College (SPSCC) has been located in southwest Olympia adjacent to the City of Tumwater since 1971. Approximately 7 acres of the college, a portion in the northeast corner and a portion in the southwest corner, are within the City of Tumwater. Access to the site is via Mottman Road to the north, RW Johnson Boulevard and 29th Avenue from the west, and from the east by Crosby Boulevard. Surrounding development consists of commercial development north of Mottman Road, residential development between the college and RW Johnson and 29th Avenue to the west, and residential development to the south.

To facilitate expansion pursuant to master plans in effect at various times, the college has been granted two major conditional use permits, one in 1984 by the Board of Adjustment, Case 856/858, and another in 2009 by the Hearing Examiner of the City of Olympia and Pro Tempore Hearing Examiner of the City of Tumwater, Case 08-0095 (Attachments 23-27).

The College Center, Building 22, was the first major building constructed on the campus in 1976, but between the years of 1984 and 2009, over a course of 25 years, the campus grew in development with seven new buildings, including by 1992, a Health Sciences cluster - Buildings 31, 32, and 33. Building 31 is the gymnasium, now known as the Health and Wellness Center. The SPSCC Master Plan of 2007 envisioned the original 1992 building being demolished and replaced with a new gym and fitness center, and possibly relocated in the cluster of buildings (Attachment 27), however with the more recent Master Plan of 2015, the building is slated for renovation and expansion.

Condition Use Permit Review of the Health and Wellness Facility Expansion

- Presubmission Conference - Mar 26, 2018, File 18-0658,
- Application Submittal - Received May 7, 2018, File 18-1869,
- Notice of Application - May 11, 2018
- Neighborhood Meeting - May 23, 2018
- Design Review - Concept Design Review, Jun 28, 2018
- Substantive Review Comments to the Applicant - Jul 11, 2018
- SEPA Determination - Issued Oct 30, 2018
- Site Plan Review Committee Recommendation - Oct 24, 2018

II. POLICY & REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The proposal has been reviewed for compliance with applicable City plans and regulations necessary to determine if the project proposal will conceptually meet the City's development standards. Pursuant to Olympia Municipal Code Chapter 18.82, Conditional Use Permit applications are within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Examiner. This report addresses project code compliance in relation to the Comprehensive Plan and the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC). The proposal will be subject to detailed engineering and building permit review.

Comprehensive Plan

Generally, the project complies with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The following citations reflect this compliance:

GL15: Focus areas are planned in cooperation with property owners and residents.
PL15.6: Work cooperatively with the State of Washington on planning for the Capitol Campus and the Port of Olympia in planning for its properties. Provide opportunities for long-term 'master planning' of other single-purpose properties of at least 20 acres, such as hospitals, colleges, and high-school campuses.

*GL20: Development maintains and improves neighborhood character and livability.
PL20.1: Require development in established neighborhoods to be of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.*

*GE6: Collaboration with other partners maximizes economic opportunity.
PE6.7: Collaborate with The Evergreen State College, St. Martin's University, and South Puget Sound Community College on their efforts to educate students in skills that will be needed in the future, to contribute to our community's cultural life, and attract new residents.*

OMC 14.04 Environmental Protection

A SEPA Determination of Non-Significance was issued on October 30, 2018 pursuant to WAC 197-11 and the City's SEPA requirements outlined in OMC 14.04. The notice of the SEPA Decision was combined with the Notice of Public Hearing. The comment deadline is November 13, 2018 and the appeal deadline is November 20, 2018. To date, no comments or appeals have been filed (Attachments 19 and 21).

OMC Title 18 Unified Development Code

1. Chapter 18.04 Residential Districts

A. OMC 18.04.020. The intent of the R4-8 zoning district is to accommodate single-family houses and townhouses at densities ranging from a minimum of four (4) units per acre to a maximum of eight (8) units per acre; to allow sufficient residential density to facilitate effective mass transit service; and to help maintain the character of established neighborhoods.

B. Permitted and Conditional Uses, OMC 18.04.040 and Table 4.01

OMC 18.04.060.W. Essential Public Facilities such as community colleges are allowed as conditional uses in the R4-8 zoning district and are further classified as Type Two essential facilities. Type two public facilities are subject to specific criteria for approval, as listed below.

i. 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:

- 1) 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.]

- ii. Critical Areas. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable, unmitigable, significant adverse impact on Critical Areas.
- iii. 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 (1/4) mile of a highway or arterial street served, or planned to be served, by mass transit.
- iv. 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:
 - 1) An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;
 - 2) An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
 - 3) The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger;
 - 4) 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
 - 5) A description of the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.

Staff Response: *The criteria above are intended to mitigate impacts to residential neighborhoods when a large facility needs to go through the siting process. SPSCC has applied for the Conditional Use Permit to expand an existing building on a campus that has been sited since 1971 (Attachments 23-26). Critical areas that exist on the SPSCC Mottman campus, including Percival Creek and wetlands previously identified in the northeast and southwest corners of the site will not be affected by the project. The other criteria listed in this Code section do not apply to the expansion of this building.*

C. OMC 18.04.060.CC Schools

When located in residential zoning districts, colleges subject to conditional use approval shall meet building expansion criteria. Building expansion depicted in a City-approved master plan or comprising no more than ten (10) percent of a preapproved floor plan is permitted. Greater expansion shall require conditional use approval. All incremental expansions are considered cumulative.

Staff Response: *The proposal to expand Building 31 represents an increase of more than 50% of gross floor area to the building. The building's expansion does reflect goals for the building in the 2015 Master Plan, and since the expansion is greater than 10% of a preapproved floor plan, conditional use permit approval is required.*

2. Chapter 18.36 Landscaping and Screening

OMC 18.36.040, Applicability. The Landscaping and Screening chapter applies to all development applications in the city, with the exception of individual single-family residential lots and development containing four (4) or less attached dwelling units. All changes in the use of a property or remodel of a structure that requires improvements equal to or greater than fifty (50) percent of the assessed property valuation shall comply with the requirements of this Chapter.

Staff Response: *The expansion of Building 31 is not subject to the requirements of this chapter because the cost of improvements to the building falls below 50 % of the assessed property valuation of the college. According to the Thurston County Assessor Parcel information for parcel number 12828110500, the total valuation is \$119,621,100.00; according to the building permit application submitted on Sep 4, 2018, the cost of the project totals \$11,800,000, which is approximately 9.8 % of the assessed property valuation of the college.*

However, since there will be areas disturbed by the improvements, those areas shall comply with requirements of the Chapter. Staff reviewed the conceptual landscaping plan submitted on May 7, 2018, and requested additional information and revisions to ensure the provision of OMC 18.36 would be met. A revised detailed landscape plan was submitted with the project revisions on Aug 22, 2018. This plan was reviewed for compliance with the comments made by staff in the Substantive Review Table (Attachments 16, 17). Staff found the landscaping plan to meet the applicable provisions of the Code. Further review will be conducted with the engineering and building construction permit application review (currently under review).

3. Chapter 18.38 Parking and Loading

OMC 18.38.060. Off-street parking shall be provided when a main or accessory building is relocated or expanded. The number of vehicle parking spaces for educational facilities, however, is not specifically called out in Table 38.01. In situations where the precise amount of parking requirements is not established in the Code, the City requires that a parking study be conducted to evaluate vehicle parking needs.

Staff Response: *The Hearing Examiner determined in 2009 that a parking ratio of 0.22 vehicle parking stalls shall be provided per student (Attachments 24 and 25). He required that this ratio be reevaluated every 10 years to determine if parking counts were keeping up with student enrollment and staffing needs.*

The Conditional Use Permit approval in 2009, File 08-0095, referenced above, also requires that an analysis of off-site parking shall be provided with every future land use application. The applicants submitted a trip generation study, a parking analysis (with the presubmittal application), and a parking utilization study (Attachments 7-9).

The applicants have stated that the expansion of Building 31 will not increase classroom size or capacity, nor will it require additional employees, and therefore does not propose new parking for the project. The studies provided by the applicant indicate that surrounding neighborhoods north, northwest, and southwest of the development site have capacity at-present and should not be affected by the expansion. Staff concurs with the analyses provided.

4. Chapter 18.100 Design Review

OMC 18.100 and 18.110, Design Review and Basic Commercial Design Criteria. Since the proposal includes construction of building area greater than 5,000 square feet, requires conditional permit review and is within a residential zoning district, the project is subject to Design Review. For the same reasons the project shall be reviewed by the Design Review Board, rather than review by Staff.

***Staff Response:** The Design Review Board convened on June 28, 2018, and made a recommendation of approval of the preliminary design program, subject to conditions, to the Site Plan Review Committee (Attachments 12-15). The conditions of approval recommended by the Design Review Board are contained herein for final determination by the Hearing Examiner.*

III. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to OMC 18.72.100, the Site Plan Review Committee met on October 24, 2018 and has found the project to meet all applicable municipal code requirements. Therefore, the Site Plan Review Committee recommends approval of this project proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Approved Development Site Plan.** Development shall be substantially in conformance with the APPROVED Development Site Plan dated Jul 28, 2018 and Aug 28, 2018, as modified by conditions of approval herein, and as may be modified by the Hearings Examiner.
 - a. Sheet AS101, Overall Site Plan
 - b. Sheet C-103, Site Improvement Plan
 - c. Sheet C-106, Water and Sewer Plan
 - d. Sheet L-001, Material Plan
 - e. Sheet L-002, Landscape Plan
2. **Lighting.** All display and flood lighting shall be constructed and used to not unduly illuminate the surrounding properties, not create a traffic hazard and not overly illuminate the night sky. OMC 18.40.060.
3. **Landscaping Plan.** Submit a final Landscape Plan, in accordance with OMC 18.36, for review and approval prior to engineering permit issuance. Submit a landscape maintenance estimate, on a separate sheet of paper(s), which includes a cost estimate for the purchase, site preparation, installation and three (3) years of maintenance of all landscaping and irrigation.
4. **Hours of Operation/Construction Noise.** Pursuant to OMC 18.40.080.C.7, construction activity shall be restricted to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.
5. **Concept Design Review.**
 - a. Update the Site Plan, Sheet AS101, and the Landscape Plan, Sheet L2.01, with the location of the short-term bicycle parking stationary racks.
 - b. Locate the long-term bicycle parking in the floor plan, Sheet A-101, Overall Floor Plan.
 - c. Provide photos of *all* plants proposed in the Landscape Plan, Sheet L-002, Plant Photos.
 - d. The Site Plan and the Landscape Plan shall show the same site elements, including but not limited to type of lawn or turf, and bicycle parking and mechanical equipment. Correct any inconsistencies between the Site Plan and the Landscape Plan.
 - e. Show the location of all mechanical equipment and utility vaults on the Site Plan, Sheet AS101, and on the Landscape Plan, Sheets L-001 and L-002. OMC 18.110.190.
 - f. Show the location of the solid waste facility area and the type of screening that will be constructed. Depict the location of the solid waste facilities on sheets throughout the architectural and engineering plan sets. OMC 18.110.190.

- g. Provide landscaping along the east side of the Auxiliary Gym that softens the scale of the blank wall. OMC 18.110.180.
 - h. Articulate façade design features to reduce the apparent size of large buildings. OMC 18.110.080.
 - i. Provide photos, cut sheets, and specifications of the types of windows that will be used on the building. The elevations should clearly depict windows at the pedestrian level around the entire building. OMC 18.110.100.
 - j. Provide a materials and colors board at the detail stage of design review. OMC 18.110.150.
 - k. Provide black and white and colored elevations of all sides of the building, labeled north, south, east, and west. Label colors, materials, and finished floor elevations. OMC 18.110.150.
 - l. Provide a lighting plan that includes fixture photos, cut sheets, building mounted heights from grade, duration of fixture illumination, and distance of illumination per fixture. OMC 18.110.160.
6. **Utility General Facility Charges.** General facility charges for City utilities (Water, Sanitary Sewer, Stormwater, and Solid Waste) and the LOTT sanitary sewer Capacity Development Charge will be assessed at the time engineering construction permits are issued.
7. **Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP).** Prior to engineering permit issuance, provide a signed Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) that outlines how the project proponent and site crew will respond in the event that archaeological resources are uncovered during the course of project work. The IDP shall be maintained and available for inspection on the project site for the duration of excavation and construction, pursuant to OMC 18.12.140.
8. **Construction.** The project shall comply with the City of Olympia Construction Codes as adopted through the Olympia Municipal Code, Chapter 16.04.
9. **Tree Fencing and Tree Protection.** Prior to engineering permit issuance the fence locations, tree protection fence installation notes and tree protection measures shall be shown throughout the civil plan set. OMC 16.60, Tree, Soil, and Native Vegetation and Protection and Replacement; and EDDS Chapter 4, Transportation.
10. **Fire Protection.**
- a. Separate the fire line serving the fire sprinklers from the domestic water line.
 - b. Upgrade the fire alarm system to a fully addressable system that reports by point via AES radio or GSM technology.
 - c. Provide an annunciator at the new south building entry.
 - d. Upgrade fire sprinklers to quick-response heads in the existing portion of the building and throughout the addition
 - e. Provide a Knox box at the north and south building entries.
 - f. Provide Knox Style locking FDC caps.
11. **Vegetation Maintenance Bond.** A vegetation maintenance bond (or other assurance) shall be provided following City acceptance of the landscape installation, including street trees, before issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. The bond amount shall be 125% of the cost estimate submitted with the Landscape Plan and approved by the City.
12. **Right-of-way Performance Bond.** Bonds or other allowable securities will be required by the City to guarantee the performance of work within the subject site and rights-of-way, or maintenance of required public infrastructure intended to be offered for dedication as a

public improvement. See both EDDS Section 2.030.F and Volume 1 Section 2.6.1 of the 2016 DDECM for more information.

Submitted by: Catherine McCoy, Associate Planner, on behalf of the Olympia Community Planning and Development Site Plan Review Committee

Report Issued: November 16, 2018

Attachments:

1. Staff Report
2. 18-0658 Presubmittal Summary
3. 18-1869 Application Forms
4. 18-1869 Project Narrative
5. 18-1869 Civil Plan Set
6. 18-1869 Landscape Plan
7. 18-1869 Parking Analysis
8. 18-1869 Parking Utilization Study
9. 18-1869 Parking Utilization Study Table
10. 18-1869 Neighborhood Meeting Sign-in Sheet
11. 18-1869 Public Comment
12. 18-1869 Concept DRB Staff Report
13. 18-1869 Concept Architectural Packet
14. 18-1869 Context Photos
15. 18-1869 Concept DRB memo
16. 18-1869 Substantive Review Table
17. 18-1869 Substantive Review Response
18. 18-1869 SPRC Recommendations
19. 18-1869 Revised SEPA Checklist
20. Extended Timeline
21. 18-1869 SEPA DNS HEX Notice
22. 18-1869 DRAFT HE Approved Plan Set
23. 1984 BOA 856/858 CUP
24. 08-0095 HE Staff Report
25. 08-0095 HE Decision
26. 2015 SPSCC Master Plan
27. 2007 SPSCC Master Plan