



City Council

Adoption of a Resolution Accepting Recommendations, Findings, and Conclusion of the Hearing Examiner and Granting Preliminary Approval of an Amendment to the Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential Development

Agenda Date: 4/15/2014
Agenda Item Number: 4.D
File Number: 13-0662

Type: resolution **Version:** 1 **Status:** Passed

Title

Adoption of a Resolution Accepting Recommendations, Findings, and Conclusion of the Hearing Examiner and Granting Preliminary Approval of an Amendment to the Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential Development

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee. The Olympia Hearing Examiner recommends preliminary approval.

City Manager Recommendation:

Move to adopt a Resolution accepting the recommendations, findings and conclusion of the Hearing Examiner and granting preliminary approval of the Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential Development (PRD) amendment.

Report

Issue:

Members of the Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential Development seek preliminary approval of an amendment to the existing Planned Residential Development (PRD). If approved the amendment would increase the total number of residential units from sixteen to eighteen, in the R 4-8 zoning district, through the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), OMC 18.04.080(A)(5).

Staff Contact:

Catherine McCoy, Associate Planner, Community Planning & Development, 360.753.8649

Presenter(s):

None. Consent Calendar Item.

Background and Analysis:

The Olympia City Council approved the Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential

Development in 2008. At that time, members of the development requested 21 units as part of its PRD proposal. However, in the R 4-8 zoning district, the maximum density is capped at seven units per acre, which in the case of the Woodard Lane Co-housing site at 2.3 acres in size, limits the total number of units to sixteen. An exception to that cap is through the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) from a sending zone in Thurston County (OMC 18.04.080(A)(4) and (5)).

Since the Council's 2008 decision on the PRD limiting the site to sixteen dwelling units, the Woodard Lane Co-Housing PRD has obtained two development credits from a Thurston County TDR sending site. Using one TDR unit for each bonus unit (over 7 per acre), the applicant proposes an amendment to increase the number of approved residential units from sixteen to eighteen.

The proposal makes no changes to the existing site infrastructure (e.g., utilities, parking, structures). The requirements of SEPA have been met (SEPA DNS 2007), and as conditioned, the proposal satisfies the requirements of the Planned Residential Development Ordinance, OMC Chapter 18.56, and the Transfer of Development Rights Ordinance, OMC Chapter 18.90. The one significant impact of an enlarged project is the handling of trash and recyclable materials, which the Hearing Examiner identified as a condition of preliminary approval (item 1 below).

Hearing Examiner Recommendations:

The Hearing Examiner, in August, 2013, recommended approval of the proposed amendment, subject to the following conditions:

- a. The Applicant shall construct a fence along the east property line to further protect the adjacent properties' privacy.

Staff Comment: After the Hearing Examiner's August 13 decision, a six foot tall solid wood fence has been installed along the east property line, between the development and the abutting homes (See Fence Photos attachment).

- b. The Applicant shall relocate waste and recycling receptacles to interior locations, away from adjacent residences.

Staff Comment: The applicant has located the solid waste facilities interior and at the furthest point away from surrounding residences (See Binding Site Plan 1-5 attachment).

- c. When and if a building is proposed for construction on Lot 4 (Unit F) the applicant will be required to submit design plans for a staff level detailed design review. The design shall demonstrate a strong effort at mitigating, to the extent possible, negative building and site design impacts on adjacent properties.

Staff Comment: This will be a condition of final PRD approval.

- d. The PRD shall be referenced on the official Zoning map by adoption of an Ordinance amending the map to include a reference to the binding site plan.

Staff Comment: This will be built into the final PRD ordinance.

- e. The Applicant shall provide signed and recorded Transfer of Development Rights Certificates for each unit of density on the receiving parcels in the Residential 4-8 district.
- f. A signed and recorded Document of Attachment of the development rights to the subject parcels.

Staff Comment: The last two conditions should be made conditions of the Council's preliminary PRD approval. They are incorporated into the proposed resolution.

Neighborhood/Community Interest:

Adjacent property owners have participated in the review and approval process of this project proposal, as well as the original Woodard Lane Co-Housing Planned Residential Development proposal.

City Staff facilitated a neighborhood meeting associated with the development request on March 21, 2013, at the Garfield Elementary School. Four members of the public attended the meeting, all residents of the Co-housing development. No one opposed to the project proposal attended the meeting.

Neighbor concerns regarding this amendment proposal pertain to the location of the development's solid waste facilities, and privacy fencing along the east property line between the development and the single family residences to the east. A summary of neighbor concerns can be found in the Staff Report (See attachment "Staff Report to HE"). The Hearing Examiner addressed neighbor concerns by conditioning the proposal as indicated in items a and b above.

Options:

The Council may:

1. Adopt the attached resolution, accepting the recommendation, findings and conclusion of the Hearing Examiner as their own;
2. Remand the matter back to the Hearing Examiner for another hearing;
3. Modify the Hearing Examiner's decision based on applicable criteria, adopt their own findings and conclusions, and approve the preliminary PRD Amendment;
4. Continue to a future date to allow for additional staff analysis desired by the Council; or
5. Deny the preliminary PRD Amendment application.

Financial Impact:

None.