



## Planning Commission

### Development Code Amendments for Consistency with Updated Comprehensive Plan

**Agenda Date:** 1/13/2014  
**Agenda Item Number:**  
**File Number:** 14-0031

---

**Type:** discussion **Version:** 1 **Status:** Filed

---

#### **Title**

Development Code Amendments for Consistency with Updated Comprehensive Plan

#### **Recommended Action**

Briefing only - no action required. Information provided may be used to establish Commission's 2014 agenda calendar and work program.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

The City Council is expected to adopt an updated version of Olympia's Comprehensive by June of 2014. This briefing is a refresher regarding the process for development code amendments to implement that update, and in particular the first set proposed by staff.

##### **Staff Contact:**

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department, 360.753.8597

##### **Presenter(s):**

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner

#### **Background and Analysis:**

Washington's Growth Management Act requires that cities like Olympia adopt, "development regulations that are consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan." Although simultaneous amendment of the Plan and the development regulations is not required, amendments are to be 'concurrent' which is generally interpreted to mean as close in time as practical.

State law also requires that any proposed development regulation amendments must be subject to at least one public hearing, and review and recommendation by the Planning Commission prior to City Council action. In Olympia, the Commission usually holds the required public hearing. In general, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires a review of the prospective environmental impacts of a code amendment prior to adoption.

To ensure timely updates of the City's development regulations consistent with the updated Plan, the staff has proposed and the City Council has directed that the process of updating the regulations begin as quickly as possible. This will minimize the period of time between Council adoption of the

updated Plan and adoption of development code amendments. Consistent with this approach, the staff identified a set of amendments related to less controversial aspects of the Plan update recommended by the Planning Commission. These were to be considered by the Commission in 2013 but, due to competing priorities in the Commission's work plan, the hearings regarding these amendments were postponed to early in 2014.

This first set of proposed amendments is briefly described below. The primary related new or revised Comprehensive Plan policy being considered by the Council is in parentheses. Note that this is only the first set of such Plan-implementing amendments that may be presented to the Commission. Others will probably be identified after the Council has adopted the updated Plan or in the related Plan Implementation Strategy, aka Action Plan, which is also scheduled for adoption in 2014.

The proposed first set includes:

- Multi-Family Transitions. Reduce from 10 to 5 acres the threshold for requiring that multi-family (apartment) projects in the Multi-family Residential 18 units per acre and Residential Mixed Use zoning districts include a variety of housing types, i.e., no more than 70% of one type. (Land Use Policy 16.12, "Require a mix of single-family and multi-family structures in villages, mixed residential density districts, and apartment projects when these exceed five acres; and use a variety of housing types and setbacks to transition to adjacent single-family areas.") Note, the Commission was briefed regarding this amendment in August of 2013.
- Scenic Views from Streets. Narrow the requirement to preserve scenic views from public streets as shown on the 'Scenic Vista's overlay zoning maps' to those listed in the proposed Plan update, which include State Avenue, 4th Avenue, Harrison Avenue, Deschutes Parkway, West Bay Drive, East Bay Drive, the 4th Avenue Bridge, Olympia Avenue, Boulevard Road, Pacific Avenue, Martin Way, Brawne Street, Foote Street, and Capitol Way. Note that this amendment would not apply to specific view protection elsewhere in the development regulations, such as height limits related to views of the Capitol Group. (Land Use Policy 8.5, "Set absolute maximum building heights to preserve views of landmarks from observation points, such as those identified in the following matrix, as determined through public process ....")
- Campus Master Planning. Add a provision to development code allowing for long-term master plan approval of 'campuses' such as Providence Saint Peter Hospital and South Puget Sound Community College. (Land Use Policy 15.6, "Work cooperatively with the State of Washington regarding planning for the Capitol Campus and provide opportunities for long-term 'master planning' of other single-purpose properties of at least twenty acres such as hospitals and the college and high-school campuses.")
- Rezone Criteria. Adopt new rezone (zoning map amendment) criteria in development code to ensure that future amendments to the zoning map are consistent with the Plan's Future Land Use Map. Criteria would correlate the designations of each map, and possibly limit amendments to increase density within the proposed Low Density Neighborhood designation of the Plan. ("Although these [Future Land Use] map lines are approximate, all future land uses should be consistent with the intent of this map and the land use category descriptions in Appendix A as well as the goals and policies of this Plan.")

- Zoning Map Amendments. Amend zoning of specific parcels on zoning map to accord with Future Land Use map of Comprehensive Plan, including moving 'Commercial Service High Density' zoning of sites outside capitol campus to another designation and eliminating High-Rise Multi-family zoning within Heritage Park. (Land Use Policy 1.4, "Require functional and efficient development by adopting and periodically updating zoning consistent with the Future Land Use Map.")

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

To date, there has not been any significant public interest in this set of amendments. It is likely that public notice associated with the related public hearings will lead to interest.

**Options:**

No action required; however the Commission may elect to request additional information regarding these amendments, direct that certain parties be notified when a specific amendment is to be heard by the Commission, or provide other direction.

This briefing is also intended to provide context for the next work item regarding the 2014 OPC Work Program.

**Financial Impact:**

Cost of review of these City-initiated amendments is included in 2014 budget.