



City Council

Proposed 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Agenda Date: 4/21/2015
Agenda Item Number: 6.A
File Number: 15-0377

Type: decision **Version:** 1 **Status:** Passed

Title

Proposed 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendations:

- Move to approve consideration of proposals 1, 2 and 3 below (Waste ReSources update, Transportation plan map refinement and Copper Ridge future land use map amendment) and direct Planning Commission to review and provide a recommendation in 2015 (provided that the Copper Ridge proponent must submit a final application on or before May 21);
- Move to add proposal #4 (Bigelow neighborhood transitional zoning issues) to Planning Commission and Community Planning and Development Department's 2015 Work Plans as one or more development code amendments with specific scope to be determined by City staff in consultation with Land Use and Environment Committee;
- Move to approve consideration of proposal #5 (M-5 property) as the initial and only year-2016 privately-initiated Comprehensive Plan amendment, such amendment to include consideration of the surrounding Kaiser/Harrison "opportunity area" as described in "Investment Strategy - City of Olympia Opportunity Areas," with review by City staff and the Planning Commission to be conducted in a manner that will provide for a final Council decision in mid-2016; and
- Move to direct City staff to continue to work with interested parties to explore proposal #6 (Wellington Heights 'automall' expansion).

Report

Issue:

The Washington Growth Management Act provides that, subject to certain exceptions, Olympia may amend its Comprehensive Plan only once each year. Olympia's municipal code establishes a structure for considering and consolidating review of such annual amendments. In 2015, the Council set March 2 as the deadline for submitting initial proposals. Which of the six proposals received

should be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and recommendations leading to a Council decision later in 2015?

Staff Contact:

Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, Community Planning and Development Department (CPD),
360.753.8597

Presenters:

Leonard Bauer, Deputy Director, CPD
Todd Stamm, Principal Planner, CPD
Representative of Inland Group (item #3 proponent)
Representative of Bigelow neighborhood (item #4 proponent)
Representative of M-5 (item #5 proponent)

Background and Analysis:

The Washington Growth Management Act provides that Olympia generally can amend its Comprehensive Plan only once each calendar year. Chapter 18.59 of the Olympia Municipal Code establishes a specific process for such annual amendments. It provides that

- Proposals may be submitted by anyone at any time without charge.
- City Council is to set a deadline for proposals to be considered in a given year (March 2 this year), and
- City staff is to review and present all preliminary proposals to the Council (April 21 this year) to determine which should move forward for formal consideration. The staff's review and recommendation at this preliminary stage is to be based on specific criteria set forth in code section 18.58.060.

In brief, these criteria are:

- Whether the proposal is consistent with state and federal law
- Whether the proposal might lead to adverse environmental impacts, and if so whether there is time to analyze such
- Whether additional capital improvements and maintenance revenue would be needed, and if so whether there is time to analyze such
- Whether the proposal conflicts with other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan
- Whether other significant amendments would be needed and, if so, whether there is time for such
- If the proposal has been previously been reviewed, whether the applicant has identified reason to review it again

(A copy with full text of the criteria is attached for convenience.)

The City Council's role at this stage is to "review all such proposals, determine which are appropriate and worthy of further review and consideration, and move those to the Planning Commission for review and public hearing." (OMC 18.59.030). Customarily, each proponent is provided about five minutes to present their proposal to the Council. Note that at this stage the Council's role is **not** to decide whether or not a proposal should be approved. Instead the Council is to decide - without otherwise pre-judging the issue - which proposals should move to the next stage of review. Whether

to consider a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is at the City Council's discretion - there is no requirement that the City consider any amendments in a given calendar year.

Amendments forwarded to the Planning Commission are deemed the 'final docket.' Prior to further consideration, private proponents of forwarded proposals are required to submit a detailed amendment application including appropriate fees. All forwarded amendment proposals will be subject to environmental review by the City staff and appropriate public processes including review and recommendations by the Planning Commission following a public hearing. Final decisions are scheduled to be made by the City Council late in 2015.

Ordinarily the annual amendment process extends over a period of twelve months or more. However, due to the major Comprehensive Plan update being completed in December of 2014, this year the review period is limited to about nine months.

Proposals

Six preliminary proposals were received. Each proposal, including related materials, is attached to this report. In summary, the six proposals are:

- 1) City staff propose to update information in the Comprehensive Plan to reflect modifications of the City's Waste ReSources (solid waste) program. Although the Plan was updated in December, that update was based on a draft prepared by City staff July of 2012. In the intervening period the background information related to solid waste has become out of date and facilities and some practices have changed. This amendment would update this key part of the Utilities chapter.
- 2) City staff propose to refine the future street network of the "Transportation 2030" plan maps. Included would be new streets associated with planned Highway 101 access improvements, removal of planned streets found to not be viable during various development project reviews, and reclassification of 9th Avenue SE east of Boulevard Road as recommended to Thurston County in 2013. While some of these transportation amendments could be considered routine in nature, others may generate significant public interest. **Note, the attached documents incorrectly refer to 9th Avenue SE as 9th Avenue SW.**
- 3) The Inland Group (of Spokane) requests that about four acres along Capital Mall Drive west of Cooper Point Road be reclassified on the Future Land Use Map and rezoned for professional office use. This acreage is a remainder of a larger parcel now designated solely for multi-family development where the Inland Group is constructing a new apartment project known as "Copper Trails." This remainder is located between areas designated for medical services along Yauger Road and the 'urban corridor' of Cooper Point Road and in the opinion of the Inland Group would be more appropriately zoned as Professional Office - Multi-Family.
- 4) Jay Elder and members of the Bigelow Neighborhood Association initially proposed Future Land Use Map reclassifications and zoning map amendments for multiple properties near State Avenue east of East Bay Drive. After conferring with City staff and the directly affected property owners, Mr. Elder revised the proposal. In the revised form, this proposal would not require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Instead it would be focused on development code changes to increase compatibility of future development in this and maybe other parts of the

city. In particular, Mr. Elder now proposes that the City codify a Plan provision limiting the height of buildings north of State Avenue between East Bay Drive and Tullis Street, reexamine design criteria applicable to new development in this area, and review the citywide provisions of the General Commercial and Professional Office - Multifamily Residential zones .

- 5) M-Five Family Limited Partnership, represented by Shelby Hentges and Ron Thomas, proposes that the future land use classification and zoning of about 25 acres west of Yauger Way and south of Harrison Avenue in west Olympia be changed from 'professional office - multifamily residential' to 'urban high density corridor.' As described below, after conferring with City staff the Partnership supports expanding the scope and timeline of this proposal to allow for a study of the surrounding "opportunity area."

Note: Moving study of the Kaiser/Harrison opportunity area forward by about six months may delay other items on CP&D's work program that were scheduled for latter half of 2015. For example, although scoping of critical areas code updates would still occur as scheduled, any significant code revisions not required by the Growth Management Act - such as identification of locally significant wildlife habitat - could be delayed by six to twelve months without additional staff or consultant resources.

- 6) Lemon Properties LLC, represented by Dean Willie and Larry Peterson, proposed that the Future Land Use Map classification and zoning of about 10 acres north of the Olympia Auto Mall between Fern and Decatur Streets in southwest Olympia be changed from Low Density Residential single-family zoning to 'Auto Services.' Although adjacent to the auto mall, the only existing access to this property is via the city streets through the single-family neighborhood to the north. After conferring with City staff, Mr. Willie withdrew this proposal (see attached email of March 27, 2015) and instead requests that City staff support his efforts to obtain alternative access directly from the auto mall area.

Staff Recommendations

City staff has evaluated these six proposals pursuant to the OMC criteria and recommends:

1. That the Council conclude that Proposal #1 (set of solid waste amendments) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
2. That the Council conclude that Proposal #2 (set of transportation map amendments) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
3. That the Council conclude that Proposal #3 (Cooper Ridge map amendment) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
4. With respect to revised Proposal #4 (Bigelow neighborhood development code issues), that Council direct that the CPD and Planning Commission work programs for 2015 be revised to include consideration of the proposed Bigelow Neighborhood area zoning map and code amendments.
5. That Council conclude that the scope of Proposal #5 exceeds the time available for

appropriate analysis in 2015. Instead, because M-Five's land use proposal is the core of an "opportunity area" that has already been identified on the CPD work program for further study in 2016, the staff recommends that Council direct that the CPD work program for 2015 be revised to include initiating study of the 'Kaiser and Harrison opportunity area (see attached map) in 2015. (See the "Investment Strategy - City of Olympia Opportunity Areas" report of September 25, 2013, for more information.)

This evaluation would include M-Five's proposal and other alternatives and lead to an appropriate Comprehensive Plan amendment decision for this opportunity area by Council in mid-2016. As such, staff recommends that this opportunity area process be the only Comprehensive Plan amendment considered in 2016. Staff recommends that Council initiate the 2017 amendment process with a call for applications in November of 2016 with consideration of proposed amendments in 2017. This would put us back on a schedule that is more consistent with what we have done in the past.

6. With respect to withdrawn proposal #6, all properties within the Olympia Auto Mall have been developed and the City staff concurs with Mr. Willie that opportunities for expanding the capacity of the Olympia Auto Mall should be explored. Therefore, staff recommends that the Council direct staff to continue investigating all possibilities including those suggested by the proponents of northerly expansion.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

There are stakeholders interested in each of the proposed items. All interested parties will have an opportunity to participate in the various public review processes.

Options:

With respect to each of the six proposals the City Council may:

- A) Direct that the Planning Commission review the proposal, host a public hearing, and make recommendation to the Council consistent with the 2015 Comprehensive Plan amendment schedule.
- B) Decline to consider the proposed amendment in 2015.
- C) Direct consideration of the proposal as part of a different process, instead of as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan amendments.

As outlined above, the staff recommends Option A with respect to proposals 1, 2, and 3; and variations of Option C with respect to proposals 4, 5, and 6.

Financial Impact:

Consideration of items 1 through 4 and item 6 is within base budget. Consideration of item 5 can be accomplished within base budget, using unexpended funds from staff vacancies (primarily Economic Development Director salary for first portion of 2015).