



City Council

Proposed 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Agenda Date: 3/15/2016
Agenda Item Number: 6.B
File Number: 16-0273

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

Title

Proposed 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

- Move to approve consideration of proposals 1, 2, 3, and 5 below (continuation of the Kaiser-Harrison Opportunity Area plan; revision of the Public Health, Arts, Parks and Recreation chapter; revision of the Design Review provisions in comprehensive plan; and consideration of a map amendment and rezone for the Lord Mansion).
- Move to deny consideration of proposal 4 below (a proposal to amend the Future Land Use Map from Mixed Residential to Urban Corridor and rezone a 2.2 acre parcel from Mixed Residential 10-18 to High Density Corridor 4 (HDC-4)).

Report

Issue:

The Washington State Growth Management Act provides that, subject to certain exceptions, Olympia may amend its Comprehensive Plan only once per year. Olympia's municipal code establishes a structure for considering and consolidating review of such annual amendments. The Council set November 2, 2015, as the deadline for submitting initial proposals for amendments in 2016. Which of these proposals received should be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and recommendations leading to a Council decision later in 2016?

Staff Contact:

Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner, Community Planning and Development Department (CPD),
360.570.3722

Presenter(s):

Joyce Phillips, Senior Planner, CPD

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 (November 2, 2015 for consideration in 2016), and
- City staff is to review and present all preliminary proposals to the Council (March 15 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 18.59.020.

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 previously been reviewed and, if so, whether the applicant has identified a 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). 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 2016.

Proposals

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

- 1) Kaiser-Harrison Opportunity Area Planning Process. Last year the Council directed the CP&D

work program for 2015 be revised to include initiating study of the Kaiser-Harrison Opportunity Area in response to a 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment application submitted by M-Five Family Limited Partnership. With the applicant's agreement, the Council directed that Comprehensive Plan Amendment application be forwarded to be part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket. The sub-area planning process is currently underway, with Public Workshops and other public engagement opportunities scheduled during March and into April. Staff is working diligently and intends to have a recommendation for a comprehensive plan and rezone scenario prepared for this cycle of amendments.

- 2) City staff proposes to refine the Public Health, Arts, Parks and Recreation chapter. The proposed amendments would update the comprehensive plan text to be consistent with the recently adopted Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan.
- 3) The Olympia Planning Commission proposes a text amendment to Comprehensive Plan Policy PL6.1 to periodically review, and amend if necessary, the design review procedures and standards. The intent is to determine if any problems or conflicts exist and to address them by improving guidance to concerned parties, if needed.
- 4) A proposal by Randall Heath to redesignate a 2.2-acre parcel from Mixed Residential to Urban Corridor on the Future Land Use Map of the comprehensive plan and to rezone it from Mixed Residential 10-18 (MR 10-18) to High Density Corridor 4 (HDC-4) or Medical Service (MS) or Professional Office/Residential Multifamily (PO/RM).

Properties to the east and west of, and adjacent to, the subject parcel are designated as Mixed Residential in the Future Land Use Map of the plan. The site is located between parcels that share the Mixed Residential 10-18 zoning classification. One review criterion is other significant amendments would not be needed or, if so, that there are adequate resources for such within the timeframe of amendments. Staff does not believe the proposed request is consistent with the criteria for a comprehensive plan amendment, given that more than one parcel should be considered when the adjacent parcels are in the same comprehensive plan designation and zoning district as the subject site. In addition, the applicant has since sold the property and is no longer the owner.

- 5) The Washington State Historical Society has requested a comprehensive plan map amendment and future rezone of a 1.15 acre parcel to Professional Office/Residential Multifamily (PO/RM). The property is known as the Lord Mansion and has been used as a museum and for office space since 1942. While recognized in statute as part of the state capitol (see RCW 27.34.900, attached), the site has not been included on the Capitol Campus Master Plan (CCMP). Pursuant to RCW 43.82, State Agency Housing, authority for the acquisition and use of state property in Thurston County is the responsibility of the Department of Enterprise Services. Further, the Capitol Committee is responsible for the construction of buildings on the capitol grounds. This authority supersedes city planning and zoning authority for the state capitol campus. (Note: City building and engineering standards apply regardless of inclusion in the CCMP.) If the subject property is determined to be part of the capitol campus and covered by the CCMP, a comprehensive plan amendment and rezone from the City would not be needed by the State Historical Society.

The Historical Society is working with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services to obtain a technical correction in order to have this site added to the CCMP. If the technical amendment is approved, the Historical Society will not proceed with its application for a City comprehensive plan amendment and rezone.

Staff Recommendations

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

1. Proposal #1 (Kaiser-Harrison Opportunity Area) is an on-going planning process that is consistent with the six criteria, and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
2. Proposal #2 (set of parks element changes) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
3. Proposal #3 (set of design review text changes) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
4. Proposal #4 (proposed comprehensive plan amendment and rezone requested by Randall Heath) is not consistent with the six criteria and do not forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.
5. Proposal #5 (proposed comprehensive plan amendment and rezone requested by the Washington State Historical Society) is consistent with the six criteria and forward it to the Planning Commission for consideration.

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 five proposals the City Council may:

- A) Direct that the Planning Commission review the proposal, host a public hearing, and make recommendations to the Council consistent with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan amendment schedule.
- B) Decline to consider the proposed amendment in 2016.
- C) Direct consideration of the proposal as part of a different process, instead of as part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Financial Impact:

Consideration of items 1, 2, 3, and 5 is within base budget. Consideration of item #4 warrants a broader consideration than one parcel situated between other parcels to the east and west that share the same Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning district classification. Therefore consideration

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

of item #4 may require additional resources.