

OLYMPIA WORKING GROUP SUMMARY PLANNING/DESIGN GUIDELINES

Date: June 14, 2021

Time: 9:00am – 12:00pm

Attendees: Clint Smith, Wendy Thomas, Tami Moody, Chase Andrizzi, Blake Thomas, Michael Maloy, Justun Edwards, Jonathan Bowers, Olympia Development Team

City staff members had been working on providing comments and any needed edits to the existing Olympia design guidelines PDF document approved by Salt Lake County. In this meeting, the working group together went through and, as necessary, discussed those comments, questions, and suggestions. Most of the PDF comments required very brief or no discussion, while a few others required more conversation.

There are several places in the document where items required County Administrator or County Council approval. The group is analyzing which of those items should be subject instead to the City's administrator, Planning Commission, and/or City Council.

There was a discussion about the development's 20% park/open space requirement, and how that will be required and enforced as the development is constructed. Overall, the development will have 20% park/open space, but it may make sense for some individual subdivisions to have more or less than 20% throughout the development's construction. City staff will work to formulate and propose a method to ensure open space needs are met throughout the project's development phases, possibly employing "catch-up" clauses or utilizing the proposed periodic "true up" period to include discussion for parks and open space. The group discussed excluding acreage used for infrastructure or schools in the overall calculation for the required 20% open space. This would not count entire school campuses as open space, but rather remove them from the equation. Another option is to count green areas within those campuses as open space. The group will continue discussing this as a method is proposed later.

Building height maximums were briefly discussed. In a previous meeting, listing maximums by stories rather than feet was generally preferred. Part of the reason is that the MDA gets complicated and convoluted when factoring in stories vs. feet vs. finished or established grade vs. established grade. Building architecture can be unintentionally negatively affected.

The group discussed clearly differentiating between decision levels for the City Council, Planning Commission, administrator, architectural review committee (ARC), and potentially an application review committee. The main purpose is to streamline the construction process for the project as much as possible by presenting only necessary items to the Planning Commission or City Council and administratively approve everything else. Some necessary PC/CC items could include compliance with the look and feel of the community, allocation of parks, connectivity of utilities,

and any material deviations from previously agreed items. The group discussed having a few different processes/methods for various application types—subdivision, single-family homes, multi-family/commercial, and anything else—and drafting those different types of processes/flowcharts in the MDA. Further work will be done to ensure the Planning Commission and City Council are properly consulted while making the process as efficient as possible. Possible members of the potential application review committee could be a licensed architect, a City representative, and a representative from the master developer.

Another discussion point was the idea of benchmarks or triggers to create job centers and other commercial areas as the project develops. There currently aren't drafted requirements about a minimum amount of commercial area that must go in, but the group agrees that commercial needs to happen. A challenge with this is that quality commercial depends on infrastructure being built (i.e. U-111 realignment intersecting with extended 12600 South) before commercial areas can survive, and those timelines can depend on the State or UDOT. The group will revisit this item.

The group had a conversation about transit. It's difficult to draft anything concrete regarding UTA transit as that is out of the City's control. However, the group wants to remain flexible for the possibility of future bus or train options, especially along 12600 South. It was noted the most likely nearby roads to see transit options in the future would be 12600 South, 11800 South (which doesn't involve Olympia), and 7300 West. The group discussed drafting a roadway cross section for a future 12600 South expansion to preserve lane usage for bus rapid transit or other options. Another complication is that 12600 South may become UDOT-controlled, so coordination will be required as time goes on and UTA plans are created.

The "Institutional" place type that was previously included has been removed. That included suggested areas for Utah State University and the Jordan School District. Those institutions are still planned to be a part of Olympia, but per state law, neither the developer nor the City can control where they are placed. Therefore, the specifics about the place type were removed, and the schools will be inserted when those locations are decided. In the case part of the designated acreage is not used, the rest of the project would be spread out to fill the vacant space, but without increasing the number of overall units.

A few pages regarding connectivity were reduced in an effort to simplify the document, and a concern was brought up that the simplification may unintentionally reduce goals of connectivity through Olympia. It is intended that sidewalks will be available on both sides of streets, blocks be walkable, and cul-de-sacs be discouraged to maximize connectivity throughout the project. Descriptions will be added back into the design standards document to reflect the intent.

Other brief points

- In the existing document, there was a limit on Olympia's commercial center place type to a maximum of 75 acres. That section will be eliminated.
- Homeowners or HOAs will be responsible for maintaining park strips along their property.

- Regarding fencing, standards will be set by subdivisions rather than for the entire project. This will allow fencing to match neighborhood architecture but still avoid an unappealing hodgepodge.
- Commercial design standards are being re-drafted. The developer felt the previous version was not flexible enough for the needs of the project area. However, the group will take care that the commercial areas will still require quality structures that respond well to the topography.
- A section about rooftop gardens will be removed. The existing document allows roof gardens to count toward landscape requirements. A narrative about the rooftop gardens may be added to the Sustainability section.
- An additional road cross section(s) will be drawn to reflect urban areas where park strips are not included, such as where tree wells are implanted in sidewalks. This is similar to the U-road around the city hall and Crane Park.
- Auto sales will be changed from a permitted use in commercial service land uses to conditional use because of the possibility of a conflict with the Auto Mall district.
- A definition will be added to restrict RV campgrounds to a specific short-term stay limit to avoid the area turning into a mobile home park.
- In some cases of limiting topographical situations, a one-way, one-sidewalk lane may be used with parking on one side of the street.
- Agricultural fields, gardens, and buildings, as well as institutional green areas, and how they count toward open space requirements, will be discussed at a later meeting. Included in those open space requirement calculations could be aspects of how appealing the given space is visually and its public accessibility.
- Per City requirements, secondary water infrastructure will be required for single-family areas with average lot sizes of 6,500+ square feet, and all open space/common areas for multi-family developments. This is applicable through areas as high as water pressure zone 4.
- Regarding setbacks, it was suggested to add language to help visually transition property in urban areas from fully public uses (i.e. sidewalk) to semi-public (front yard) to semi-private (fenced area within yard) to fully private (living space). This would help avoid sudden changes from fully private to fully public within one step. The current draft also increased setbacks in urban areas from the County-approved 0' to 4-6' to help in this regard.
- It was suggested to form standards to ensure some consistency for building forms (i.e. Victorian, traditional, modern, etc.) to avoid mixing items within the same building (i.e. a modern style garage door on a traditional style house). It was discussed to have these standards on a smaller or subdivision level (rather than whole development level) to establish consistency throughout neighborhoods but allow for variety for adjacent neighborhoods.
- Final notes on the design guidelines are due on Monday, June 21 to allow time for compilation by June 23 to be included in the July 1 Planning Commission packet.