

OLYMPIA WORKING GROUP SUMMARY PLANNING/DESIGN GUIDELINES

Date: July 19, 2021

Time: 7:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Attendees: Nathan Cherpeski, Tami Moody, Chase Andrizzi, Blake Thomas, Jonathan Bowers, Michael Maloy, Olympia Development Team

In this meeting, key issues discussed include level of service for roads when considering development applications, open space pro rata and pacing, open space allowed types, block lengths, and pacing of residential vs. commercial development.

It was brought up that in the current draft MDA, a phase of development may cause a road to go from the minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) of D to E as long as a traffic study shows a planned remedy by Olympia's buildout. The group discussed how to refine the language of the MDA to require a quicker remedy for LOS E while still allowing development to occur. Factors considered were 1) onsite versus offsite roads, 2) state- versus city-controlled roads, and 3) new versus existing roads. It was agreed that LOS E would not be acceptable for new, onsite roads. For offsite roads, an idea was to require a proportional amount of money paid to the City to offset costs for the City to upgrade or build a roadway (but not hold up Olympia if the City delays such an offsite project). For state roads, it was suggested to allow development if an improvement to the affected roadway is identified in an official UDOT plan inside a certain number of years. It was also mentioned that proportional offsite impacts may change as more development occurs. For example, on hypothetical Pod 1, impact on a given offsite road may only be 10% of overall traffic, but adding Pods 2-3 could total 30% impact, so that will have to be considered when drafting the agreement. Another factor is exogenous third-party variables, such as potential development of Kennecott property that causes a failing LOS through no fault of Olympia's. Those factors will all be further considered, and appropriate parameters will be proposed and analyzed in future meetings.

The required number of different housing types was discussed. In a previous meeting, a minimum quantity of single-family homes had been added to the required percentage of single-family versus multi-family residential units. It was requested that the number be removed and only the percentage be included, with flexibility as the reason, i.e. if the housing market near the end of the development was favorable to larger lots, the developer wouldn't be required to build a large amount of densely-placed single-family homes to fulfil a minimum quantity, as long as the minimum percentage was maintained. The development team noted they can negotiate the percentage with the city council.

Another discussion item was pro rata open space accounting. As Olympia building units are constructed, is it required that the developer include a proportional amount of open space that is

consistent with the overall 20% open space requirement. It was suggested that there be a 10% cushion within that proportional 20% requirement, i.e. one area can lag behind on open space by up to 10% of its requirement, as long as future areas make up for it. Any fluctuations beyond the 10% would be subject to approval by the Independent Review Committee (IRC). The IRC consists of five members: the City administrator, a neutral architect, a neutral land planner, a representative of the Architectural Review Committee, and a representative of the developer.

The group discussed land uses that are allowed to count as open space, stemming from a conversation during the recent Planning Commission meeting on July 15th. The Commission had questioned “farm or agricultural lands” and “landscape around private buildings” as meeting open space requirements. To improve clarity, definitions will be added to “farm or agricultural lands” to clarify the scope of that land use. It was also noted that a concern possibly exists in providing agricultural or farmland within Olympia that count toward open space, only to have that same land developed by future property owners. One remedy could be an overlay of the area to prohibit development. Development on such property would also be disallowed if it brought the overall open space percentage below the required 20%. “Landscape around private buildings” will be eliminated and considered to be included in the “restricted common areas for developments” use. “Landscape around commercial buildings” will be added. Schools are eliminated from the calculation for open space requirements, as are roadways. Public safety facilities will also be eliminated from the calculation.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had expressed a desire for a large park comparable to what was discussed with Salt Lake County. A 50-acre park had been proposed with the County but had been effectively swapped in discussions for the large trailhead on the southwest end of Olympia. The developer noted they were willing to discuss with Herriman City smaller park options (i.e. 4 or 5 acres), but felt a 50-acre park wasn’t as feasible on top of the trailhead. It was also noted that there are other large parks planned in the nearby area, including the Creek Ridge area park and a regional park in Kenecott property. The group felt a vision of the area’s larger context would help answer concerns about the lack of a very large 50-acre park within Olympia.

The group discussed block length as it relates to connectivity. The group considered whether the “connectivity preferences” table is too restrictive. They reviewed other residential and commercial area block lengths in other cities and agreed that some areas were desirable that had longer block lengths and/perimeters than is currently allowed in the design guidelines. It was noted that blocks can be broken up by roads on only one side of the street (not required to be both), which helps in areas with limiting topography. After the discussion, the group decided to leave the maximum block length numbers as they are, while proposing allowing alleyways to count as breaking up blocks. The matter will be discussed more in the work meeting with the Planning Commission on Wednesday.

The pacing of commercial versus residential development was briefly discussed—however, this is primarily an issue to be considered by the MDA working group. The City Council has made known its desire to ensure commercial areas are developed properly. It was noted that it’s difficult to

require a minimum quantity of commercial buildings as the development is constructed and ensure a measure of success. It was suggested to reserve certain areas (specifically the intersection of 12600 South and realigned U-111) for commercial-only uses. Previous agreements in other areas have used similar language to reserve the areas for a minimum number of years. The group noted it wants to ensure a long enough minimum time period to adequately attract commercial development. Another element the MDA group will consider with this matter is that some commercial areas are intended to be mixed-use land uses, so prohibiting residential completely wouldn't be feasible. Additionally, vertical mixed-use versus horizontal mixed-use will also have to be differentiated (as residential almost always precedes commercial in horizontal mixed-use areas). The matter will be considered in more depth in later meetings with the MDA group.

Lastly, the group discussed if sub-developers wish to not use the planned underground stormwater retention system, if those areas should count completely or partially toward open space requirements or should not count. That will be discussed in a future meeting in coordination with the infrastructure group.