

**OLYMPIA WORKING GROUP SUMMARY
PLANNING/DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Date: August 12, 2021

Time: 8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Attendees: Clint Smith, Nathan Cherpeski, Tami Moody, Wendy Thomas, Chase Andrizzi, Blake Thomas, Justun Edwards, Jonathan Bowers, Clint Spencer, Olympia Development Team

This meeting centered primarily on a discussion about parking requirements, then on infrastructure in the project’s early phase. In a previous meeting, the developer raised a concern that current City parking requirements seem to penalize single-family (SF) homes (4.25 required stalls) versus multi-family (MF) homes (2.75) that could otherwise be identical in size. The City has expressed a general desire for the building of SF homes over MF where possible in Olympia.

The developer stated they do not want a parking problem any more than the City does because it hurts the community product, but they also do not want to over-park Olympia. The group reviewed parking ordinances for comparable cities and communities and proposed the following tables for parking for both residential and commercial uses.

Residential Unit Type	Bedrooms	Total Parking Requirement Per Unit	Notes
Apartment/Condo	1	1.5	
	2	2	
	3+	2.5	
Townhome		2.5 + .25 offsite guest	1 car garage required. 1.5 additional stalls required from table A options. 2-car garage + 2-car driveway exempt from offsite .25 guest
Single-family		3	2 car garage required. Front-load with required setback will have 4. Rear/alley-load third stall from table A options.

<p>Table A Driveway: 1 stall Parking lot: 1 stall On-street: 1 stall</p>
--

Throughout the residential parking discussion, the group brought up the following points:

- Single-family homes shouldn't have a fractional requirement (as is required in existing City code) because a quarter of a parking stall is impossible to build when a property owner wishes to build only one home on a single lot. On the other hand, multi-family homes are always built several at a time, so a fractional parking requirement is doable.
- Rear/alley load homes will not have a full driveway (only a 3' apron driveway) and will use on-street parking or a parking lot stall to satisfy the third space requirement.
- The parking table includes visitor parking stalls.
- On-street parking can be accommodated by bulb-out sections to provide "protected" parking spaces while allowing for snowplows to clear the street in the winter. Most neighborhood roads where on-street parking would occur will be private roads. There may be parking allowed on the spine road, which will be a public right of way.

The commercial use table below only refers to requirements that would differ from existing City ordinance. The proposal for commercial uses was based on feedback from current business owners in the respective industries.

Commercial Use	Stalls Per	Net Square Feet
Office	4	1000
Fast food	7	1000
Restaurant	10	1000
Shopping center	4	1000

The group suggested that the Design Standards can include a caveat that applications for 1) one-off uses not identified in the document or 2) deviations from the requirement should include a parking study to justify any changes. Any changes more than 10% over or under the parking requirement would come to the Planning Commission, while adjustments within the 10% buffer could be addressed by City staff.

It was also suggested to consider alternate uses for very large parking lots that are infrequently used at their full capacity, such as stadiums or retail shopping. The group noted some areas throughout the country that use grass fields that are protected by grids that can hold vehicles' weight but are usable for recreation when they're not actively used for parking.

The group then discussed transportation infrastructure, starting with conversation about the City's ~\$10.5 million transportation bond that had parameters approved the previous night at the City Council meeting. The group again discussed the high priority of the construction of 6400 West connections. Though the exact priority list and budget for the bond have not yet been solidified, it has been anticipated that Herriman Main Street improvements will take a significant portion of the bond funds. It was suggested to combine the City's and Olympia's voices and try to work with Salt Lake County to fund the Main Street improvements to free up bond funds for other projects on the bond's proposed priority list. It was suggested that the County will have significant interest

in improving Main Street as it is a main corridor that leads to the Olympia project's trailhead—an amenity favored by the County. It was also suggested that County funds may be interested in funding water line construction alongside Main Street improvements to help enhance the trailhead. The City does have other needs and obligations that need to be addressed with the bond money, including possibly the improvement of failing road conditions on existing City streets. The City and developer will work to engage with the County regarding potential funding for Main Street.

It was noted that there are two things the group needs to figure out funding for as Olympia looks toward a public infrastructure district (PID): 1) what City funds are available for its portion of 6400 West through Creek Ridge, and 2) City funds availability for its portion to upsize the first water tank from 1 million gallons to 2.5 million gallons. The group will work on analyzing any available funding or reimbursement options and discuss in coming meetings.