

**City of Sumner**

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**October 5, 2000**

Members present: Livingston, Nalder, Walker, Lovgren

Members absent: Myers, Richardson, Smith

Also present: Ryan Windish, Senior Planner  
Leonard Bauer, Director

**CALL TO ORDER**

WALKER called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

WALKER stated there were some corrections on the minutes.

LIVINGSTON indicated on page 3 of the handout the comment that reads "Smith stated that he would like to set a time frame which the Commission could revisit the issue," should be revised to state "LIVINGSTON." Page 4, top third about Smith indicating that this is looked at again in the future - not sure if that was Tim or himself. Give that to Tim.

WINDISH got a phone call from Tim and he had some concerns. The reason there is some confusion is because Christina transcribed the minutes off the tape. She was not at the meeting. She was having troubles distinguishing the two voices. He expected some corrections.

LIVINGSTON indicated on page 6 we had two Smith comments at the bottom and those should actually be "LIVINGSTON." On page 7, "Livingston seconded the motion." Should read "Smith seconded the motion." Finally, "Smith questioned whether the ..." should be "Livingston."

WALKER was present for the meeting but she believes the wording got a little mixed up on a couple of things. On page 3 in the paragraph "Appearing was John Schmidt," third to the last sentence, "It will also enable the citizens to park in front of their houses, which is very important and it will sort of the needs" - Maybe it should read "sort out the needs." Page 8 "BAUER stated that what was discussed tonight would be on the upcoming Monday nights agenda, but besides that it knows of nothing....." This should be "he" knows nothing.

LOVGREN moved to approve the minutes as corrected. WALKER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

WALKER asks the audience for comments on any item not on the agenda.

BARBARA KECK. Address is 816 Kincaid Avenue. She is not sure if this is on the agenda and wants to know if it's on the agenda. She wants to know if we are going to be addressing the two hour parking possibilities on Kincaid and Cherry Street. She wants to know what the proposal is for the parking around

the train station, including Cherry and Kincaid. Seems like there might have been something in your last meeting notes. Could you clarify what the proposed parking situation is.

WALKER was not present.

LOVGREN stated that Council decided.

BAUER stated that Council did approve the recommendation.

KECK asked that the recommendation be clarified.

BAUER used the map to explain. The streets affected would be one block of Maple, Cherry and Kincaid, Academy, and one more block of Kincaid. It would be a two-hour parking limit on those streets. Same as we have on Main Street and Alder Street already on weekdays. 7:00 to 6:30. Actually about 9:00 to 6:00. That would be weekdays only just on those streets. There were signs to be posted in the alley behind the woodworking store and posted at that bank.

KECK asked what the purpose of the 2-hour parking would be.

BAUER stated the main purpose was that there were a couple of meetings that the Planning Commission had discussing the station area and the people who were present had asked that some parking patrol be in that area. Points out streets on a map. Those streets are actually closer to the station platform than the southern end of the parking lot is. Those streets were getting parked up before the parking lot by the commuters using the train.

KECK missed the last meeting but she was present for the other meetings. She feels like she missed an important meeting. What she is hearing is the purpose for the two-hour parking is to keep the commuters from being able to park on those streets.

BAUER stated yes - being able to park all day on those streets.

KECK asked about the residents. Are the residents going to be receiving permits so that they can park on those streets, because that leaves less parking for the commuters anyway?

BAUER stated she was correct. The way it was passed was there is no permit system except for those residents who absolutely have no off-street parking. No driveway or garage at all. There is an ability in the current code for the police chief to give permits to those folks who don't have any parking whatsoever. That's the way it reads right now.

KECK asked what can the citizens now do about that because she has talked to several people that live in the Seattle area and they get permits so that they can park where they have been parking for the past 10 to 20 years. She doesn't understand why Sumner cannot do the same.

BAUER stated that was an option that was presented at the earlier meeting when the citizens were there. This program was initiated by the citizens of the neighborhood through a petition. If they have more than 60% of the parking on their street or block being taken up by nonresidents. There has to be a problem first. If there is a demonstrated problem then the resident could sign a petition and the council could consider a permit system. The catch 22 is that with this passed it will be difficult to demonstrate a problem because if the 2-hour parking signs up and assuming people are abiding by those - you may not ever get to that point where you have 60% of nonresident parking on the street. Your options are to ask council to reconsider and then if it does get to the point where it's a problem, then you do the petition.

KECK said that it feels like the council didn't take into consideration the resident's feelings on this. We can get a petition and go back and ask the council to reconsider this permit situation?

BAUER stated that is an option she has. Reminds her that the initiation of this whole thing was at the request of some of the citizens who live on these streets. There is always a split opinion.

KECK stated that the residents did want restricted parking but thought they were going to be given some priority to that parking first. She only missed the last meeting and sitting there she never heard that they were not going to be able to park on their street if they were a resident and had vehicles. Some of the residents have been there 10, 20 years and some longer. She asked whether there will be a meter maid to monitor the situation. She has had a business in Sumner for eight years and a few times after a public meeting when one complains about parking, then they will send a police officer out and have them monitor and mark tires. Honestly, it has happened twice and it has been the day after we have had a meeting here in City Hall.

BAUER said the police chief has requested a meter maid in the budget process for the last two or three years. He is requesting one again. He is not sure if the funding is there for that position or if that will be the Council's decision.

KECK stated that people know they are not monitored and they are ignored now. Its like putting them up in front of our houses, not letting us park there, and then having it not be monitored. It doesn't seem like it's going to work really well.

LOVGREN is concerned because she doesn't remember hearing anything that said that the only way that the residents could get permits is if they didn't have off-street parking. She does not remember hearing that little detail anywhere.

KECK stated we need to go back and look at the notes.

NALDER refers to page 3.

LOVGREN refers to minutes. At no time was this stated they could only do this if they could show just cause if they didn't have off-street parking.

NALDER asks where the motion was.

BAUER stated that the minutes reflected he did say that. The motion that was passed did not include that comment or that change to the original proposal. At City Council there was a lot of discussion about this very issue and it was a very conscious decision to do it this way. In fact, one of the council members voted against it for the very reason you are bringing it up. It certainly was not an unknown thing when the Council passed it.

KECK asked whom they thought was going to take advantage of the two hour parking that on those streets. If it's not for the residents and its not for the commuters, then who is going to be taking advantage of that parking? Do we just want to have empty streets?

BAUER stated that part of the discussion related to the 2-hour parking to the north that is primarily for businesses. It appears that the businesses would be losing parking. It was thought there may be an overflow of downtown or business parking down into this area as well and that two hours would allow shoppers/customers, but it would still discourage the commuters.

KECK hopes there is that much traffic flowing through downtown Sumner with customers. But for customers to do the whole town, they need more than two hours and that is something that the

businesses have talked about. For them to come through and do all the little shops, have lunch, and to really have a day - typically most people are in town longer than two hours unless it's the locals who are here all the time. She is referring to the out-of-towners that come for the day. She asked if the minutes were available for other people.

BAUER states they are on the web site after they are approved.

KECK stated she did find the web site and marked it.

BAUER stated that they will be put on as soon as the web master can do that. Within a few days. City Council minutes are always on there too after they are approved.

NALDER refers to Kandi's motion in the minutes. Page 7 - it has Smith seconding the motion, but there is no motion.

LIVINGSTON stated that if you go to page 6 - Smith made a motion, which is actually "Livingston" made a motion. That was when he mentioned the sunset clause. From his perspective he wanted to put in a time limit to renew this and to look back at this again after one year to see what would happen. It was more of an urgency to do something now as the station opened, as opposed to waiting two weeks, one month, two months down the road.

WALKER stated she thought someone stated that Kandi had made the motion.

NALDER said she made the motion to have it to go to City Council. He does not see it in the minutes.

WALKER said the only motion was the one that Keith just pointed out on page 6.

NALDER said he had a motion to accept some of staff's comments.

LIVINGSTON stated that was the input we had collected during the session. We had fussed around with the boundaries.

NALDER asked if they were referring to the big motion with all the streets. It doesn't seem to be in the minutes.

WINDISH asked who made the motion to move it to counsel.

NALDER thought it was Kandi.

LOVGREN stated that she thought she had made a motion to have it moved to Council with all of their comments included.

NALDER doesn't find that in any of the minutes. That's what he was looking for.

LOVGREN was concerned about the motion. She wanted to make sure that Academy was included.

NALDER referred to that one street that was under construction that was not included.

BAUER asked if they would rather rescind the action of approving the minutes until he goes back and look at the tape.

LOVGREN moved to rescind the last motion to include the minutes of September 7th. WALKER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WALKER asks for any other public comments.

ROBERT C. SECHRIST (spelling?) of 11090 Witch Lake Road, Port Orchard, Washington. He and his wife have a small business just north of the terminal on Cherry Street and their concern was the parking arrangement they had prior to this no parking zone in the alley way between the building and the railroad tracks. From what he understands, now there is no parking there and the signs have been placed denoting that fact. The no parking signs the City has placed is now on railroad right-of-way. He worked for the railroad but he won't make determinations as to where to put the signs. He is curious why are 6 ½ feet wide dumpsters are permitted, but their vehicles, which are only about 6 feet wide, are not. They only have a 10-foot alley easement. Fire codes state they need at least 14 feet for fire access. We only have 10 unless we use more feet of the railroad access. There is some kind of hearsay agreement with the railroads that we are allowed to use that part of their graveled off area for access. There is 40 feet from the building to rail so the 25 foot and 10 foot zone do exist. He is curious why they are not allowed to park parallel to the buildings as long as they don't obstruct access to the buildings.

WINDISH responded by stating they he has been working with Mr. Sechrist and his wife, Lynnae, on the parking issue behind the businesses along that alley. It is posted right now "No Parking." Legally there is the railroad right-of-way and then there is a 10-foot alley and it's illegal to park in the alley. It was posted as such to keep commuters from clogging up that alley and it obviously limits parking options from employees for those businesses and their customers. He talked with the chief of police and Leonard about the signage back there and one alternative would be to note that area as a loading zone and put "Loading Zone" signs up there. That way if you're a business you can park there, but obviously commuters will know that it's a loading zone and they cannot park there. He understands it was the intention to put "Loading Zone" signs so that employees could park there.

SECHRIST states there are "No Parking" signs there now.

WINDISH states that we need to get some "Loading Zone" signs up there. The food bank actually has a "Loading Zone" sign and they park their van in front of the dumpster being referred to.

SECHRIST stated there are three dumpsters servicing the three different businesses.

WINDISH states there is room in the alley. To allow a loading zone type of parking situation is not going to obstruct the movement of traffic up and down the alley or interfere with the railroad. The idea was to keep that area from being taken advantage of and being clogged up by commuters.

MYERS asked how long it would take for the loading zone signs to be put up.

WINDISH does not know.

MYERS asked if it had to be approved by the Council.

WINDISH stated that it already has been approved by the Council.

BAUER stated that is what was approved and apparently the signs that were put up when the street crews went out were actually just "No Parking." They did not say "Loading Zone." We need to get that corrected. What was actually approved was the loading zone designation.

LOVGREN asks if employees parking there in the mean time will run the risk of being ticketed.

BAUER said they could talk to the Chief about that. They already discussed this with him and he was in favor of the loading zone. The advantage to that is that the loading zone enforcement is really at the request of the business. The police will come and enforce that if its being blocked. It would not affect that businesses use.

SECHRIST stated that the City signs for no parking were placed 10 feet into the railroad's right-of-way. Also there is a trainman out there right now coordinating the RTA terminal with other train and road traffic for safety reasons and he is a flagman. He was actually going to be cited by the City police for parking his vehicle on railroad property as a worker and he had provided multiple proof, including the fact that he was using a radio to communicate with train service as to who he was. He found it rather humorous that he had to go that far.

WINDISH asked if it was a private vehicle or if it was marked.

SECHRIST stated that they use private vehicles and they travel to different locations to do flagging.

WINDISH stated it was unfortunate they he had to go to the degree he did to prove who he was. The police chief did tell him they have permission from Burlington Northern to enforce keeping people out of their easement.

SECHRIST said he will speak to the road master about it, Brian Hipple, and see if the railroad can put up some of their own "No Trespassing" signs to assist. He was just wondering about the alley right-of-way because it was so wide. Couldn't there be some kind of variance or conditions made? They do have quite limited parking in there. They try to provide as much use of the roadway for the hair salon so they park behind the building. There is just no place to park. Now with the RTA terminal coming in we have even less. Instead of actually enhancing business, it is going to be a detriment.

BAUER explained that the railroad is private property but the remaining part is only 10 feet wide. Technically any parking there would block their right-of-way altogether. The legal portion of the right-of-way. It will shift to a loading zone when the business requests it. This should allow the business to have vehicles there at their own discretion behind their building.

SECHRIST stated he found it kind of humorous that the vehicles were not allowed to park there but the dumpsters which are wider than their vehicles were allowed. He provided a few copies of a letter typed up by his wife.

LOVGREN asked when they can expect something to be done about that. How long before they have the no loading zone?

BAUER stated it depends on if they have any signs in stock right now. If they have to order them it will be a week or two before the signs actually arrive. He stated he will talk to them tomorrow about it.

LOVGREN asked that if they do get a ticket - Can they bring it and in and it will be taken care of?

BAUER said they will be glad to do that if they come into the police. If it does happen, then they should come in and talk to them. They have talked to the Chief already about this and he has agreed. He cannot guarantee the person at the counter will understand that right away.

JOHN SCHMIDT of 908 Cherry Avenue discussed that the southern end of the alley is not safe for even parallel parking. You can see big tire tracks where the tires wrap around the corner right up against the power pole and shrubs. He attends the public meetings and he is not opposed to parking in the alley as long as they get far enough so they don't block loading doors and fire exits. The dumpsters that are behind his building could be laid sideways and he can rotate them so they are not sticking out. He does

not think there is safe parking until you get up to the north end of his building. They need a decent access for fire trucks. Fire trucks are big trucks. The south end is improbable until you get up near his dumpsters. He could lay those sideways if somebody wants them laid sideways.

WINDISH stated it sounds like we should have "No Parking" for a portion of that stretch on the south side.

SCHMIDT doesn't think it is probable to safely park without being in the way of fire trucks and big semi-trucks. There is room for one car behind his building up towards the north end. There is a series where you can get half a dozen more vehicles behind the parking lot. You can post it "loading zone" so it will let the food bank or other people flow back and forth. He thinks they need to look at that alley.

LIVINGSTON asks if anything was being done with the station plan on the side of Mr. Schmidt's building with regards to a sidewalk. Will that intersection get built with more curbing, etc., and wrap around the end of Mr. Schmidt's building?

BAUER said he did not believe there will be any more work for that point.

KECK reappeared with a question about the discrepancies on what the minutes really should have been and what was really said. She thought the residents were still going to be able to park on the street.

BAUER said it would be up to the Council if they want to reconsider. They could do that at a Planning Commission's suggestion or citizen's suggestion. The Sunset Clause specifically says that it would sunset in a year or Council could choose to revisit it earlier.

LOVGREN wants to have a workshop on this in the beginning of November. She believes these issues can be addressed again with input from the Planning Commission.

KECK said one resident went to the police department. The resident was asked if they had a garage somewhere on their property. They have two vehicles and would have to constantly move their cars back and forth. These are older buildings and homes and most of them have only a one car garage off the alley. Her opinion is that the residents feelings did not matter.

LOVGREN stated she used to lived next-door to Keck. She never used her garage for parking.

KECK stated she uses her garage for other purposes. She will be at the meeting in November.

SECHRIST said he believes the people of Sumner are being railroaded. He has worked for the railroad for almost 30 years and he knows how they work. What are you going to do during the holiday season when each home has 10 or 15 vehicles drive up? You also have a flooded RTA terminal with an overabundance of parking. Where are the people going to go? Is the police chief going to go and start handing out tickets?

WALKER asked if this matter would be reviewed monthly.

BAUER said it was Kandi who wanted to revisit this in November. His suggestion was that there would be a station area plan discussion at every meeting monthly until its done and so it could be revisited at any time. He wanted to re-emphasize that this whole thing came from citizens in the neighborhood. There were some citizens who were very happy with this proposal and then created this proposal. They were very clear several times that there were two options. One was a permit system that could be put in place only after a problem occurred. That was not felt to be a good solution because we had to wait for a problem to occur under the ordinance before the issue could be brought forward. The other option was to take action immediately before the station opened with a time limit parking, which was the option that was chosen ultimately. Those were the two clear options that were presented throughout the process. 30 to 40

people at a couple of the meetings very strongly favored the time limit. There are some split opinions within the neighborhood.

LIVINGSTON stated his personal perspective of the meetings. It seemed that the most adamant vocal position was that something needed to be done "now" as opposed to "later". He knows that Sound Transit officials have been telling people that even though the signs were not up at the time, don't get into the habit of parking off the parking lot because that will be restricted parking. Sound Transit is also trying to do their part to alert the commuters about the parking situation.

JOHN SCHMIDT wanted to make one more comment. He has been an advocate through the Promotion Association to get a short term parking plan for the City, not just the train area. He wants to know what is going to be done for the mid-term plan, 24 to 48 months. What are we going to do for the long term? A parking problem exists. There are 400 riders a day. We are burgeoning at the seams. We need to get together as a team and start figuring out the plan.

LOVGREN asked Bauer if it is impossible for them to have a permit system in place in the two hour parking zone.

BAUER stated that was the other option that was presented. The way the ordinance was written was that in order to implement that system there has to be a problem to the extent that 60% of the parking is being occupied regularly by non-residents.

LOVGREN stated that the ordinance was written to address the situation around the high school.

BAUER stated that when that ordinance was adopted it was assumed that the station area would eventually have the same problem.

LOVGREN stated that people shouldn't have to wait for a problem to exist. Can we write another ordinance for that particular area?

BAUER said that was a possibility and the Planning Commission could recommend that to the Council at any time.

LOVGREN asked to have something drafted to look at as a possibility for November. Residential parking permits that don't say it has to be limited to people that only have off-street parking.

BAUER said that the permit portion of it would be very similar to what we have at the high school now and the area around the high school. The permit completely exempts you from the time limits.

LOVGREN asked if she can just make a suggestion or does she need to make a motion?

BAUER said it could be by her suggestion. A motion would have to be made to adopt it.

WALKER asks for any further public comments.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

WALKER moves on to new business with the public hearing on the zoning text amendment for the pre-existing vehicle and RV sales.

WINDISH presented the summarized staff report on this request. This request first came before them in the form of a Comprehensive Plan amendment during the last round of amendments. The Sumner RV Center wanted to have some property that had been zoned from commercial to residential through the 1994 Comprehensive Plan process. They requested that it be rezoned to commercial. The Planning Commission recommended denial when they heard the request. City Council voted denial, but they directed staff to look at some other options that would allow them to operate their business and also use the residential zoned property for the business they have ongoing right now and also for the future expansions if needed. One of the options proposed by staff was to allow pre-existing RV sales businesses in residential zones to remain as a permitted outright use. A permitted outright use is different from a nonconforming use. Nonconforming uses have certain restrictions on their expansion. It is not a favorable designation as outright permitted would be. One of the concerns of the RV center was they might lose their dealership license through the Department of Licensing. That was one of the main reasons for their request for the property to be rezoned to commercial. The amendment would allow pre-existing vehicular and recreational vehicle sales and rental businesses to remain as specified existing uses in all the residential zones. This proposal has a pre-existing commercial use. This would limit that use from turning into anything else. A rezone to general commercial would have more of an impact to single-family residential zoning than just allowing a vehicular sales business to continue. If you go through any zone in our Code you'll find that single-family homes are allowed pre-existing uses. The idea is that you are not basically zoning someone out of a house. In this request, you would be zoning someone out of business in some respects. You allow those homes to be pre-existing and outright permitted in an industrial zone and a commercial zone. The downside to this request is that you will have a residentially zoned piece of property that has little potential for redevelopment. Any expansion that required a building permit would trigger a condition that they would have to construct a 10-foot landscape buffer between their commercial operation and adjacent residential properties. He referred to a comment letter from the RV center's attorney, Darcy Luxenburg. She requested that the statement describing the use be extended to include any successors on that location. Her fear was that if the owners of existing businesses decided to sell, she was afraid it was not clear enough if they could continue to operate. The Code implies that a lawfully existing use would be able to continue. She requested to add some language. For clarification, the additional language would be required.

LOVGREN says she understands that this will act as a general commercial zone even though it is still LDR. Her concern is all the new homes going in over at Creekside [south of the Sumner RV property] and where they would expand to would be the south side of Salmon Creek, which would be right up against all those brand-new homes. She does not feel that a 6-foot fence and a 10-foot landscape buffer are sufficient to shield those people from that zone. We are treating it like it is general commercial, but it is not general commercial. We specified that we do not want it to be general commercial and the Council specified this also. She wants to know why it is being treated as general commercial. She does not find this to be sufficient.

WINDISH states that the option is wide open. If she feels like it needs to be 20 feet, 6 foot fence, and landscaping standards. It is wide open. This is just a suggestion/proposed ordinance. In order to make this thing work and not impact local residents then the standards can be increased. Something can be brought back to the Commission. He asked the Commission to direct some specifics.

WALKER asks if they decided they were just going to expand their storage lot and south Salmon Creek they just gravel it and fence it and store their trailers there, she wants to know if that is going to require a building permit. Is this going to require them to put in a landscape buffer?

WINDISH said it does not require a building permit. He stated he could look into that and see what other permits could be put in that would raise the threshold.

NALDER said this special provision should be open to all the businesses that qualify.

WINDISH asked if this refers to all businesses now zoned residential? Would they be allowed as pre-existing uses?

NALDER says yes if they were pre-existing uses.

WALKER opens the public comment portion of the hearing. Requests for comments.

WILLIAM CAROL of 6501 151st Street says he cannot see why the Commission is so concerned about the future homes that are being built when you have a business in Sumner that has been there for many years. Why are you worried about the new homes when the business is trying to build itself up in the City of Sumner. He doesn't understand what the buffer has to do with these future homes. Why can't the business do what they want to do?

LOVGREN says the reason she is concerned about it is because that use does not exist right now. Those homes and those people are going to move in there not knowing that they are putting forth something that could be detrimental to their living environment. She feels they are acting improperly to create something that is going to affect their future property values.

CAROL asks why the contractor can't build the buffer on his side of the area where they are going to expand to.

LOVGREN stated that the builder has already been through the process and his permitted and he is already vested in everything that he is doing.

WALKER said that when you are building a residence next to a commercial use it is not necessarily detrimental for that commercial use. However, if you build commercial next to residential, it could be detrimental. She asked for any further comments on this issue. She closed the public comment portion.

LOVGREN moved that Ryan Windish double check the definitions as requested. Also find out more about what possible building permit triggers that we can have and what greater protections for the homes that will be an LDR-1 zone that we can provide. Livingston seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

WALKER asks if the public hearing needs to be continued until the next meeting.

BAUER said we could just close the public hearing.

WALKER says they will move on to the station area plan land use issues.

BAUER refers to handouts and points out the large scale map. There have been extensive discussions at the meeting before last and a work session where they divided into two groups. A parking group and a land use portion. He referred to the handouts he got off a Puget Sound Regional Council web site. There are three aspects to transit station communities. One is parking and access management. Pedestrian friendly land use design, and then compact mixed-use development. That is really the one he would like to concentrate on tonight. Parking and land use are completely interrelated. The map is the essentially the center of town. It really is a central point of Sumner and the center of activity in Sumner. The map he refers to shows the Comprehensive Plan currently in Sumner around the station and points out the different density zones. There is a good mix of zones around the station. Establishment of employment base. Promote pedestrian uses and protect the historic character. We are doing well in terms of the base we have to work from for land use in the station area. He refers to another handout - table of station area plan selected zoning features. He just went through the zoning code. He would like to do a visioning exercise/discussion on what they see as possibly still needing despite the good base for station area planning. Are there some things we can do for land use that could fit into Sumner and keep the character of the community and yet provide for support of transit station and really make this the center of Sumner.

He referred to a list created at a previous work session on some suggestions that were provided that night. This may be a good place to start. Wants there to be discussion on where they want to see this area go and whether there are opportunities.

LIVINGSTON said he has been taking the train for three weeks and he has been walking from the station to his house. As far as traffic patterns go, everything is fair game. He sees all the roads being used as the station empties out. Another frustration was that nothing is open this time of the day. Something needs to be created that meets the needs of the commuters from a business perspective. He is not sure how to do this. He is not sure what they need to provide the business community in order for them to be successful at the same time meeting the needs of the residents.

BAUER says it sounds like he is envisioning possibly a restaurant or grocery store that would be open a little bit later.

LIVINGSTON says there are a lot of people waiting to pick up people. He always sees people waiting there. There is the potential to capture some of those dollars.

LOVGREN says that the Red Apple is not going to be a permanent fixture.

BAUER says that the City owns the property. Red Apple is a tenant of the City.

LOVGREN would like to see a really nice grocery store stay in the downtown area. This would service people who are getting off the train that want to stop at the grocery on the way home. This would be an ideal thing for them.

WINDISH suggests something with small square footage that offers certain things, but still provide local shopping.

LOVGREN wants it to stay more affordable for the elderly people living in this area who walk to that store. There is a very large elderly population in Sumner.

LIVINGSTON says there is a difference between commuters who ride the train and those who ride the Metro. The cars in the parking lots at the rail station are on average more expensive than you see at the Federal Way Park-N-Ride. You'll see a different type of commuter. There is more disposable income from these commuters. The cost of riding the train is significantly higher than the bus. There is more of a discretionary income. People are more willing to pay for that convenience. There needs to be a balance between serving the community and serve this new market that we will be developing over the next couple of years.

WINDISH says that the flip side of the commuter equation is that the station is also going to be a bus transit stop all day long. Any business located there would definitely put that into the equation.

LOVGREN asked Bauer about the "n/a" under MDR for Accessory Dwelling unit.

BAUER defined an ADU. They have a whole series of criteria that they have to meet. They have to be fairly small. An MDR you can put a second unit really any size as long as it fits on the lot. He put "n/a" because it was a little different situation.

LOVGREN said she wants to take it one step at a time. She doesn't want to start re-zoning things and then not need it. She thinks it should be looked at when a quality construction piece needs the zoning.

WINDISH explains LDR zones. As a developer or property owner who has property that is LDR 8.5 and would like it rezoned to LDR 7.2 without going through an entire year long Comprehensive Plan

amendment process - you can take that forward as a rezone and go through your normal hearing process. It has to go all the way to Council but it is shorter and more immediate. Things would be a little more gradual.

LOVGREN says that doing something like that there would give an opportunity to put the screws on the design guidelines and be a little more specific about what they are looking for in doing something like that. If you just have the zoning in place just outright without some kind of a difficulty in getting there, then it just becomes automatic. If you don't have things tight enough, then you get something that you don't really want. She doesn't want to compromise the integrity of that neighborhood.

WINDISH said that requiring an additional rezone process before you can proceed with the development will provide that level of difficulty that she is looking for. The developer is going to have to decide if they want to go down that path or do they want to look elsewhere. If the market is really there and they are willing to work with the City and take the risk, then they will go forward.

LOVGREN says that they could really make it attractive for the City.

BAUER says the design guidelines have different types of developments that are judged by different criteria. You can attach something more stringent to that proposal than otherwise would be and we could choose which design guidelines would apply to something like that.

LIVINGSTON says from the Northwest perspective, the concept of mass transit is still a little bit new and we are not sure if this is really going to take off or is it going to sputter after mixed results about the commuter rail ridership.

WALKER says she is really pleased with the direction that this discussion is taking. There is only a handful of people pushing to consider the higher density. We have not really had the residents come and say there needs to be high density. She does not want to see the sentiments of a few people and articles be the driving factor between making drastic changes.

WINDISH says that between 10 and 20 units per acre is used to look at supporting transit around transit bus stations and light rail as well as commuter rail.

WALKER said it wasn't until they were committed to the construction that we started talking about having high density in this area to support it. None of that was brought up when the whole idea was discussed originally.

WINDISH said he was not trying to promote higher density. He was just trying to give her a figure to have in her mind.

LIVINGSTON says they saw a lot of very appealing developments on their trip to Portland. We could all picture those in this community, but he doesn't think we have the dollars out there yet to support this. Developers won't want to spend that kind of money in this market.

BAUER said that Portland had \$150,000 to \$300,000 condominiums built along the light rail and that is definitely not the Sumner market.

LIVINGSTON likes the concept of incrementally building. On the Portland trip they saw how the City worked with the developers to guide how they wanted the area developed. We can do the same thing.

WALKER asked if there were any more questions.

BAUER said it was clear that an incremental approach is a good one, especially the residential side of things. Not a lot of zone changing, but providing policy language that allow for that later when the market is there. Try to encourage the kinds of commercial uses close to the station that will serve the typical commuter and community in this area (take-out and restaurants). Something that provides a little more activity in the evenings in the area.

LIVINGSTON refers to the Portland trip and how much activity and density exists along that light rail line of theirs. It is a different scenario with our situation, but he thinks it does hold some promise for what could be for this community. We need to come up with some ideas on how we should proceed with the parking issues? He is not sure how to go about it but it obviously will need to be addressed.

BAUER said the intent of tonight was partly to get a little more focused on where the land uses are going. In order to do a parking analysis for the future, you need to know where the land uses are going in the future. To get an idea where the Commission feels we should be going with land use - this has been extremely helpful and basically this is saying no real big changes. Lets do small changes as we go along. It is much easier to project parking needs. Before tonight we didn't really have any idea if we were talking about some sort of major wholesale zone changes or if we were talking about smaller incremental kinds of changes. This helps with doing more parking analysis. The intention he has right now on the parking issue is to schedule a meeting with the Puget Sound Regional Council with a parking expert who has worked in the Seattle area and other communities around the country with train stations that have been in existence for some time. We also have the downtown parking study that we did five years ago that we definitely need to update. If we can get some expertise and funding behind that then we can really do a good comprehensive parking study.

LIVINGSTON said he advocates strongly for this. Five years ago, downtown was drastically different.

BAUER said that the situation has certainly changed and most of the recommendations from that study have been carried out.

WINDISH said that another thing that needs to be looked at is a market analysis. Look at business potential and types of mixes of businesses, who is the customer and who is the commuter.

BAUER said that was something else they were working out with the Council to possibly get some funding that type of market analysis.

JOHN SCHMIDT added a comment. In the City file there is an analysis of what happened in Chicago and its outlying communities. It lists in there the top 15 or 20 businesses that succeed within a half-mile circumference of train stations. He has a copy of it somewhere in his files. He likes the comments about going slow and moving carefully. The studies will show you that you don't capture very much from the going-home crowd. You capture it in the morning with newspapers and coffee, etc. When they get home, 80% of them are in a rush to get home unless they need a gallon of milk. A business person would be kind of foolish to put a significant investment into some of those businesses right now.

SECHRIST reappeared to state his idea to make a multilevel unit. First level with convenience stores. The railroad has expressed to him 13 trains a day within five years. That is a lot of commuters. If you look at the bus terminal in Tacoma, they have built the first phase. Before it got completely full, they are now almost complete with the second phase. They have the train service, bus service, and they also have retail service right in front of the terminal - Freighthouse Square. He thinks they should look at multilevel and not worry about what you have today. By the time you get finished it is going to be so far out of date.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

## COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

LIVINGSTON says it seems that everyone is very enthusiastic about the train. Overall it has been a positive experience.

## STAFF COMMENTS

WINDISH introduced the new minutes taker - Lori McNett. She is temporarily replacing Christina who is due to have her baby in three weeks. He attended a meeting last Friday with the Puget Sound Regional Council. They are making themselves available as a resource for helping different communities look at planning around their station areas. It was a real opportunity to hear what they are working on. Some are a lot larger scale than what we will see in Sumner, but they have some of the same problems and issues. We are going to meet every couple of months. He thinks it will be good resource to make contacts. He invites the Commission to attend any of the meetings. Just let him know.

BAUER said the new Associate Planner, Ron Buckholt, is starting Monday. He has been in a similar position in the City of Bonney Lake. He is very experienced at permitting activities and Planning Commission type work. We are really glad to see him. We will be glad to be back at full staff. He also wanted to give an update on the East Sumner Neighborhood plan activities. There was an open house a couple of weeks ago. About 25 people signed in but there was closer to 40 or 45 total. They did take a written survey about the three options that are still being considered. The overwhelming favorite was the one that had the "Main Street". This is scheduled for a City Council work session on October 23rd. The City Hall expansion to the east went out to bid a few weeks ago and it was awarded to Father & Sons Construction. They will be starting within just a few weeks. A good nine months or more process to get the east wing built. They will tear down the back half of the building and then do some remodeling upstairs in the administration area.

WALKER said she wanted to clarify the meeting in November regarding the parking issue. Is it going to be at our November regular meeting or will it be a separate meeting?

BAUER said it was going to be at the regular meeting. We can have an extra meeting if you want to do that.

NALDER asked if there was going to be some information from Sound Transit and the police department, if there are problems.

WINDISH said at the next meeting he would like to bring the Comprehensive Plan amendments. There are two of them. He needs to get a staff report together by the first of November.

WALKER asked if they want to have a separate meeting. It will be a lengthy discussion.

BAUER said it may be a good idea. It may be difficult to get it together for this month. If we put it closer to the end of October - first of November time frame.

WALKER said she would like to have more time to really discuss the issue and take a look at things without having to watch the clock. She would rather have two meetings than one really long one.

BAUER said that Ryan suggested that we move the Comprehensive Plan items to December to clear a little space on the November agenda. The only items would be the parking and the station area plans on the November agenda.

WALKER asks if notice was going to go out to the businesses and the residents in the area to let them know that it will be at that meeting.

BAUER said yes and that notice went out for this meeting as well.

LIVINGSTON made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:13 p.m. Nalder seconded the motion and is passed unanimously.

---

Lori L. McNett, Minutes Taker