

City of Sumner

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Study Session

January 02, 2003

CALL TO ORDER

MYERS called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Myers, Nalder, Powers, Richardson and Walter

Members Absent: Lovgren (Notified)

Also Present: Ryan Windish, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NALDER noted that on page 9 of the December 5, 2002 minutes "A" Street should be changed to "8th" Street.

NALDER motioned to approve the December 5, 2002 meeting minutes as corrected. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NALDER motioned to approve the December 19, 2002 meeting minutes. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RICHARDSON motioned to approve the August 22, 2002 meeting minutes. NALDER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

NEW BUSINESS

1) Election of Chair and Vice Chair (Action)

NALDER motioned/nominated MYERS as Sumner Planning Commission Meeting Chair for 2003. POWERS seconded the motion/nomination and it passed unanimously.

NALDER motioned/nominated RICHARDSON as Sumner Planning Commission Meeting Vice-Chair for 2003. POWERS seconded the motion/nomination and it passed unanimously.

WINDISH reviewed for the Commission the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 2001-2002, Chapters 1 – 5 at the December 5, 2002 Planning Commission regular meeting. Chapter 6, having been tabled to the present meeting, was continued as follows:

2) Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 2001-2002 – Finish Public Hearing Recommendation to City Council (Action)

WINDISH reviewed for the Commission the following:

6. Capital Facilities Plan

This amendment is an adoption of a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) for the City of Sumner and includes some minor updates to the goals, policies and objectives within the Comprehensive Plan. The Sumner Capital Facilities Plan is a document that provides a list of proposed major capital expenditures throughout the City. It also provides a multi-year look at the strategies and financing requirements for major capital programs. The CFP attempts to project needs six years into the future for major construction, infrastructure improvements, land acquisition, and machinery and equipment purchases. The plan then provides a funding strategy and projected funding scenarios for each succeeding year. The threshold minimum for inclusion into the Capital Facilities Plan is \$35,000. The draft Capital Facilities Plan is not complete. The financial section is complete. Staff has included the six-year improvement programs for the Transportation Plan, Water System Plan and the Sanitary Sewer Plan.

Staff recommendation is approval.

WINDISH further reviewed for the Commission the Comprehensive Plan Amendment criteria for this chapter.

NALDER asked with regard to page 39, under table 4-4, if the distance of 1,500 feet from park facilities is possible?

WINDISH responded that in looking at the location of our parks that it is fairly close.

NALDER asked with regard to the level of service for firefighters and police being based on population as stated on page 40, is that a valid ratio when so much of their service is non-population oriented?

WINDISH stated that in talking with the fire department, they felt that it was accurate in determining “level of service”.

NALDER noted that the restrooms/irrigation in Loyalty Park was not included on page 48, table 6-1. Is it too new to have made it on the table? It was also his understanding that the expansion of the senior center had been dropped?

WINDISH responded that the senior center had not been dropped, however, it has been significantly cut back. He further stated that he would look into the status of the restrooms/irrigation in Loyalty Park.

MYERS opened the meeting for Public Hearing on the Capital Facilities Plan and/or any of the items under the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

There was no Public Comment.

WINDISH further walked through discussion on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the December 19, 2003 Study Session, and the changes that were made in accordance with that discussion.

The Commissioners had the following questions/comments with regard to each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment:

1. 24th/28th Street Interchange

There were no questions on this chapter.

2. SE Annexation Area

NALDER asked whether on the northern/northeastern edge, on the other side of the off ramp, if it would be interchange instead of general commercial?

WINDISH responded that it would not be interchange instead of general commercial.

3. East Main Street Rezone

There were no questions on this chapter.

4. Transit-Oriented Overlay Amendment

WINDISH noted Staff's recommendation to remove the Transit-Oriented Overlay District all together.

MYERS asked if they voted to eliminate it, if Staff would work on adding other incentives in those areas?

WINDISH indicated that they would.

5. 2002 Transportation Update

NALDER suggested including Edgewood to the last sentence on page 7 of the Transportation Plan following Pierce County, Cities of Pacific and Puyallup.

WINDISH agreed and stated that they would add that.

NALDER noted that on pages 22 - 23, where there are references to railroad crossings, many of them are not in there, for example, the one at West Valley Highway, the Main Street railroad crossing and two crossings at 8th Street.

WINDISH agreed that it is important to reference all of them.

NALDER commented that page 32 is blank, and further that there is nothing in the chapter about the pedestrian overpass.

WALTER asked how often the Transportation Plan was updated?

WINDISH stated that the 6-year street plan is updated every year, and that this is the big overall City update.

POWERS asked with regard to the section on the temporary sidewalks whether the recommendation would be just as it relates to Parker Road, or are they also looking at other main streets, such as Elm Street?

WINDISH stated that the recommendation could be street specific or general as to roads frequently travel by children, etc.

DISCUSSION was had about specific streets in need of sidewalks as opposed to a general policy with regard to temporary sidewalks. Further concerns were address with regard to the cost of temporary as opposed to permanent sidewalks, and whether after a temporary sidewalk was constructed that that street would then not be a priority for a permanent structure. Further discussed was what would trigger the requirement that a property owner put in a permanent sidewalk.

WINDISH stated that if an LID was established on specific streets to do those improvements, it could not be protested. The LID would only be good for 10 years.

RICHARDSON asked why they could not just approach the property owners and obtain an LID up front. They could then put in regular sidewalks along Parker?

WINDISH stated that that is one way to get it funded through the property owners. If they could do that, maybe the City could then bring some money to the table. He would discuss that with the Public Works Director.

NALDER commented that he prefers that it be generally stated to accommodate the safety issue.

RICHARDSON added that it could be narrowed down to roads without sidewalks on school bus routes. He would like to meet with City Staff to discuss the different options.

WALTER stated that she thinks it would be better stated in general terms.

RICHARDSON expressed his concern that it not be too general, causing the money to go to all different kinds of projects and not solve the 3 to 4 streets that are the real problem. He was further concerned that after the temporary sidewalks were in place that those streets would no longer be a priority and would then never get permanent sidewalks. To whatever extent possible the City should make it affordable for the property owners to put in new sidewalks, or to complete existing runs of sidewalks, possibly through an emergency LID.

MYERS asked if the City could initiate an LID?

WINDISH stated that the property owners would have to agree with it.

DISCUSSION was had about the possibility of State funding or State aide to offset some of the cost of constructing some of the priority sidewalks.

RICHARDSON stated that he personally did not wish to recommend anything until he has the opportunity to meet with Staff and discuss the options available.

WINDISH stated that the question is whether the policy on temporary sidewalks should be general or street specific.

RICHARDSON noted that he would like it to be presented initially as construction of permanent sidewalks, and that in the event that that is not possible, have as a backup option temporary sidewalks for specific problem areas.

MYERS stated that he would like to see it be a street specific recommendation, to ensure that the specific streets frequently traveled by students are safer.

POWERS also stated that he was inclined to support a street specific recommendation.

MYERS asked for a show of hands as to whether the recommendation should be general or street specific. It was determined through the majority that the recommendation should be street specific.

NALDER asked if through the permit process, the school could be required to fund a temporary sidewalk to address safety issues?

WINDISH stated that Daffodil School has a no protest LID for their street frontage. If a new school were built they would be required to sidewalk. The football stadium was required to build a portion of sidewalk along Valley Avenue, and Fred Meyer will be required to finish the sidewalk also.

6. Capital Facilities Plan

WINDISH added that the 6-year Transportation Plan is part of the Capitol Facilities Plan. Further, if you look at the Collectors Street Program it addresses Parker Road and improvements to Elm Street. It gives an estimate and describes reconstruction of these two streets to include curbs, gutters, sidewalks and storm drainage on the eastside. Parker to Main and 50th is estimated to cost 1.1 million, and Elm Street from East Valley Hwy to 160th is estimated to cost 2.9 million. There is no funding at this point. The Council looks at the 6-year Transportation Plan every year.

There were no further questions with regard to this Chapter.

COMMISSIONERS made the following MOTIONS as to each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment:

1. 24th/28th Street Interchange

NALDER motioned to approve the proposed change to the 24th/28th Street Interchange from M-1 to Interchange Commercial. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. SE Annexation Area

NALDER motioned to approve the proposed change to the area of 166th and Highway 410 to interchange commercial from residential, and to further include the existing properties shown as general commercial that are to be changed to interchange commercial. NALDER further motioned to approve the annexation in the interchange zone. WALTER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. East Main Street Rezone

POWERS motioned to adopt No. 3, East Main Street Rezone, to "straighten the line" in the commercial district along East Main Street. RICHARDSON seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Transit-Oriented Overlay Amendment

NALDER motioned to approve the Transit-Oriented Overlay Amendment, and further to go with Staff's recommendation to eliminate the Transit-Oriented Overlay Zone, and that Staff look into additional incentives for employment in that area. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. 2002 Transportation Update

POWERS motioned to approve the 2002 Transportation Update to include the changes that were suggested, and further to accept the Staff recommendation as it relates to the update of the Transportation Plan. NALDER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. Capital Facilities Plan

NALDER motioned to approve the update to the Capital Facilities Plan, along with Staff's recommendation and NALDER'S suggestions. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3) Environmental Regulations (Discussion)

WINDISH indicated that the intent of his presentation was to give the Planning Commission, specifically the new Commissioners, and introduction to basic planning and associated State and City laws. He chose to first address environmental regulations as they have just completed the update of their Shoreline Master Program, which has been forwarded on to City Council, and they are now in the process of updating the Critical Areas Regulations. He addressed why those regulations are in place and other environmental aspects, specifically explaining SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act), the Endangered Species Act as it relates to Sumner, and the Growth Management Act.

WINDISH also walked through the Environmental Ordinance (provided to the Commissioners as a handout).

There were no Commissioner comments/questions with regard to the Environmental Regulations presentation.

WINDISH advised the Commissioners that Sumner University is scheduled for the 6th and the 13th of February, and will take the place of their regular Thursday meeting. The next meeting will be in March.

POWERS motioned to cancel the February 6, 2003 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. WALTERS seconded the motioned and it passed unanimously.

WINDISH further advised the Commissioners that there would be a joint meeting with City Council on January 13, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall. The topic of this meeting is the Shoreline Master Program.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence received was as follows:

- 1) A Letter from John Doan to the Mayor;
- 2) The Growth Management Report put out by the EPA; and
- 3) An Article on the State's Tax System.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

NALDER notified the Commission and Staff that he would not be in attendance at the March and April meetings.

MYERS asked with regard to the Nile Virus and all the drainage ponds in town that attract mosquitoes, does the City have a plan to spray these pond and/or something else to protect the public?

WINDISH stated that he would look into that.

STAFF COMMENTS

WINDISH had the following Staff comments:

1. Sumner University is schedule for February 6th & 13th;
2. An Attendance Report for the last 6 months was provided to the Commissioners. The Commissioners are required to notify Staff by 5:00 p.m. the day of the meeting if they are unable to attend. Further Commissions should miss no more than 3 meetings consecutively; and
3. City Council passed an emergency ordinance in November adopting inter-regulations affecting the development of pipe-stem lots. This is a temporary regulation, giving Staff a chance to study the whole situation and to write a report to then bring before the Planning Commission for discussion and recommendations before ultimately going to City Council. It will be most likely set for public hearing in March.

ADJOURNMENT

NALDER moved for meeting adjournment at 9:25 p.m.

Ryan Windish, AICP
Senior Planner