

City of Sumner

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Regular Meeting

**October 7, 2004
7:00 p.m.
Sumner City Hall 1104 Maple Street**

CALL TO ORDER

WALTER called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bush, Ganz, Hannus, Morrison, Powers and Walter

Members Absent: Myers (notified)

Also Present: Ryan Windish, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

GANZ motioned to approve the September 2, 2004 regular meeting minutes as written. HANNUS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no Public Comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Presentation: Draft EIS

WINDISH gave a brief background of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement's (DEIS) 2004 update process and scope. The Growth Management Act mandates this 10-year update. This document provides the background analysis of the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and analyzes environmental impacts through a "No Action Alternative" and "Proposed Action Alternative" analysis.

WINDISH presented the following outlined information as to the DEIS, via a slide presentation as follows:

- ***Why write a DEIS?***

The DEIS addresses various environmental impacts caused by the proposals, and takes into account changes, as to whether no action is taken or action is proposed. The programmatic approach is an EIS written on a plan (such as the Town Center Plan), and how that plan impacts the environment. It is a more generalized review than a site-specific project. It is also a phased review because further environmental review for specific projects will be required. A DEIS affords an opportunity for public comment on specific impacts. There is a 60-day review period. Finally, the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) is published and addresses comments on the DEIS and presents the impacts between the Proposed Action Alternative and the Preferred Action. The FEIS is smaller, requires less review time, and comments.

- ***Affected Environments***

Affected environments are things such as earth, air quality, water quality, flooding, land use, population, city services, etc. that are both in the natural and built environment.

- ***Areas of Analysis***

The areas of impact analysis includes significant impacts (notable impacts to specific environments), mitigation measures (how we are going to deal with impacts, this is a place that the City can influence the most,) and significant unavoidable impacts (i.e. increase in traffic, etc.).

WINDISH chose to address only those affected environments that seemed to have the most impact or would be of most interest to the Planning Commission:

- ***Population & Employment Capacity***

WINDISH summarized the population statistics, growth projections and capacity for the City. The City limits have adequate capacity for future population growth in both the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative.

- ***Population Growth/Targets***

WINDISH summarized the population growth projections and targets set by Pierce County. The 2022 Summer target population that we must accommodate for is 12,250 within the City limits and another 2,100 in the urban growth area.

- ***Current Employment***

WINDISH presented the breakdown of current employment statistics. It addressed the total number of jobs for 2000 and 2020 comparatively.

- ***Forecast Employment***

Employment in retail, construction and resources areas is very strong. It is projected by a similar breakdown that in 2010, employment will be growing in the financial, real estate and insurance services. It is difficult to project/forecast future employment for a city. Also taken into account in those projections are warehouse employment and manufacturing. The EIS further outlines additional information not shown on this topic.

- ***Population and Employment Impacts***

The capacity for both population and employment impacts exceeds the target.

- **Transportation**

WINDISH said the transportation model has been undated from 2020 projections to 2022. The comparison of no action took into account the new housing units in the Town Center Plan. The 2003 model results were compared to the 2022 No Action Alternative in the Comprehensive Plan and the Proposed Action Alternative was compared to this.

HANNUS commented that if 24th Street were lengthened from East Valley were lengthened, that would alleviate a lot of that traffic.

WINDISH agreed with that comment, and stated that it is a suggestion in the Transportation Plan Report to complete this extension.

- **Transportation Arterials/Collectors**

WINDISH stated that there was no significant increase in the area of transportation, however, Valley Avenue had the least amount of increase.

WALTER asked WINDISH what period of time would be considered the “peak hours” of traffic?

WINDISH responded that peak hours would be between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

- **Transportation Impacts**

The unsignalized intersection of East Valley Hwy/Elm Street has gone from a “B” to and “F” and will need a signal. In looking at the analysis, it will not have a greatest affect on Valley and Elm and dropping the level of service to F by 2022 and required a signal light in this location.

- **Transportation Mitigation**

To mitigate traffic impacts, proposed is implementation of the transportation plan, the extension of 24th Street and a signal at East Valley Hwy/Elm Street.

- **Land Use**

This is broken down by “no action” and “proposed action”, the proposed action being the Town Center Plan, the East Sumner Neighborhood Plan, and location-specific rezones. Specifically with regard to the East Sumner Neighborhood proposal, proposed action is to eliminate the East Sumner Neighborhood Commercial, reduce the MDR zoning, create an LDR-4000 zone and expansion of the general commercial zoning.

- **Land Use: East Sumner**

A “Proposed (Action)” location specific map amendment from the Environmental Impact Statement of the East Sumner Neighborhood Area was discussed.

BUSH noted that, with regard to the changes in that area, a letter had been received from Mr. Froehling as to a road coming through his property. What is going to happen to his property?

WINDISH responded that the East Sumner Neighborhood Plan proposes a grid street layout. If a developer subdivides property, they are required to build a section of road that meets that plan (figure 338, Chapter 3 on Transportation). Staff is proposing an amendment to that, which would take out the

stretch of road between 62nd Avenue and 64th Street east because it is encumbering a narrow piece of property with a natural gas line and wetlands.

HANNUS noted the same problem just north of that area.

WINDISH stated that there is potential for that section of road to be eliminated from the plan as part of this process.

DISCUSSION was had about the dangers of building roads near gas lines.

• ***Location-Specific Map Amendments***

WINDISH presented the site-specific map amendment locations discussed in Appendix C and summarized them as follows:

- 7306 Orting Hwy (LDR-2 to neighborhood commercial). Staff is recommending denial because of the poor pedestrian connection. Further, it lacks compatibility with adjacent properties; - 1418 Wood Ave (MDR to General Commercial). Staff is recommending approval, due to close proximity to railroad, other commercial, existing use and isolation. We would like that area of the tracks to all be general commercial, as it seems to work best; - 207 Valley Avenue (LDR-2 to neighborhood commercial). Staff is recommending denial due to the poor pedestrian connection, and potential for future development pressure.

HANNUS asked if the Department of Transportation is proposing using that property for interchange expansion?

WINDISH stated that they possibly are.

- 15615 Elm Street/Parker Road (LDR-1 to HDR). Staff is recommending approval, and actually proposed that it be larger than the applicant is requesting. It is across the street from HDR zoning and is already developed as apartments. - 5221 160th Avenue (M-1 to HDR or LDR-1). Staff is recommending approval. City Council has requested a change in the zone of that area. Both HDR and LDR would work for this property. Salmon creek runs through it and it is across the street from multifamily

POWERS asked if the property is still operating as a slaughterhouse?

WINDISH stated that he is not sure if it is operational at this time, as the Health Department was scrutinizing their operation.

- 901 Wood Avenue (LDR2 to CBD). Staff is recommending denial, due to the fact that it is further encroaching in a residential area. The applicant is required to apply for a conditional use permit. Under their existing zoning they could convert it to parking. With the CBD zoning no permits are needed. - 3202 E. Valley Hwy (MDR to M-1). Staff is recommending approval, as the location is adjacent to the railroad, and isolated from other residential. - 6004 and 6006 Bock Avenue (LDR-2 to General Commercial). Potentially proposed in this area is a large drug store. Staff is recommending denial because of incompatibility with adjacent residential.

• ***Water Quality***

WINDISH stated that this has to do with with existing conditions (streams, rivers, wetlands in the City and wellheads/groundwater), impacts (increased development = increased runoff and potential for pollution), and mitigation (new storm water manual, low impact development techniques, wellhead protection program, and monitoring). The new storm water manual may be adopted in the near future. Low impact

development techniques include alternative solutions such as reducing impervious surfaces, green-roofs, etc. The wellhead protection program addresses limiting the amount of pollutants by reducing the development close to the wellhead. There are “time travel” zones at 1, 5, and 10-year intervals where hazardous material could contaminate the well in that time frame if released into the ground. Nothing with hazardous potential would be allowed around a well. The water monitoring is part of the program to determine how the conditions might be changing and what further mitigation measures may need to be taken.

HANNUS asked if water “quantity” was also addressed?

WINDISH stated that it would be addressed later.

- ***Water Supply Sanitary Sewer***

The proposed Water Plan is almost ready for adoption. The existing plan projects growth greater than what we predicted for future growth in the Comprehensive Plan. This reviews the existing conditions, impacts and mitigation. The Public Works Department is constantly looking for more water sources as the supply is quickly approaching the demand.

- ***City Facilities***

The police, fire, public works and general administrative buildings all fall under City Facilities. Generally, City facilities have been upgraded and expanded in the last 10 years to accommodate the next 20 years of projected growth.

GANZ asked if the fact that Sumner is in the middle of a two-lane freeway was taken into consideration?

WINDISH stated that that is shown in the transportation model. The plan found that there is a lot of cut through traffic. One strategy is to not over build our roads to accommodate the cut through traffic, forcing it back on the freeways and forcing the State to build more capacity, as opposed to Sumner.

- ***Next Steps***

There will be a Public Hearing next month. It is expected that this will take a few meetings, depending on how things go with the Planning Commission. It is also expected that the Planning Commission will reach its decision by December/January. It will then move on to City Council, and it is anticipated that they will reach their decision by February/March.

2. Presentation: Draft Comprehensive Plan

WINDISH walked through the proposed changes to the Draft Comprehensive Plan as follows:

The format of the Comprehensive Plan is going to change to the format of the Environmental Impact Statement. Included is the vision statement and value statement that, with minor changes, were adopted by City Council in March. The changes bring in housing to the downtown as a theme. There was one change to the value statement, and a lot of housekeeping changes. The economic development element will become an actual element, as opposed to a sub-element. This was approved at the last meeting for recommendation to City Council. They will have a study session on it next Monday. The commuter rail and regional transit portions were updated, and on page 49, “town center residential” was added as a description. The goal as to the community character section was to update all the illustrations and maps. A couple maps still need to be updated at this time. A reference to the East Main Street Design Strategy was included, and there were no changes to the Parks Element. The Environment section now includes reference to “best available science”, and the shoreline policies were deleted because it became its own

element. The housing element addresses housing for life stages, and updates on page 80 to the city's plan for "fair share" housing. Which basically shows how much of the low-income housing needs in the County Sumner can meet. The buildable lands program language was added, as was language as to the town center plan and goals. An important change was made to the transportation element on page 88, policy 3.1, in that we are at a level of service D or better, except for a couple of intersections in town that are at a level of service F. The term "except" was inadvertently left out of the original Transportation Plan and Element. There were no changes to capital facilities element, and the only change to utilities was to update some of the names after receiving input from Puget Sound Energy. Further, the human services element was also updated. Finally, the shoreline element takes the goals and major objectives out of the Shoreline Master Program and puts them into the Comprehensive Plan.

After ten years, not a lot of major changes have been made to the Comprehensive Plan. At this point, it is a draft plan and up for discussion. The policies in the Town Center Plan will fit well into the Comprehensive Plan.

There were no Commissioner comments or questions as to this agenda item.

3. Presentation: Draft Town Center Plan

WINDISH presented a slide show put together by Robert Holler, entitled "Sumner Town Center Plan – Visions to Reality". This presentation was shown last week to 125 people. Robert Holler did a great job on this presentation, and we will be applying for a planning award for it. There was a lot of public input. Largely the response was positive, and only about 5% of the people were upset about growth. WINDISH continued with the presentation as follows:

-Visions to Reality -

"Sumner, a city of excellence reinforcing its role as classic, small town Americana that goes beyond nostalgia."

The Town Center planning area housing strategy analysis is broken down by total population, average household size, owner occupied housing, population median age, civic uses, commercial, industrial, single family, multi family and vacant.

Why Downtown Sumner? It is the focal point of the community, the historic core, and will further keep downtown relevant to the greater community.

Town Center Plan Phase I: The Town Center Plan – Phase I December 2002 – set an agenda to examine opportunities and set a schedule of "many, many projects" within the Downtown core to keep progress rolling. Input from the consultant reinforced the following points: successful downtowns thrive with more housing, the town center is a natural area for a focus on housing, and more residences strengthen the downtown core. In support of this, a "Jump Start Matrix" was adopted, to complete or start on some of these tasks prior to final adoption of the plan; certain time sensitive projects such as securing property for potential development.

Public Input - Open Space Meeting: An Open Space meeting was held in July 2003, and yielded input to that has been woven into the planning process. Some of the comments received included: recruit an evening restaurant and other businesses to the downtown; ensure that new development has character; be proactive with development and develop housing for life stages needed to keep the downtown vibrant.

Public Input - Community Survey showed: residents want another grocery store and they want good design. There is also the goal to reclaim public open space.

Town Center Plan Housing Strategy Report: This focused on how we could incorporate 350 - 500 units in the downtown. We can expect to get close to that goal with proposed regulation changes on commercial zoned land.

Sumner Town Center Plan - Final Draft: This plans for inevitable growth and helps meet growth management goals. It sets for the Town center alternative and goals and policies.

Town Center Zoning Alternative: This map addresses zoning of various areas, and highlights the following: Town Center Residential, General Commercial, PMUD Overlay, CBD along North Street and CBD along South Block.

Regulatory Changes: Regulatory changes are recommended in the Town Center Plan that would make it more feasible to develop housing options that fit into the character of downtown, provide adequate off-street parking, and work in the market place. The recommended changes are as follows: create new town center residential zone, increase central business district zoning, increase general commercial zoning, increase allowed density from 25 to 40 du/acre in CBD and GC zones w/structured parking, and increase CBD/GC height limit to 45 feet.

The Big Question - What Would This Look Like? Development within the Town Center Planning area must respect the character and feel Sumner is known for if it is to be successful. Regulatory changes, including zoning and design review will help accomplish these goals.

WINDISH showed a video at this time created by Robert Holler, on the City of Sumner Town Center Plan and Visions for the Future. Upon conclusion, WINDISH continued with review of the slide presentation on "Visions to Reality", addressing the following topics:

- Addition of new residential on vacant parcels (shown was examples of new residential, cottage style houses, and a town house infill project, and existing housing on Elizabeth Street, and how their character fits in);
- Town Center Mixed Use (shown was examples of mixed use projects that feature housing);
- Town Center Density Transition (shown was examples of transition from housing to mixed use); and
- Town Center Mixed Use (shown was example of mixed use that includes commercial on the ground floor and offices on the second floor)

Town Center Plan – Next Steps:

- Sumner Planning Commission Public Hearing October 21, 2004;
- Sumner Planning Commission Public Hearing November 4th (Comprehensive Plan);
- Ongoing discussions with property owners; and
- Review and adoption by the Sumner City Council in February or March.

WINDISH noted that one of the most exciting changes will be to the Red Apple site. He also noted that Appendix A contains detailed amendments to the regulations.

WALTER asked if the meeting on October 21st will be about the Town Center specifically, and if the meeting on November 4th will be on the Comprehensive Plan specifically?

WINDISH stated that they would and that they expect a lot of people to show up for those meetings.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

POWERS advised that he would not be in attendance at the special meeting on October 21, 2004, and that he may not be at the regular meeting on November 4, 2004.

BUSH advised that she would not be in attendance at the meeting on November 4, 2004.

STAFF COMMENTS

WINDISH had the following Staff comments:

- 1) WINDISH suggested with regard to the public hearing on the Location Specific Map Amendments, that the Commissioners not have conversations with applicants or others as all of the discussion, information and deliberation should be done in a public forum, as to avoid the appearance of an applicant lobbying for anyone's vote;
- 2) There will be a court hearing on Wednesday as to the Beach House. The owner is almost out of time;
- 3) The engineer of The Twin Apartments is back on board. Permits should be straightened out soon and things look more positive; and
- 4) There was an event at the Windmill Gardens put on by the Sumner/Bonney Lake Education Society, which is a non-profit organization headed by John Doan.

WINDISH also stated that he attended a Planning Conference in Portland on Monday, and gave a presentation on the Design Review process. There was a lot of interest, as Sumner is one of the few jurisdictions to do design review in the State.

WALTER asked if Kent has a design review process?

WINDISH stated that he believes that they do as they put on a presentation as well. He noted that the challenge of design review is to have enough flexibility to allow interesting things to be built, yet to be specific enough to not allow poor construction.

WINDISH also noted that the entire City Council will be attending the trip to Portland on October 23rd.

WALTER asked if Sound Transit is still on board?

WINDISH stated that they are not, however, Mark Hinshaw will be in attendance on the trip also. The bus will leave at approximately 8:00 a.m. Individuals are on their own for lunch. The tour will end in downtown Portland.

TOM POWERS advised that he would not be able to attend the Portland tour.

BUSH stated that she is scheduled to be in Portland at that time with her husband and will try to figure out a way to attend.

WALTER advised that she also may or may not be able to make the trip.

WINDISH stated that he would provide the necessary information as to the trip next week, and that the Commissions should advised Sally Abrams as to whether they can or cannot attend.

WALTER asked if Portland uses a form based planning model?

WINDISH responded that South Portland uses one, along with another listed city in Oregon. Cities all over the country are using it.

WALTER commented that Oregon does a really good job in their planning.

WINDISH advised that they have been doing it for approximately 20 years longer, and that their GMA came in to affect in 1973.

HANNUS asked what would be going in across the street from the Daffodil Bowl?

POWERS stated that there would be apartments there.

MORRISON asked whether the delay on the veterinarian hospital was due to them trying to sell their property?

WINDISH stated that their property was sold to Marshall Bennett, and that they made some changes to their plans that were recently approved. Hopefully construction will start sometime soon. ADJOURNMENT

POWERS motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:21 p.m. GANZ seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ryan Windish, AICP
Senior Planner