



SUMNER PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, March 3, 2005

7:00 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

GANZ, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bush, Ganz, Hannus, Morrison, Myers, Powers

Members Absent: Walter (notified)

Also Present: Ryan Windish, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BUSH had the following changes to the February 3, 2005 regular meeting minutes: Under her comments on page 2 of 13, it should read "... we like Sumner so much..."

MYERS motioned to approve the February 3, 2005 minutes as corrected. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

RANDY HYNEK, 1640 Washington Street, appeared. John Doan told him to come in this evening with regard to his concerns about Johnson Chevron. Where that business is presently located, he cannot put a car wash in. Putting a car wash in would help his business. John Doan told him to bring this before the Planning Commission. It is his concern, as the business has been there for 40 years. It has made a lot of civic donations to help the community, and has been very charitable. The City should help this business owner who has been here for so long. As it is zoned now, he cannot sell it. He cannot put in a car wash and he cannot sell liquor because of how it is zoned. He has a buyer

who will agree to purchase it with a single lane car wash. The City should make an exception in this instance and help this business owner out. He needs it. He hopes there is something the Planning Commission can do about this. He thanked everybody for their time.

GANZ closed public comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

GANZ suggested, and the Commissioners agreed, that Agenda Item No. 2, Map Amendments should be discussed first. Agenda Item No. 2 was presented and discussed as follows:

2) 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update / Including Rezone Applications (Deliberation)

WINDISH reviewed Staff's Memorandum as to the Proposed Map Amendments, and addressed the following specific amendments:

15165 Elm Street: Staff has not heard back from the property owners. Based on public comment, Staff recommends that those properties be excluded.

BUSH asked if it is known whether the properties in question are owner occupied?

WINDISH stated that they know that one of them is for sure, however, it is the owners that were notified.

MYERS motioned to accept the recommendation for exclusion of properties as to 15165 Elm Street. The motion was seconded and it passed unanimously.

WINDISH advised the Commissioners that this meeting is in more of a study session format, and that as the agenda does not indicate that they will be taking action, they should probably leave it at discussion and take action at the next meeting.

5221 160th Avenue East (Crescent Meats): This is a contract rezone. Staff has experienced difficulties meeting up with property owner as he has been out of the country. At this point Staff is looking for the Commissioners thoughts on the contract rezone. Staff is asking the property owner to improve and enhance the stream area, and further to landscape the property where it fronts 160th. The property is to remain a slaughter / meat packing plant. The City will work with the property owner to obtain grants to help improve the fish habitat along Salmon creek.

MYERS asked Staff about the status of the southeast corner of Valley and Main?

WINDISH stated that Staff settled on the recommendation of a rezone of the north house that lines up that property with the bank property, and further keeping the duplexes.

1) **2004 Comprehensive Plan Update / Draft Town Center Plan (Deliberation)**

WINDISH reviewed Staff's memorandum with regard to the Draft Town Center Plan. Information has been received from the Sumner Neighborhood Association, commenting on the process to date and proposing an Alternative C, which recommends a number of different amendments to the Town Center Plan, one being to drop it. They further suggest recommendations as to proposed map amendments, and provide responses to the frequently asked questions. They have also provided statistical information they have gathered on the Town Center Plan. WINDISH further provided additional comments from the Sumner Neighborhood Association received this evening, containing 73 pages of material, including two letters and a host of surveys asking questions about the Town Center Plan. Staff has not had an opportunity to review the materials in detail, however, they have briefly reviewed them. In sum, the survey says: no chemical distribution facility on Fleischmann's Yeast property; a two story height limit to all new development; no lowering or waiving fees or parking standards, etc. for developers; extend current apartment building zoning controls; and to eliminate the Town Center Plan and work with the Sumner Neighborhood Association to create a new plan. There were mixed opinions on a parking garage and recreational vehicles. This is just more information to consider as we ponder our options.

GANZ asked if the regulations at this time are the same as are currently proposed in the Town Center Plan?

WINDISH stated that they are.

BUSH asked if there was a difference in the R.V. parking, as in one place it prohibits street side parking and in another it addresses side parking.

WINDISH explained that those are two different sets of regulations. One addresses the size of recreational vehicles on the street, limiting the hours on the street, which is police regulated. The other regulates R.V. parking on a front lot. If it is parked over 120 hours, it is considered storage. R.V.'s need to be parked to the rear or side, and adequately screened. This is enforced by complaints, which is the way it has been for years.

GANZ asked with regard to a parking garage if it had to be 5 stories?

WINDISH explained that it is the most economical way to do things, as the first few stories are taken up by ramps. There is no real gain until about the 3rd floor, if you are looking at it from a cost per space perspective. It will also make room for storefronts. In Kent, they have a 3 story parking garage for City Hall. As it is now, there is a 35-foot height limit. A variance would have to be granted to build a parking garage.

WINDISH further reviewed for the Commissioners the summary of the results/comments collected from the survey that was conducted at the Town Center Workshop on February

17th. When comparing the comments received to the range of alternatives, Alternative A seemed to line up best. Therefore, the recommendations for each of the topic areas focus on changes to Alternative A as a beginning point.

MYERS asked if anything is being done to limit driveways on Fryer, as they were limited in East Sumner?

WINDISH stated that in the Design Guidelines, as they are today, there is a limit of 5 feet of curb cut every certain feet of street frontage. Also taken into consideration would be rezone residential commercial, and the zero lot line.

WINDISH continued with his review of the information collected from the Town Center Workshop. People were in favor of keeping policies supporting restricted parking zones, and keeping policies supporting housing in the Town Center Plan. There was also a desire to keep the current height restriction. They are suggesting a possible increase to 45 feet for mixed use structures, and it was suggested that once a building reaches a certain height, that the next story will be set back. As in Portland, this would create an outdoor courtyard space. This height increase would not be as dramatic on a smaller street, such as Traffic. WINDISH provided to the Commissioners various drawings of the buildings downtown, *i.e.* City Hall, for a better understanding of scale. Per the code, height is measured at the gable, and not the peak of the roof. There can be a significant amount of peak above the 35-foot height limit.

HANNUS asked why the peak is not used as the basis for the height limit.

WINDISH stated that he is not sure why it is done that way, but noted Puyallup as an example of a more absolute height limit.

DISCUSSION was had about the various diagrams provided as to their scale. It was noted that cupolas are exempt, as well as spires and bell towers.

WINDISH went on to indicate that there is a desire to continue restrictions on franchise architecture and other drive-through prohibitions (as in alternative A). He noted that the reason the buyers cannot do a car wash on the Roger's property, is that a car wash is considered a drive-through.

MYERS asked why a limited drive through could not be done. Maybe one that loops through, or one that you drive into and back out of, or with two driveways on separate streets. That would not be a drive through.

WINDISH stated that as the code is written, gas stations existing prior to certain date can do it. It could be written in such a way as that only a certain number of gas stations can do it in the downtown (one or two). That area is zoned general commercial.

POWERS asked if something could be written up along those lines.

WINDISH indicted that it could.

WINDISH further discussed Alternative A, referring to Staff's January 31, 2005 Memorandum on Comments/Responses from Public /Workshop and hearings on the Town Center Plan.

MYERS asked if Staff is recommending an elimination of the waiver?

WINDISH stated that, as it is written today, they are recommending elimination of the waiver, and to give a credit for existing parking. If you have 1000 sq. ft., you would be credited 2 1/2 spaces of on-street parking. This would depend on the size of the property. A small property could get a waiver.

LOVGREN offered to assist the Planning Commission by leaving to get her copy of parking Alternative C for their consideration.

WINDISH continued working off Alternative A from the January Memorandum. Alternative A provides a strong policy for management and maintenance. It prohibits stand alone multi-family in CBD, and requires that mixed use developments shall have ground floor commercial. Further south, multifamily should be ground related, such as cottages and townhouses. The question is, do we allow for stand alone commercial in the general zone, or do we want to force a percentage of it to be mixed use?

GANZ commented that nobody wants another Meridian in Sumner.

BUSH confirmed that front parking with stores set back would not be allowed.

WINDISH stated that that is not even allowed at this time, as only 30 percent of the frontage of the lot can be parking. The current Design Standards do not allow parking in front, requiring that the front be pedestrian.

MYERS commented that he does not see anything wrong with stand alone commercial. The second story is needed for the property to pay off.

WINDISH stated that they could design one aspect of it first, such as the residential or the commercial, depending on the market.

BUSH asked if, as it is now, stand-alone multifamily dwellings can be built on Traffic Avenue?

WINDISH responded that you cannot do stand alone residential except in a mixed-use development as it is now. Stand alone multifamily in the CBD and General Commercial is already prohibited. This is not different than the current code.

BUSH commented that it seems like mixed use would be more consistent with Main Street, as opposed to a stand-alone, box like stores. It would be more consistent with the

downtown core, giving it a common feel, as opposed to separate things that are not related to one another.

WINDISH stated that that is consistent with the vision of the Town Center Plan. Whether the height is 35 or 45 feet is one of the concerns this evening.

BUSH noted, in looking at the surveys, that there were not many comments from the people in the area in question. She would be interested in what the people on Cherry Street think, as to whether they want it higher density, being that it has been lower density for years. It would be nice to have the opinion of the people in that neighborhood, to give the Commissioners a general sense of who is directly affected.

WINDISH stated that they have notified all the residents over there. Some of the people have talked to Staff and have come to meetings.

BUSH stated that she is tempted to go door to door to discuss it with them.

LOVGREN (from the audience) stated that she has gone door to door, and that the response is that they feel it is hopeless.

WINDISH stated that Staff has talked to a couple people this side of Cherry who were opposed.

WINDISH continued with discussion of Alternative A. He asked for direction from the Planning Commission as to the height limit.

MYERS asked if Alternative A would do away with the FAR?

WINDISH responded that the FAR would remain.

MYERS suggested adding language about the FAR to Alternative A.

WINDISH stated that FAR controls building size, as opposed to lot size. 40 units per acre is a planning estimate.

HANNUS asked if it would actually be 40 units per acre? That is awfully tight.

WINDISH stated that it would come down to Design, which is why we are looking at the FAR. The plan contemplates 40 units per acre.

BUSH asked if that would up the FAR, making it higher?

WINDISH indicated that it would.

HANNUS stated that he is opposed to it.

WINDISH clarified that the Town Center Plan considers dwelling units per acres, to provide incentive to build housing downtown, and also to provide a variety of housing. It is a different housing type and style, as it is stacked. In the mixed use in Alternative A, it is the only time you will see stacked apartments.

HANNUS stated that he does not approve of density. There is not much room to do anything with in 40 units per acre. That would be roughly 1000 sq. feet.

WINDISH indicated that this is not the only housing choice.

MYERS added that 40 units per acre would be the “maximum” they could do. Builders would not build something that there is not a need for. They will not build something that will not make money. Somebody creative enough could come in with something that will work.

WINDISH noted, that to get to a 45-foot height limit, they would be required to do under-story/under building parking.

BUSH asked what the highest number of dwelling units per acre is at this time in Sumner?

WINDISH stated that high density allows up to 20 units per acre. With parking and storm water requirements, it ends up being approximately 12 units.

Discussion was had regarding various apartment styles in the downtown area. There was concern that apartments do not support the feel of old Sumner.

MYERS commented that how it is built and designed is what makes it like old Sumner, and that not everybody who lives in an apartment is a bad person.

HANNUS commented that Sumner already has enough apartment buildings and that he thinks the Commission should say no to more apartments.

WINDISH commented that, in the current market, new apartments are renting for about \$950 to \$1200 a month. The requirement is that your rent be no more than 30 percent of your income. You would need to make \$34,000 a year to afford the rent. At this time, the median income in Sumner is \$38,000.

BUSH asked if there was any information available as to the transient nature of renters. How long are people going to pay a rent like that? Her concern is that we are adding an element to the community that will not invest in the community?

MYERS stated that people do not rent just apartments, they rent single family homes too. We can set the standards, but we cannot regulate everything. MYERS stated that he would not be opposed to 30 units per acre as opposed to 40.

DISCUSSION was had as to the opinions of the various Commissioners as to what the units per acre should be, with WINDISH expressing the various benefits to parking and other aspects with it being 30 to 40 units per acre. GANZ, BUSH and HANNUS preferred 25 units per acre, whereas MORRISON, MYERS and POWERS preferred 30 units per acre.

WINDISH explained that a higher number of units per acre allows for under structure parking, which creates a better streetscape.

HANNUS agreed that if it just affected the orange portion of the map, he would go with 30 units per acre.

WINDISH asked the Planning Commission if they would be comfortable with the concept of a larger parcel with mixed use up on the street, along with stand alone multifamily on the same block. The mixed use could be vertical or horizontal. It would be similar to Washington Court, with the remainder being stand alone residential.

GANZ asked if it would be kept at 35 feet?

WINDISH indicated that as it is written now, it would be a 35-foot limit, measuring to the median. It would be higher with a peaked roof. If it were 45 feet, it could either be peaked above that, or it could be 45 exact to the peak. That would be if the mixed use building had under structure parking.

MYERS suggested 35 feet, with an absolute of 45 feet.

The Commissioners seemed comfortable with that height limit.

WINDISH recapped that the Commissioners agreed on 30 dwelling units per acre, a 35-foot height limit, mixed use with underground parking, and an absolute height limit of 45 feet.

WINDISH asked the Commissioners if they just wanted this on Traffic and Fryar?

MYERS felt that was a Design Commission issue.

HANNUS asked if there would be planting requirements?

WINDISH stated that there could be a minimum planting requirement in that area.

POWERS commented that it should be limited to Fryer and Traffic Avenue. HANNUS agreed.

MORRISON commented that he has not had enough time to digest the idea, as it is a new concept.

BUSH asked Staff if there is a way to make sure that underground parking is going to work in certain areas?

WINDISH responded that there is not, and that there are just more likely places in town that it will work. In some cases, they will only be able to dig down half a story, and in other cases parking would come in on the first floor of the structure to the back. They will have to do studies to determine that.

WINDISH continued on with other comments on the Town Center Residential, as to the maximum build-out of a 6-unit town house. WINDISH asked if the Commission was comfortable with the change to that, or whether they wanted to leave it at 6-units as it is at this time? This would allow for a variety of housing variations, such as a detached cottage style. With a lot size of 4,000 sq. ft., it would allow for tandem houses, town houses, each with specific lot requirements.

MYERS asked if the City is going to follow through with 30 units in the CBD?

WINDISH stated that the way it is written now, it is 15 dwelling units maximum. In referring to the table of densities, it would increase density, but maintain the single family fabric of that area. What you would not get is stacked apartments. They are not allowed, as it would have to be ground related. The height limits vary from 2 to 3 stories (3 stories would require a flat roof). Tandem houses would have to be 18 feet (a story and a half). Cottages are held at a total floor area of 1,000 sq. ft. This is how infill is done without creating out of character housing.

BUSH commented that she would be more comfortable if the neighborhood was asking for it. She thought that it seemed sort of arbitrary without strong support from the neighborhood core. There has not been a lot of opposition, or a lot of support.

WINDISH commented that people usually come in when they are opposed to something. You do not usually hear from them if they are for it. Staff has personally talked to 3 or 4 residents, and Kandi Lovgren indicates that she has gone door to door to get people involved. It would be great if people came in to either support or oppose it.

MYERS commented that they have all been given notice. The changes are not significant.

WINDISH asked the Commissioners if they felt that, as to town houses, if a six-plex was too big (see pg. 30 under townhouses)? Under this, you would not have 6 identical units in a row. There would be 3 and then they would have to change it up.

MYERS asked, when the density changes from 40 to 30, if it will change the FAR?

WINDISH stated that he would look into that.

BUSH asked what the regulations are with regard to requiring an elevator in a building?

WINDISH stated that he was not sure what that requirement was. They would avoid it if they could, as an elevator is expensive.

BUSH expressed concern that they have given the false impression at the workshop that some of this housing has been directed at seniors. If seniors are to live in some of these buildings, there would have to be an elevator. We received a positive response based on providing housing for seniors.

WINDISH stated that there are incentives provided for building senior housing, *i.e.* fee waivers and various other reductions. It is something we want to promote.

MYERS added that the higher density buildings would require an elevator. There is a statute that dictates that.

BUSH reiterated her concern about portraying what might be there, but not really being able to make that happen. She is concerned about selling the community on it, if there is no way to guarantee it.

POWERS commented that we cannot regulate what goes in. We can only set limits.

WINDISH stated that the only thing we can do is encourage it by providing incentives, and to continue to raise the bar on design standards.

BUSH commented that it should then be made clear that there are limitations to what we can guarantee.

DISCUSSION was had about elevators and when they would be required.

WINDISH asked the Commissioners if there were any more recommendations as to the Town Center Residential?

MYERS asked if the Design Commission has had an opportunity to review this?

WINDISH stated that they are updating the Design Guidelines this year. There are enough design standards to work with at this time. It is just a matter of beefing them up.

GANZ moved the conversation on to parking.

WINDISH, referring to the February 28th Staff Memorandum on page 3, recommended providing more detailed language as to the parking facility, in relation to retail or office on the ground floor.

POWERS suggested leaving it a 3-story maximum. It could be north of Sumner, and they could shuttle back and forth.

WINDISH stated that Staff was thinking along the same lines. The bottom line is that we need something that is going to fit in town. If it does not fit, it does not fit.

MYERS commented that a parking garage, is a parking garage. There is a need for it. To get rid of on street parking, the only solution is a parking garage.

MORRISON added that it is a lot more attractive than surface parking.

HANNUS asked about the Sounder Station?

MYERS commented that Stewart Road is an ideal spot, and it would eliminate a lot of parking that way.

WINDISH advised that they have heard opposition from Puyallup over the Shaw Road Station. They want to keep people in their downtown area.

MYERS commented that just because people park downtown, does not mean they will shop downtown. A parking garage seems like an ideal solution.

POWERS commented that he would like to see someone else spend their money on a parking garage.

HANNUS felt that it would not be approved by City Council.

MORRISON agreed with the 3 story limit on the parking garage.

GANZ also agreed, but added that he would not like to see it on Main Street.

DISCUSSION was had as to various locations for a parking garage.

GANZ commented that Alternative A is good, however, he felt it could be balanced out with Alternative C.

WINDISH discussed the waiver option as proposed in Alternative C, wherein it states that the waiver for commercial parking should be eliminated. WINDISH felt that that would make it tough on small lots, such as the Beach House or Casey's Caboose.

MYERS asked Staff if the no protest LID would still be deleted?

WINDISH responded that it would still be deleted.

MYERS stated that he would have a problem with the rezone if it were to remain the same size. If it is rezoned to a heavier use, more parking should be provided. The LID would not work. MYERS suggested small public lots for various small businesses.

GANZ commented that Alternative C strengthens the RV parking requirement.

MYERS added that it only addresses street parking, and not parking in the yard.

WINDISH asked if the Commissioners were okay with the waiver and getting rid of what is existing. He further asked their thoughts on the size of the properties.

MYERS indicated that he is okay with the waiver.

WINDISH noted that he would look further into lot size. With regard to parking, he would like to see more bicycle parking for the station. He has calls into Sound Transit. We may be adding bike locker requirements.

BUSH had a question with regard to Traffic Avenue. How do they know that the street traffic will be essentially the same?

WINDISH responded that they have modeled it based on a certain amount of trips per household. Based on information provided, a model is built. It is modeled with and without the changes. With both models, there was little difference. Staff has discussed their recommendation as to Traffic with Council. Council wants to restrict traffic flow by keeping the bridge narrow.

WINDISH thanked the Commission for their good direction.

DISCUSSION was had, and it was determined that there was need for another study session on this topic. It was agreed that another study session would take place on Thursday, March 17, 2005, however, it would take place at a different location, possibly the School Administration Building.

MYERS commented that a decision on it should be made at a regular scheduled meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MORRISON asked if Staff had the capability to provide MSDS sheets?

WINDISH responded that they did, and that they were provided to Staff by Lovgren.

BUSH expressed that commendations should be given to the Fire Department.

STAFF COMMENTS

There were no Staff comments.

ADJOURNMENT

MYERS motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 p.m. POWERS seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ryan Windish, Senior Planner