



SUMNER PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, February 1, 2007

7:00 p.m.

Sumner City Hall
1104 Maple Street

CALL TO ORDER

SWANSON called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bush, Ganz, Morrison, Powers, Swanson and Walter
Members Absent: Haines (Notified)
Also Present: Ryan Windish, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

POWERS had a change on page 7 of the January 24th 2007 regular meeting minutes. In the middle of page 7, under POWERS' comment, it should read *POWERS asked Staff what it would take to...* (Scratch: ... *the street from* and Add: ...*Maple Street, Alder to Ryan*). **WALTER motioned to accept the January 24th 2007 regular meeting minutes as corrected. GANZ seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a. **PUBLIC HEARING: 2006 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (725 Narrow Street) (MA-04) (DISCUSSION)**

SWANSON opened the public hearing.

WINDISH reviewed for the Commissioners Staff's report as to the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (725 Narrow Street) (MA-04) as follows:

The amendment at 725 Narrow Street also includes a request for consideration by adjacent property owners that their property also be considered for redesignation/rezone. Since the request came in as a response to comments on the Notice of Application, it is discussed here as a second alternative. WINDISH reviewed Alternative's 1, 2 and 3, and the Comprehensive Plan Amendment criteria. There are 7 criteria that need to be met. Staff recommends approval of a recommendation to the City Council for Alternative 3.

WALTER asked WINDISH to clarify his report on the parking study.

WINDISH reiterated that certain types of businesses are exempt from providing off street parking. This applies to the businesses from the railroad tracks along Main Street to Meade Avenue. There was a previous study that showed ample parking for that core downtown area. There is discussion about increasing that by two acres. The new area needs to provide for its own off street parking.

SWANSON commented on the second area of concern, potentially diminishing Main Street's central core. To what degree is that a concern?

WINDISH stated that it is a concern, however, it is not a deal killer. It also adds to the supply of potential redevelopment on Main Street. It is something to be aware of, but it is not going to decimate the Main Street plan.

BUSH asked WINDISH if he knew how many of the mixed-use commercial units have been leased?

WINDISH stated that he did not know, but would look into that.

SWANSON confirmed that there were no further questions from the Commissioners and no comments from the public, and then closed the public hearing.

WALTER motioned to open this agenda item for discussion. BUSH seconded the motion. (*no vote*)

BUSH asked if there had been any response from the single-family homeowner on that block?

WINDISH stated that he was not specifically contacted by anybody who claimed to be the single-family homeowner. He received two phone calls, one from the owner of the home on the corner opposite of Cherry and then one other. There was no opposition, just questions about what was being proposed.

GANZ motioned to table this agenda item to the next meeting. WALTER seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

b. PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Code Amendment (Accessory Dwelling Units) (ZA-01) (DISCUSSION)

SWANSON opened the public hearing.

WINDISH reviewed for the Commissioners Staff's report as the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Package Zoning Code Amendments for Accessory Dwelling Units (ZA-01), as follows:

This Zoning Code amendment request is part of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Amendment package and pertains to allowing accessory-dwelling units (ADU) to be subdivided from the parent parcel. The applicants, Bradford Hinkley and Cathe Labelle have submitted two separate applications with similar requests and are combined herein. Proposed amendments to allow for accessory dwelling units to be subdivided from the parent parcel and to allow this in a pipestem lot configuration for existing accessory dwelling units in the Low-Density Residential zones (SMC 18.12.030). The amendment to the accessory dwelling unit would provide for greater flexibility in subdividing detached accessory dwelling units from the principal property and thereby creating more housing options in the City. The newly created lots would be required to meet all other dimensional and setback requirements to minimize impacts in character and density in the neighborhoods. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission APPROVE a recommendation that the City Council adopt the amendment as proposed. Staff is recommending approval of the amendment in the draft ordinance (Exhibit "A" to Staff's Report)

GANZ asked if the owners of the split lots would have the same requirements as to each lot?

WINDISH stated that they would be treated as individual lots and would have to meet the same requirements.

BUSH noted that no units have been permitted since 1999. Are they allowed?

WINDISH stated that they are allowed. He used the word "legally" permitted, as Staff is not sure if any have been illegally built. Records show that nobody has gone that route since 1999, however, people have turned garages into accessory dwelling units.

BUSH asked what the potential was within the City for construction of any new accessory dwelling units that can then be subdivided?

WINDISH stated that it would depend on the lot size. There has been an analysis done for subdividing lots in the downtown area during the pipestem process, however, he could not remember how many. It is not a lot. He will go back and look at that. They

are also updating the Buildable Lands Inventory, and can look at that as well and can highlight those lots on the map.

WALTER commented that this is contrary to the pipestem exercise gone through in the past. WALTER asked when these regulations were written?

WINDISH stated that they were written in 1995.

WALTER asked if at that time there was an interest not to have subdivisions and, if so, then what was the rationale for that disinterest and why are we changing it now? She is uncomfortable with that and owner occupation.

WINDISH stated that he would look up the legislative history.

BUSH asked what the requirements are of the access to an accessory dwelling unit, specifically the driveway requirements?

WINDISH stated that it would have to be at least a 15-foot access. That is the minimum standard.

SWANSON opened this agenda item to public comment. There was no public comment. SWANSON closed the public hearing.

GANZ motioned to table this agenda item to the next meeting. MORRISON seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Zoning Code Amendment (Increase Lot Coverage) (DISCUSSION)

WINDISH reviewed for the Commissioners Staff's Report as to Zoning Code Amendment (Increase Lot Coverage), as follows:

The City has received an application for a zoning code amendment to increase lot coverage regulations in Low Density Residential (LDR) zones. The proposed amendments are discussed briefly as follows: a) Proposed amendment is to increase the allowable lot coverage in the low density residential zones (SMC 18.12). The amendment proposal also includes an allowed increase in lot coverage for single story (rambler) structures. The current code for structures located in standard platted subdivisions allows for maximum lot coverage of 30 percent (35 percent in LDR 6,000). For structures in subdivisions utilizing the neo-traditional option under SMC18.12.090, the allowed lot coverage is currently 40 percent for all zones. The proposal would raise the allowed lot coverage for all lots in all zones by 5 percent. The allowed lot coverage for single family structures would be increased by 10 percent. This proposed amendment increases to lot coverage to closer represent what is being built in town under the neo-traditional option. It allows for larger single story homes and provides potential developers an incentive .

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission DISCUSS the proposed amendment. There will be a Planning Commission Public Hearing on March 1, 2007 for action on an ordinance to implement the above mentioned zoning amendments.

GANZ asked if this proposed zoning code amendment was developer driven?

WINDISH stated that it is. The Applicant is Ginger Development. This will provide a market for different types of housing.

MORRISON stated that there had been discussion about floor area as to lot coverage. MORRISON asked for a more detailed explanation of that?

WINDISH explained that it would be the size of the lot to the size of the structure. A certain ratio is allowed for the square feet of a house for any given lot. Floor area ratio does that as well.

WALTER asked if that change would have to be made consistently throughout the code?

WINDISH stated that it would have to be consistent.

WALTER commented that she thinks FAR speaks to volume, and that lot coverage is less sensitive that way. Is this limited to single story structures?

WINDISH stated that it could be for a two-story building as well.

WALTER asked if there was any way Staff could provide some graphic examples of this?

WINDISH stated that he would do that, and thought that the Applicant may help out with that as well.

SWANSON concluded this agenda item.

b. Attendance Report (DISCUSSION)

WINDISH stated that this is provided for informational purposes. Staff generates this report every 6 months, however, it has been some time since the last report. Notification was not tracked as consistently this time. Staff would like notification from this point on for tracking purposes. Notice needs to be given by 5:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

c. Rules and Procedures (DISCUSSION)

WINDISH stated that he met with SWANSON a couple of days ago to discuss Planning Commission procedures. One thing that was mentioned was that they give Pledge of Allegiance at the beginning of every City Council meeting. He does not know if that is something that the Planning Commission would like to do as well? Also discussed was

how things are forwarded on to City Council. There is a Planning Commission majority opinion that covers that for the most part, however, it would be helpful if the Chair or a designated member of the Planning Commission would attend the City Council's study sessions when things get to Council level. SWANSON attended the last City Council meeting to see how they would deal with the outdoor drinking ordinance. It would be nice, especially in the instances of a close vote, to have both sides represented, unless the Planning Commission trusts that it will be presented fairly on their behalf. The Chair can be designated the Planning Commission representative, or we can just say whoever can be there should be there. Staff would advise the Planning Commission as to when specific items are coming up for a study session, and would then advise the City Council or the clerk that somebody from the Planning Commission will be in attendance at that study session.

WALTER asked if the City Council study sessions are on Mondays?

WINDISH advised that they are the 2nd and 4th Monday at 6:00 p.m. (City Council's regular meetings are on the 1st and 2nd Monday). If the Planning Commission would like, something specific can be added to the rules and procedures, or it can just be the understanding that someone from the Planning Commission will be in attendance at those meetings.

GANZ asked if John Doan was still putting out the "Friday Letter"?

WINDISH stated that he is, and explained to the other Commissioners that it is a letter on noteworthy things and announcements that come up during the week. WINDISH will make sure that everybody who wants to be is on the list to receive that.

SWANSON commented that he would like to see not just one person being designated to attend the City Council's study sessions, but would like to see all show an interest in attending. As such, he would like to see that left open.

MORRISON stated that he thinks that saying the Pledge of Allegiance at the beginning of the meetings is a fantastic idea.

GANZ motioned to make the second order of business at the Planning Commission meetings the flag salute. MORRISON seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence, other than the e-mails received from the Jenkins.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

GANZ asked Staff for a copy of the new Staff telephone directory.

WINDISH stated that he would e-mail it to everybody.

BUSH requested that Staff provide a list of the documents that they feel would be important for the Commissioners to hang on to for future reference, as she would like to get rid of a few documents stored at her home.

WINDISH stated that he would provide that list.

MORRISON asked if there had been any further talk about a Code Enforcement Officer?

WINDISH state that it had been talked about, but nothing has been done about it yet.

SWANSON thanked his fellow Commissioners for their patience with regard to his first meeting as Chair.

STAFF COMMENTS

WINDISH had the following Staff Comments:

- 1) The RFP went out to 3 firms on the Red Apple Site. They have until April 13th to submit their proposals. Staff will then go through the selection and negotiation process. Hopefully there will be an agreement with a developer by May or June. It was originally short-listed from 5 to 3 firms;
- 2) The Northstar Chemical Plant located on the Fleischmann's site, has been given a Notification of Significance. They must provide an EIS (*aquifer recharge, impacts to ground water, safety to community, traffic impacts, etc*);
- 3) The Alton Macmillan study on how the area might develop in the future, has been in the County process for the last 3 years. Next, it will be going from the Community Board to the County Planning Commission and then on to County Council;
- 4) In the parking study it was mentioned how to and when to comment on parking. The parking study will be discussed at the February 26th 2007 City Council study session. Staff will forward on to the Commissioners the latest City Council agenda;
- 5) On February 12th 2007, there will be a study session on outdoor drinking areas, interchange commercial zoning amendments and the update to the wetland ordinance;
- 6) Sumner University will take place on March 6th 2007 and March 13th 2007. There will be the usual presentations on current projects. Tim Matson of the County Assessor's Office will be there and there will also be discussion on the merger of the Fire District, along with other things;
- 7) On March 14th 2007, in this room, there will be an Affordable Housing Workshop put on by Pierce County. It is a discussion on affordable housing in relation to incomes in a specific area. This is done by jurisdiction;
- 8) On the east side, at Rainer View Park, the tiles, big toys and signage are being completed; and

- 9) We are also looking forward to the restroom enclosures at our local parks. They will be a little more substantial than Sani-Cans.

ADJOURNMENT

GANZ motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m. MORRISON seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ryan R. Windish
Senior Planner