



Planning Commission Minutes
February 1, 2006 Regular Scheduled Meeting

APPROVED

City Hall Council Chambers

The meeting was called to order at 5:34P.M.

Planning Commission Present

Randy McKibbin, **Chair**
Grant Sulham, **Vice-Chair**
Quinn Dahlstrom
Dennis Poulsen
David Eck
Katrina Minton-Davis
L. Winona Jacobsen

City Staff Present

Stephen Ladd, Planning Manager
Christy McQuillen, P&CD Assistant/Clerk

A poll determined that a majority of Commission members would be available for the next meeting scheduled for February 15, 2006 to be held at City Hall Council Chambers.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes requiring review and approval were those of January 18, 2006.

Commissioner Sulham noted a grammar correction to page 2, paragraph 3 the word “slow” should read “slope”.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DAHLSTROM, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SULHAM TO APPROVE MINUTES FOR JANUARY 18, 2006 WITH NOTED CORRECTION TO PAGE 2. APPROVAL WAS UNANIMOUS.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS/CONCERNS:

A few individuals were in the audience but chose not to speak.

III. OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS:

Proposed revisions of the Critical Areas Ordinance regarding steep slopes- As part of the Planning Commission packet, Mr. Ladd said that the City Attorney submitted comments/suggested changes to the DRAFT Ordinance. The most significant being: to move the language that was being added to 16.28.050 to the end of 16.28.010 instead, because otherwise the language would have no effect. 16.28.050 lists additional requirements that “shall apply to geologic hazard areas.” But areas with less than 25% slope are not “geologic hazard areas.”

Mr. Ladd added that the language now at the end of 16.28.010 is an attempt to add flexibility of a sliding scale nature (less slope, less tree retention, more slope, more tree retention). But it's difficult because only certain types of regulations are appropriate in the critical area ordinance. Others are appropriate in "Land Clearing and Landscaping (Chapter 16.12). The two codes have to work together.

As a group, Commissioners briefly went over a map which Mr. Ladd distributed that shows (city-wide) areas that have slopes of 25% or greater (Exhibit A)*. This visual tool allowed the Commission an opportunity to see that not only steep slopes at the western edge of the city are 25% or greater, but areas to the south of Lake Bonney, Fennel Creek corridor and a few scattered within city limits. Mr. Ladd informed the commission that this map is not 100% accurate but an approximate as technology can provide in GIS.

Vice-Chair Sulham broached the subject of the stepped land clearing limit concept once again. At the January 18th Planning Commission meeting, staff provided information on the City of Puyallup land clearing ordinance and Vice-Chair Sulham had distributed research materials which he feels is worth exploring more. Chair McKibbin and a few other Commissioners agreed.

Commissioners agreed to move forward with a Public Hearing on Wednesday, February 15, 2006 at 6:00PM in City Hall Council Chambers. Comments would be received on the current Draft Ordinance and then the Planning Commission could always move forward with changes with no set timeline.

This item would remain on the Agenda under Old Business/Public Hearing for the Planning Commission meeting schedule for February 15, 2006.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING- None

V. NEW BUSINESS-

Proposed revision to the R-2 Residential Zone to give a maximum density rather than a minimum lot size and revise the setback requirements- As outlined in the Staff Report dated January 23, 2006 the R-2 zone has not yet been revised to match the R-1 zone. In R-2, the minimum lot size for single-family residences is 8,600 square feet, which equals 5.0 units per acre. The minimum lot size for duplexes is 10,000 square feet, which equals 8.712 units per acre. Thus, the R-2 zone encourages duplexes by allowing them to be built at a higher density. Placing two dwelling units on one lot means one or both of them must be rentals. Thus, the R-2 zone poses a disincentive for owner-occupancy. This reduces overall property values because owner-occupants have a long-term stake in the community. The solution is to put the R-2 zone on a density basis rather than a minimum lot size basis, as was done with the R-1 zone in 2004 (Ord. 1099).

Mr. Ladd used an example of a recently approved preliminary plat of Legacy Park located at 70th St. E. near Meyer Road. The zoning is R-2. To maximize density, the applicant is creating ten duplex lots for a total of 20 units. They will probably be rental units forever unless the R-2 zone is changed to allow each unit to sit on its own lot with the property line running along the common wall. The Applicant has expressed an interest in eventually selling them as townhouses because they would be worth much more than rental units.

Mr. Ladd went on to add that in residential development, clustering allows the City to retain more trees and open space. Clustering is density-neutral. The same number of homes are built, but they are closer together,

often attached. Each home sits on its own lot. Prior to Ordinance 1099, clustering could be accomplished through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. However, the PUD process was repealed in 2004. In the R-1 zone Ordinance 1099 inserted other means of flexibility for clustering (reduced dimensional requirements in certain circumstances and with special approvals).

The proposed DRAFT ordinance removes the disincentive for owner-occupancy by putting the R-2 zone on the same basis as the R-1 zone. In effect, it allows attached single-family residences (townhouses) on lots averaging 5,000 square feet in size. The proposed DRAFT ordinance does not alter the number of units a developer can get. It regulates density in a manner that encourages owner-occupancy.

The following table discusses the ordinance.

BLMC section being revised	Explanation
18.16.020	Both detached and attached single-family residences would be permitted. (The references to modular homes and manufactured homes are deleted because they are by definition single-family residences.)
18.16.040	Clustered lot (lots with reduced dimensional requirements) become conditional uses, approvable by the City Council.
18.16.050.A	The required density at the conclusion of any subdivision is 6.0 to 8.712 dwelling units per net acre for attached single-family residences and 4.0 to 5.0 dwelling units per net acre for detached single-family residences. This does not alter the current allowance.
18.16.050.B, C, E, G, and H	Minimum lot width and minimum setbacks are reduced, in some cases subject to City Council approval of a conditional use permit.

Conclusion: Staff recommends that the Commission absorb the draft ordinance, consider desired changes, and schedule a public hearing as soon as possible.

As a group, commissioners were mainly concerned with: 1) Existing “duplexes” within the City and owners selling these units separately without a firewall being built between the 2 units and 2) 18.16.050 H, allowing a reduction in subsections B,C,E and G by up to 50% (if indicated by application of the conditional use permit).

This item would remain on the Agenda under Old Business for the Planning Commission meeting schedule for February 15, 2006.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Correspondence- Ms. McQuillen distributed a memo dated February 1, 2006 from Robert Leedy, Planning and Community Development Director regarding Sign Code Review/Update (a request by Dan Rattenbury, business owner of Priced Right Print & Sings).

Commissioners reviewed the memo and materials and determined that Mr. Rattenbury could voice his concerns at the February 15, 2006 Planning Commission meeting under Public Concerns but do not support moving forward with a Sign Code amendment. This request should come from City Council directive.

Staff Concerns- Mr. Ladd briefly updated Commissioners on the WSU/Quadrant Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement is in progress however, the applicants have placed the amendment/process on hold.

Mr. Ladd said that a few members of the Fennel Creek Trail Committee would like to speak at the February 15, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioners welcome their presence.

Commissioner Concerns – Vice-Chair Sulham brought up the discussion of Planning Commission mail and email system. Ms. McQuillen said that the mailboxes are located at the City Hall Annex and suggested Commissioners decide on a mutual agreed system for distribution. As a Group, it was decided that mail would be picked up during the week by members and if any mail is not picked up, then Ms. McQuillen would mail out (US Mail) on Fridays at 2:00PM. No email notification required.

Commissioner Minton-Davis passed out flyers with information on a Mexican Riviera cruise sponsored by the Bonney Lake Chamber of Commerce.

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DAHLSTROM, SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIR SULHAM TO ADJOURN. APPROVAL WAS UNANIMOUS.

The meeting ended at 6:48P.M.

Christy McQuillen, Planning Commission Clerk
Approved on February 15, 2006