

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 5, 2014
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Town Hall Meeting Room

Note: The Action Minutes represent a summary of presentations given and actions taken. For a more detailed record, the audio recording of the meeting can be accessed through the City Clerk's Office, City of University Place. Contact Emy Genetia at (253) 460-2511.

1. Call to Order (7:05)

Chair Quisenberry called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call (7:05)

Planning Commission Members Present

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair
Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Tony Paulson – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Chris Barrett
Mr. Diogenes Xenos
Mr. Steve Smith

Planning Commission Members Excused

Staff Present

David Swindale, Planning and Development
Services Director
Jeff Boers, Principal Planner
Kevin Briske, Principal Planner
Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant

Planning Commission Members Absent

3. Approval of Minutes (7:06)

Chair Quisenberry ask to have an addition to his comment under the Commissioner Comments section of the January 15 minutes, that he was impressed by the caliber of the military present at the event.

MOTION: by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Barrett to approve the minutes of January 15, 2014 as amended. The motion to approve the minutes for January 15, 2014 as amended passed unanimously.

4. Public Comment (7:07)

There being no public comment on any item not appearing on the agenda, Chair Quisenberry closed the Public Comment section of the meeting.

5. Town Center Zoning Code Amendments – Drive Through Location (7:07)

Principal Planner Briske reviewed the memo and attachments included in the agenda packet. The City has received an application to make a text amendment to the drive-through standards to allow a drive-aisle in a location where it is currently not allowed when there are grade differences. The request would be to allow the drive-aisle location between the building and the street when there is a 7 foot or more grade differential.

Commissioner discussion and comment included:

- The maps presented are based on an estimate of 6 to 8 feet grade range.
- The McDonalds site is in the Town Center zone, map 3 is all mixed use zone; map 2 is majority mixed use office, there are two parcels zoned mixed use. Mixed use office does not allow food establishments, mixed use does.
- The application of this change could possibly apply to the McGuire properties close to Fred Meyer, depending on the zoning applied.
- Only site actually measured is the McDonalds site, which is a bit more than 7 feet.

Brian Matson, McDonalds construction manager, and Sherri Grueneis with Freiheit & Ho architects introduced themselves. Commissioners discussed the proposed building and drive-through lane with Matson and Grueneis. Discussion and comment included:

- Are there design options that can be utilized to move the building closer to Bridgeport and run the drive through lanes under the projection of the building?
- Matson stated that the intent was to invite pedestrians towards the front of the building. Most two story buildings do not include drive-throughs. From an operational and business standpoint it is ideal to have two drive-through lanes, customers go through faster.
- Commissioners commented that moving the building away from Bridgeport seems counter to the long term vision of bringing the buildings up to the street to create a pedestrian friendly environment. The goal was to provide pedestrian entrances from the street to the building. This has not happened in all cases.
- Director Swindale noted that the significant issue to consider here is elevation. The original standards were written to bring buildings up to the street. Is it reasonable, with the significant grade difference, to expect this to happen? Does the Planning Commission feels it is in the public interest to maintain the vision or feel it is more in the public interest to have this new building without requiring the additional expense?
- Language should be more restrictive dealing with access for the sake of other parcels, not this one. Principal Planner Briske feels that language can be drafted to address this issue.
- Commission should be true to what the vision is. This is an opportunity, with complete demolition of the existing McDonalds building, to be true to the vision. Both Commissioners Boykin and Barrett feel this way as does Chair Quisenberry. Commission needs to reassess that vision and design standards, and encourage the architect to see if there are creative ways to address the vision.
- Principal Planner Briske stated that there are other visions in the design guidelines as well that could be achieved with this proposal. Staff can redraft language to address access concerns, and applicant can review other options to address the street level issue.
- Principal Planner Briske reminded the Commission that this is just a request for a text amendment, and only one possible design. Chair Quisenberry expressed concern because the amendment would open up other areas in the City to changes that would go against the vision. This change could be written so that is just applies

- to the Town Center zone, and not others.
- Chair Quisenberry commented that simply adjusting language does not deal with the more important issue, which is the design standard goals and vision. He would like to see a different approach that does not violate the street front vision.
- The request is to allow a drive-through lane between a building and arterial, this can still be discussed.
- Under this proposed configuration you lose parking to the south. This still does provide the required parking.
- Is the main 15 foot route absolutely necessary or can the drive-through lane be reconfigured? The by-pass lane is a concern.

The petitioner will work with city staff to adjust language of the amendment to address the concerns expressed by the Commission and will return with additional building configuration proposals as well.

6. Consideration and Approval: View Protection (7:57)

Principal Planner Boers reviewed the view protection summary as included in the agenda packet. He suggested that the Commission review the topics, and identify any changes they would like to make.

Topic 1: paragraph 2, factors other than view preservation vs. preserving privacy should be considered. Add language about these factors being viewed equally, or consideration of all aspects are important. Send a strong signal to the Council that view protection does NOT trump all else. It is just one of the factors that should be considered.

Paragraph on top of page 3, should say the City has the final decision, it is their property, but that input from all parties should be heard. This is Commission consensus.

The approach should be balanced, because the factors are not equal in each situation.

Topic 5 – rewrite third sentence to emphasize the accommodation, and not the number. Say there was “one Commissioner”. Commissioners who dissent can be identified by name unless the Commissioner would rather remain anonymous. Both Commissioner Barrett and Boykin agree with this.

Principal Planner will redraft these sections while the next item is discussed and bring changes back at the end of tonight’s meeting.

7. Comprehensive Plan Update - Introduction (8:26)

Director Swindale summarized the need to complete the process of reviewing and updating the Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed work that has been done the prior two years, and the update of the land use and shoreline elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The bulk of the Comprehensive Plan still needs to be reviewed and updated in a year and a half including Planning Commission review and recommendation and Council review and approval. In order to keep within the projected timeframe, the Planning Commission needs to be done with its review by the end of this year.

Commissioners were encouraged to read the “Guide to Updating the Comprehensive Plan” due to Growth Management Act amendments (distributed at the December 18, 2013 meeting). Discussion was held of population numbers and the need to plan for 2030 projected population.

Commissioner discussion and comment included:

- The City is a Candidate Regional Growth Center. The intention is to complete this application process this year to become a Designated Regional Growth Center.

At the next meeting the Commission will start with the Land Use and Housing elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff will also provide copies of the final accepted workplan to Commissioners.

Principal Planner Boers distributed changes in response to the Commission's earlier discussion regarding the view protection draft memo to the Council. (attached to these minutes).

MOTION: by Commissioner Paulson, seconded by Commissioner Boykin, to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes. The motion to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes was approved unanimously.

MOTION: by Commissioner Paulson, seconded by Commissioner Xenos, to forward the view protection recommendation, as amended, to the City Council for recommendation. The motion to forward the view protection recommendation, as amended, to the City Council for recommendation was approved unanimously.

8. Staff Comments (8:59)

Director Swindale reported that digging has begun at Lot 10 and work is beginning on the parking garage underneath Latitude 47. Jersey Mike's is close to opening. There was a micro-brewery interested in locating here, but that has not materialized. New developments are counted at 1.4 persons per unit for multi-family building with 5 or more units.

Ms. Metcalf stated that there is a Partner UP event scheduled for tomorrow evening. She also reported that Fresh Rolls! is open.

9. Commissioner and Liaison Comments (9:04)

There are 3 applicants for the vacant position on the Commission, as Morry Stafford has applied. The application deadline is Feb. 14. The mayor will interview each and then make a decision.

ED Commissioner Foster stated that the Economic Development Commission has not met as yet this year.

Commissioner Boykin stated that he and his wife enjoyed the 4th annual black tie event to raise funds for parks and recreation.

10. Adjourn (9:06)

MOTION: by Commissioner Paulson seconded by Commissioner Barrett to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was approved unanimously.

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as amended: February 19, 2014