

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 19, 2015
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 (7:01)** Chair Quisenberry called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. **Roll Call (7:01)**

Planning Commission Members Present

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair
Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Diogenes Xenos
Mr. Morry Stafford
Mr. Tony Paulson

Planning Commission Members Absent

Mr. Chris Barrett
Mr. Steve Smith – Co Vice Chair

Staff Present

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

3. **Approval of Minutes (7:01)**

MOTION: by Commissioner Stafford and seconded by Commissioner Xenos to approve the minutes of August 5, 2015 as submitted. Motion passed.

4. **Public Comment (7:02)**

There being no public in attendance, Chair Quisenberry stated the Public Comment section of the meeting was closed.

5. **Discussion: Transition Properties Overlay and Consideration and Approval of the Development Regulation Amendments (7:02)**

Principal Planner Boers provided background and summary of this topic. Staff concern regarding the transition properties overlay proposal presented by Commissioner Stafford at the August 5, 2015 meeting are related to timing and the requirement of public process.

Commissioner discussion included the following items:

- Principal Planner Boers and Director Swindale explained the difference between quasi-judicial and legislative matters as it applies to property rezoning.
- This item can be included in the housekeeping amendments which the Commission will be reviewing this fall.

MOTION by Commissioner Paulson and seconded by Commissioner Boykin to recommend to Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, and City Council the approval of amendments to UPMC Title 4 Revenue and Finance, UPMC Title 17 Critical Areas and UPMC Title 19 Zoning in accordance with Washington State Growth Management Act Periodic Update Requirements. The Motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion: Tree Retention Code Amendments (7:21)

Principal Planner Boers provided background on and a summary of this item.

Commission discussion and comments included:

- There is no city inventory of “significant trees”. It may be unwise to do this. Where is “significant tree” referenced in the code?
- Would the designation of a tree on private property as a “significant tree” be considered a taking? Would the City have to buy the tree?
- How is a “significant tree” inventory populated? What are the criteria and process?
- A “significant tree” could be defined by size.
- Remove “significant tree” from the code if the city does not have an inventory and doesn’t intend to have one. It may be helpful to have one for future use.
- The most significant tree in the City currently is the Lone Pine at Chambers Bay.
- Provide more information from other cities that actually have and use a significant tree list or inventory.
- There should be a process for placing a tree on a significant tree inventory as well as a fee.
- Perhaps the City could hire a consulting arborist to help identify significant trees.

Director Swindale stated that on page 5 item D, the title of the evaluation form used by the International Society of Arboriculture has changed and will be updated.

Consensus among the Commission is to increase the tree size threshold for trees the City protects to be 12” for evergreen and 9” for deciduous trees from 6”.

The language on page 5, 19.65.070 item B will be clarified.

On page 19, the red-line under item B does not include the 20” tree size given in the staff memo as one of the options for the Commission to consider. This could be added as an option.

Next steps: change regulated tree size for deciduous to 9” and then the consensus of the commission is that this document will be acceptable for hearing. More work needs to be done on the significant tree issue, and the Commission would also like to see information about what other cities do as far as “significant tree” issues. Staff will research this and bring back more information on “significant trees” to the Commission.

Director Swindale asked for confirmation that the change on Page 5, waiving of the arborist requirement for identifying a dead or diseased tree, is acceptable to the Commission. The Commission concurs with this change.

7. Staff Comments (8:36)

The Monday night joint City Council/Planning Commission study session regarding the Comprehensive Plan amendments went very well. The process now is that Council will be provided information on the items that were raised for discussion and the Planning Commission will receive this information, as well. However, possible revisions to the Comprehensive Plan will not come back to the Planning Commission for review.

8. Commission and Liaison Comments (8:37)

Commissioner Boykin agreed that the Monday night joint Council/Commission meeting went well. He was glad to see staff's work was acknowledged. He also stated that he appreciated Commissioner Paulson's comments during the Monday night meeting.

Commissioners Paulson and Quisenberry also expressed appreciation for staff's work on the Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

9. Adjourn

MOTION: by Commissioner Paulson, seconded by Commissioner Boykin to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was approved unanimously. (8:39)

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as amended: September 3, 2015