
Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday,
February 3, 2016
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 (7:00)** Chair Quisenberry called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Roll Call (7:00)**

Planning Commission Members Present

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair
Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Steve Smith – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Chris Barrett (arrived at 7:08)
Mr. David Graybill
Mr. Ken Campbell
Mr. Tony Paulson

Planning Commission Members Excused

Staff Present

Jeff Boers, Principal Planner
Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant

Chair Quisenberry welcomed new commissioners David Graybill and Ken Campbell to the Planning Commission. He also congratulated Commissioner Smith on his reappointment.

3. **Approval of Minutes (7:00)**

MOTION: by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Boykin to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2016 Planning Commission meeting as amended.

MOTION: by Chair Quisenberry and seconded by Commissioner Smith to add a bullet to minutes on page two at the end of the transitional landscaping discussion reflecting that three commissioners expressed reservations about the proposed policy after discussion revealed additional parcels that this policy may apply to. Motion passed.

Following this discussion and Motion, the initial **MOTION to approve the minutes as amended was passed.**

4. **Public Comment (7:03)**

There being no public comment on any item not appearing on the agenda, Chair

Quisenberry closed the Public Comment section of the meeting.

5. Discussion: Housekeeping Amendments (7:03)

Principal Planner Boers reviewed information provided in the agenda packet regarding housekeeping amendments.

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points re Permit Processing:

- The Community Meeting requirement has not been enforced in recent years because the requirement for this meeting was previously repealed in the zoning code. This proposed amendment would achieve internal consistency.
- Pull out the "review process" section because it is repeated verbatim under each type of permit. Place in one location.
- Combine exemptions from procedure with review information.
- Move matrix (Exhibit A) to the front of the title.
- Fourth page, item 6 does not seem to fit in this listing.
- Organization needs some work. Principal Planner Boers will work on formatting clean-up, and the Commission noted its agreement that Boers could contact Commissioner Paulson for clarification of his comments.

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points re Code Amendments:

- A quasi-judicial rezone is heard by the Hearings Examiner, and the Examiner's recommendation is forwarded to the City Council for a decision. A Comp Plan amendment or area wide rezone are reviewed by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council for a final decision.
- It may be beneficial for the City Council to have input from the Hearings Examiner on a quasi-judicial rezone before making its decision on an associated legislative Comp Plan amendment. The change to allow these proposals to be considered concurrently would provide that opportunity.
- The intention is to make the process more timely and efficient for staff and the applicant and improve the decision-making process and outcome.
- Item D on top of page 2 will be reworked to eliminate the requirement for a pre-application conference; instead such a conference would be recommended.
- The City Attorney has received a copy of these changes but has not provided any feedback. Staff will confirm that the Attorney does not have any issues or concerns with these changes.
- The change on the bottom of page 4 is to ensure consistency with State timeline requirements.

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points re Development Agreements:

- This new chapter could apply to agreements made, for example, the development of Town Center.
- Projects approved prior to enactment of this chapter would be vested and not subject to this process. It is likely that this tool will be infrequently used, and only when a developer and the City see a benefit in using it.
- The question was raised as to whether there would be a possibility for incentivization with the use of this process. Staff suggested this could be explored, although applicants would still be locked into complying with the Code. Approving a development agreement would not relieve an applicant of code compliance in and of itself, although the variance process could be used to consider deviations from the code.

- Nothing in the Development Agreement chapter would change the process for a quasi-judicial rezone. This is an enhancement to the standard process, not a replacement.

6. Staff Comments (7:48)

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be February 17. Although the Election of Officers has been slated for the first March meeting, it could be moved to the February 17 agenda if there is room on the agenda and Commission support. Critical Area amendments reviewed on January 20 should be heard by the Commission on a separate track from the housekeeping amendments – Critical Area amendments trigger shoreline master program amendments – which means there will be a higher level of State agency interest and involvement. A public hearing on the critical area amendments may be held in March.

7. Commission and Liaison Comments (7:53)

Commissioner Boykin thanked the new commissioners for their interest and stated that he is looking forward to their contributions.

Chair Quisenberry discussed some important guidelines for commissioners, including that four commissioners represents a quorum, and that commission business (by a quorum) cannot be discussed outside of a properly noticed meeting. This also applies to emails among commissioners that discuss Planning Commission business.

Chair Quisenberry stated that the State Department of Commerce puts on a short course on planning and encouraged commissioners to attend this course. The next offering of this course that is not scheduled on a Planning Commission meeting night is March 23, 2016 in Vancouver.

Discussion was held on how the development community would be notified if the Development Agreement provisions were passed. At a minimum, the MBA would be notified (as they are of all code amendments) and information would be placed on the City's website.

8. Adjourn

MOTION: by Commissioner Boykin, seconded by Commissioner Paulson, to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was approved unanimously. (8:02 p.m.)

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as submitted: March 2, 2016