

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday,
March 2, 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. Steve Smith – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Chris Barrett
Mr. David Graybill

Planning Commission Members Excused

Mr. Tony Paulson
Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair
Mr. Ken Campbell

Staff Present

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

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

MOTION: by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Graybill to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2016 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed.

4. **Public Comment (7:00)**

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: Miscellaneous Amendments (7:01)**

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

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points regarding Wireless Telecommunications Facilities:

- Discussion of reasons for changes made on Permit Table on page 49 of housekeeping code amendments. The main reason is a reorganization of information, rather than a change of content.

- Cell towers currently exist at the Public Works shop, Chambers Creek properties and Curtis High School, each of which is located within a residential zone. Types of conditions that could apply to the approval of cell towers are screening of the facility and specified hours for construction.

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points regarding Commercial Zone Design Standards:

- Temporary uses – provisions do not apply to events such as Duck Daze – events are covered by special events permit.
- The intent is to remove all prohibited uses and cover these in the Zoning Code.
- The word “should” is used with Guidelines; the word “shall” is appropriate for use with Standards, which are mandatory.
- Under former section 19.52.290, Guidelines, on number 3, strike the word “consider”.
- Under former section 19.52.250, separate the two subjects being addressed.
- Under former section 19.52.260, item 4 refers to Town Center architecture. There is no definition of the Town Center architecture. This item will need to be reworded.
- Former section 19.52.430. Currently the City has no kiosks.
- Former section 19.52.070, differentiate between information and sales kiosks.
- Former section 19.52.600 will need to be reworked because of a recent Supreme Court decision.

In response to Commissioner Barrett’s query, the background and history of allowing, and then dis-allowing rounding for allowed lots and parcel size, was discussed.

Under Housekeeping Amendments, comments and discussion included:

- Page 46, 10, b, iii, change from 36 months to 30 months. Make sure the verbiage in the following item iv is consistent.
- Transition landscaping amendments are still in this document. There needs to be additional discussion by the Commission and a determination on this item.
- What is the definition of inoperable? There is a definition in Title 9.

6. Discussion: Sign Code Amendments (8:04)

Director Swindale reviewed the material included in the agenda packet for this item. The recent Supreme Court decision states that signs cannot be regulated by content. The City’s code regulates most temporary signs by size, and duration of signage, based on their content. In the future, should the city allow the proliferation of temporary signs in rights-of-way or should it prohibit them? The tough issues to be addressed are location of signs, how many are allowed, and how long the signs can stay up.

Commission comments and discussion covered the following points:

- The Commission would like information from the city attorney as to what the Supreme Court opinion says.
- Issues are about proliferation and impact. Maybe shared signs would reduce the need for lots of signs.
- Businesses have other ways of advertising, via new technology.
- Resolution 743 provides very specific direction on what facets of the sign code are to be reviewed by the Commission. However, if something else comes up that would be in the interest of the City to review, these issues can be brought forward. The recent decision from the Supreme Court overrules this Resolution, and will require the City’s attention.

7. Staff Comments (8:45)

Director Swindale stated that on March 7 the Council will appoint seven members of the subarea ad hoc committee. Staff interviewed 14 individuals, and a good cross section of the community has been recommended for appointment. Also, the draft Planning Commission Workplan will be reviewed by Council the same night.

8. Commission and Liaison Comments (8:48)

Commission officer elections will be held on March 16.

Economic Development Commissioner Platt reported that the Economic Development Commission met on February 18. Mayor Figueroa attended. The EDC will put together a workplan and has recommitted to working closely with the Planning Commission. Sign code amendments are a priority and will be reviewed by the EDC. Commissioner Platt summarized the January Business license report.

9. Adjourn

MOTION: by Commissioner Graybill, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was approved unanimously. (8:55 p.m.)

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as submitted: March 16, 2016