

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday,
September 7, 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)

Acting Chair Boykin called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call (7:00)

Planning Commission Members Present

Mr. Frank Boykin – Acting Chair
Mr. Chris Barrett
Mr. David Graybill
Mr. Ken Campbell
Mr. Tony Paulson

Planning Commission Members Excused

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair
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 Paulson and seconded by Commissioner Graybill to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Motion passed.

4. Public Comment (7:02)

Acting Chair Boykin opened the meeting to public comment on any item not to be addressed in the meeting agenda.

David Harrowe, 4616 79th Ave. Ct. W. Stated that with more people in University Place in the future, the roads will become congested. He suggested a shuttle service that would run only in UP. Pierce County Transit has a bus that only services major thoroughfares. A shuttle service would go to side streets as well as major points. He asked how much traffic within UP is intra-city rather than going to points outside of the city.

There being no further public comments, Acting Chair Boykin closed the public comment section of the meeting.

5. Discussion: PSRC Recommended Areas for Further Work -- University Place Comprehensive Plan (7:05)

Principal Planner Boers reviewed the staff report and attachments for this item as found in the agenda packet. Four areas were identified by PSRC for further work as the City continues to refine its Comprehensive Plan. Principal Planner Boers reviewed those areas. Staff's conclusion is that a good portion of this work is likely to be developed as part of the subarea planning process that is now underway. Some of the additional work may be informed by the results of the subarea plan process, and the subarea planning process may result in some recommended amendments to the Comp Plan. It would seem prudent to wait to address these areas for further work until the subarea planning is completed in 2017. There is a private Comprehensive Plan amendment ready to move forward now, and holding that process up so that both the PSRC recommendations and the private amendment can be taken to Council together may unnecessarily delay the process for the private amendment.

Commission comments and discussion included:

- Clarification was requested on the first PSRC recommendation regarding the transportation plan. The City did provide a 20 year transportation finance plan, although it is difficult to identify sources of funding for projects that far in the future.
- If PSRC recommendations are postponed to 2017, is there any jeopardy regarding our certification? Not likely. PSRC will be kept informed as to the City's intentions and timeline as a result of the subarea planning process.
- The subarea plan will deal with housing and transportation, so this seems an obvious strategy. Will the economic development strategic plan be rewritten given the results of the subarea plan? The subarea plan will inform updates to the economic development strategic action plan.
- Was the City's Comprehensive Plan was certified? Yes, and the certification was not conditional.

MOTION by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Graybill to delay action on Comprehensive Plan amendments in response to the PSRC recommendations per the recommendation by Director Swindale and Principal Planner Boers until 2017. The motion passed.

6. Discussion: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment for Chambers Landing (7:20)

Director Swindale provided background on this issue. Director Swindale asked Commissioners to become familiar with the application and begin noting any questions or concerns.

Commission comments and discussion included:

- Parking would be partially underground. The recommended building height would conform to that allowed in the proposed MF-L zone.
- Staff is hoping to have its analysis completed by the next meeting of the Planning Commission, and will provide recommendations for Commission consideration at that time.
- The property immediately to the north is a 16-lot subdivision under construction by the name "Cascade Point". Two parcels are being divided into 16 lots.
- Final plat has not been recorded for Cascade Point. When the final plat is recorded, the parcel map with street layouts will be updated.
- Property to the south is the same MF-L designation as this request. According to the area of the parcel and density permitted for that property, allowed density would be

about 60 units. Because of the topography of the area, the owner is advertising it as space for 45 units.

- A previous rezone as a justification for this rezone is valid in the sense that it shows that the approval of this request would not result in spot zoning.
- Properties to the west – is there a current buffer because of the topography? There is a narrow buffer that is associated with existing development. For the proposed development there would be an additional 20 foot buffer requirement. The resulting total buffer should be about 40 feet.
- Would the additional traffic load be considered? Yes. This development as well as the 16 units, and the “for sale” property to the south will have access to 67th via a single driveway each. The applicant for this project has submitted a traffic analysis, and frontage improvements would be required (curb, gutter and sidewalks).
- There will be additional opportunities to ask further questions.
- Commissioner Paulson requested that staff address the following issues in their review of the proposal:
 - Note the tax differentiation between multifamily and condominium parcels.
 - Please review traffic issues carefully – an option to mitigate increased traffic would be to push Alameda through.
 - Address concern that The Quarry would now be surrounded by non-single family units.
 - How will the new development impact views of the single family homes at Cascade Point?
- Maximum density allowed in the requested zone is 35 units per acre, and the applicant is requesting approval for 15 units per acre.

7. Staff Comments (7:44)

Director Swindale stated the City Council reviewed recommendations for amendments to the sign code at their September 6th meeting. Some Planning Commission recommendations will move forward. The Council agreed with increasing the number of open house signs, and is also interested in the feather signs being added to the banners definition. The Council liked the idea of lowering the fee for temporary sign permits, was not enthusiastic about increasing the amount for the sign permit deposit. The Council has not addressed changing message signs or billboards yet. Council would like to increase the distance allowed for off premise signs.

8. Commission and Liaison Comments (7:47)

Commissioner Paulson noted that the City Council adopted the amendments to the tree ordinance. Director Swindale stated that the Council added a few other items. The most significant change made by the Council is that they rejected the recommendation to increase the minimum size of regulated trees.

9. Adjourn (7:48)

MOTION: by Commissioner Graybill, seconded by Commissioner Barrett, to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was approved unanimously. (7:48)

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as submitted: October 5, 2016