

Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday,
December 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 Smith called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call (7:01)

Planning Commission Members Present

Mr. Steve Smith – Acting Chair
Mr. Chris Barrett
Mr. David Graybill
Mr. Ken Campbell
Mr. Tony Paulson

Planning Commission Members Excused

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair
Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair

Staff Present

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

3. Approval of Minutes – October 5, 2016 and November 2, 2016 (7:01)

Commissioner Paulson pointed out that on the October 5 minutes, page 2, 7th bullet point, the first word should be "Traffic" rather than "Profit".

MOTION: by Commissioner Graybill and seconded by Commissioner Paulson to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2016 as amended and November 2, 2016 meeting as submitted. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Public Comment (7:02)

Acting Chair Smith opened the meeting to public comment on any item not to be addressed in the meeting agenda. There being no public comment, Acting Chair Smith closed the public comment section of the meeting.

5. Public Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment for Chambers Landing (7:02)

Principal Planner Boers reviewed the staff report and attachments for this item as found in the agenda packet. He stated that the hearing on this topic is closed.

MOTION by Commissioner Paulson and seconded by Commissioner Graybill to approve the resolution found in Exhibit BB to be forwarded to the City Council.

Commission discussion included the following issues:

- The resolution would rezone the property to the general classification providing higher density. This is more density than the applicant is requesting.
- Without Council's earlier actions on the property owned by Mr. McGuire, this change would have been considered spot zoning. Now that three properties in a row are designed to be redeveloped, there is a buffer of multi-family housing between commercial and residential properties.

Motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion: Zoning Review for Marijuana Uses (7:10)

Director Swindale reviewed the information found in the agenda packet for this item. He also presented maps showing areas in the City where marijuana uses would be allowed with 1,000 foot buffers, and also with 500 and 100 foot buffers on certain types of properties.

Commission discussion include the following issues:

- What was the rationale of the Liquor and Cannabis Board to give cities the option to reduce the buffers? It may be that many jurisdictions were sharing the experience of University Place, where there is not much property available for marijuana uses when the 1,000 foot buffers are applied.
- Seems that there has been a bit of license taken with the public initiative which was originally approved by the voters with the 1,000 foot buffer. Now administratively the 500 and 100 foot options are being allowed.
- In order to participate in the revenue sharing, do University Place regulations need to be consistent with state law? Yes, but we would have to lift the ban that is currently in place.
- Would ancillary uses to residential units need to be added to the code to include cooperatives? Could cooperatives be banned and still allow retail? Rules have been tightened up on cooperatives because retail has been allowed. If we ban cooperatives, can we still participate in revenue sharing?
- The commission can choose to just allow retail and not processing or producers.
- The odor can be offensive.
- How much money would the revenue-sharing be? Staff will look into this.
- Security is a concern. Retail can be locked up, producers and processors can be required to have manned 24 hour security or a high level of "sensored" security.

The Commission asked public who are in attendance to speak, although this is not a formal public hearing. The following individuals spoke and expressed thoughts as follows:

Matthew Moravec, 2101 MacArthur St. W, Stated that although the revenue estimate given for \$45,000 or \$50,000, these figures may not be accurate because there are so many pending applications for shops. Property taxes of homes within a ½ mile of a dispensary in Colorado have a 1/3 less property tax value.

Margaret Schwarz, 2101 MacArthur St. W. is concerned about the crime component. There is already a lot of crime in that area.

Jill Peters, 7621 27th Street W (owner of accounting center in UP who moved her office

out in order to accommodate a retail marijuana use). Revenue sharing would be added to direct sales tax as well.

Commission discussion included the following issues:

- Reduction of home value may have more to do with home being in a mixed use area, rather than the marijuana uses.

Commission consensus.

- Lift the ban? Yes – 2, No – 3 – if council chooses to lift ban, apply most restrictive buffers.
- Don't hear any outcry among the citizens that this is a need in the City.
- If ban is lifted, for the retail portion (the face of the industry and most public interface) a consensus of the Commission in attendance tonight are in favor of 1,000 foot buffer. For processing and producing, drop the buffer to 100 feet in the light industrial area, with strong requirements regarding odor and security.
- Regulation for odor mitigation would be important.
- Security is an issue, require tight security.
- Clarify cooperatives and how this is included.
- 1,000 foot separation between separate marijuana uses is important.

7. Staff Comments (8:18)

Principal Planner Boers reminded commissioners of the Subarea Plan public meetings next week. Fliers were passed to each commissioner. Invitations will be sent out to subarea plan ad hoc committee.

December 21 meeting of the Planning Commission will be cancelled.

8. Commission and Liaison Comments (8:23)

None.

9. Adjourn (8:25)

MOTION: to adjourn the meeting was approved unanimously. (8:25)

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant
Community and Economic Development

Approved as submitted: January 18, 2017