

## Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Wednesday,  
May 17, 2017  
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.

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

#### **Planning Commission Members Present**

Mr. Cliff Quisenberry – Chair  
Mr. Steve Smith – Co Vice Chair  
Mr. David Graybill  
Mr. Ken Campbell  
Mr. Tony Paulson  
Ms. Tonya Mushallo

#### **Planning Commission Members Excused**

Mr. Frank Boykin – Co Vice Chair

#### **Staff Present**

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

### **3. Approval of Minutes – April 5, 2017 (7:01)**

**MOTION: by Commissioner Graybill and seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2017 meeting as submitted. The motion was approved.**

### **4. Public Comment (7:01)**

There was no public in attendance at the meeting.  
Chair Quisenberry welcomed Councilmember Belleci to the meeting.

### **5. Regional Growth Center Subarea Planning Update (7:02)**

Director Swindale reviewed the staff report included in the agenda packet. He presented a PowerPoint that Otak presented to the City Council in March 2017. The PowerPoint covered the background and reason for the subarea planning process, progress to date, and next steps.

Commission discussion covered these items:

- The same groups that were invited to the December meetings are being invited to the May 31 community outreach meetings. Invitations are currently being sent.

- This process will work in tandem with the Planning Commission's work to address the Council-assigned task in Resolution 791 to review zones and land use designations.
- At the May 31 workshop, it would be great to have a fly-through station so that participants are able to visualize various development scenarios.
- Staff is already holding meetings with individual opportunity property owners. The property owners are very engaged in these conversations.

Director Swindale reviewed the graphics included in the Planning Commission packet.

Commission discussion covered these items:

- Mixed use typically does require ground floor commercial uses.
- Are the zones exclusive to building heights?
- Most realistic growth projection is about 6,000 additional people.
- Residents could be asked how they would feel about 30 buildings such as Latitude 47 and Clearview lining Bridgeport.
- In some areas, buildings up to 10 stories may be acceptable. The northeast business district seems to be appropriate for that height.
- Some other areas of the City could be pulled into these height groupings. This would be important to consider when the Planning Commission addresses overall land use designations and zones.
- A traffic impact study will need to be part of the action items for the subarea plan.
- Be mindful when making changes in the northeast business district to consider similarity of uses with the neighboring properties in Fircrest and Tacoma.
- The only areas that will increase in height from what is currently allowed are the areas identified to be 70' high that are outside the Town Center project area. There is only one area where 70' heights will be adjacent to single-family residential, but separation will be provided by a street (Larson Lane).
- Current codes allow for an increase in density if a certain percentage of housing is affordable.
- The mixed-use light industrial illustrations suggest residential uses could be allowed. The consultant should find more illustrations of business park or incubator buildings. If offices are allowed in light industrial, some light industrial uses are not compatible with offices. Discussion is occurring at the staff level about changing the name of this area from light industrial to employment mixed use.
- Would new schools be allowed within the proposed districts? The UP School District is being included in the discussion of these plans. Currently, the District has excess capacity. Many of the schools are in close proximity to the regional growth center.
- Including street names would be helpful in the massing diagrams.
- On the massing model, show transition from single family residential to MUR 35 and/or MUR 45.
- Important to accommodate open space as redevelopment occurs.
- Plan for more frequent and express buses.
- The consultants are working off PSRC subarea planning requirements.
- Setting up a model that requires ground floor commercial space may result in see-thru first floors with no commercial.
- If corporate clusters come into the area, other commercial uses may follow. The draft concepts would not accommodate bringing in a large corporate entity, like Google.
- Horizontal mixed use could accommodate a larger corporate facilities.
- Add some areas/graphics that are employment intensive rather than residential intensive.

Principal Planner Boers reviewed the Planning Commission/Subarea Plan Process Coordination document.

Commission discussion covered these items:

- Councilmembers are receiving this update as well, and have been agreeable so far.
- It will require time for the Planning Commission to look at all the uses allowed in each zone, and make decisions based on recommendations of the subarea plan.

#### **6. Staff Comments (8:28 )**

Director Swindale reported that the City Council adopted the Commission's recommendations on marijuana use zoning without change. The ordinance has been officially submitted to the Department of Commerce. There is no proposal by Council to lift the ban at this time.

Swindale also reported that on May 15<sup>th</sup>, the City Council finished their study of the miscellaneous code amendments and will be moving forward to making a decision. Both the Chambers Landing and the 54<sup>th</sup> and Bridgeport amendment proposals were approved by Council. The Planning Commission had recommended approving the Chambers Landing proposal and denying the 54<sup>th</sup> and Bridgeport proposal.

Ms. Metcalf stated that commissioners will receive a flier regarding the planned May 31 subarea plan community outreach meetings.

#### **7. Commission and Liaison Comments ( 8:30)**

Commissioner Paulson has an audio file on unintended consequences if Commissioners are interested in listening to it. Please contact him to receive this file.

Commissioner Quisenberry stated that it is bad form to present proposals to the Planning Commission to study that are championed by Council rather than a developer. It can raise perceptions by the public of undue influence and bias by the Council being introduced into the Commission's independent deliberative process.

#### **8. Adjourn ( 8:35)**

**MOTION: by Commissioner Campbell and seconded by Commissioner Graybill to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.**

Submitted by:

Becky Metcalf, Project Assistant  
Community and Economic Development

Approved as submitted: June 7, 2017