

Planning Commission
January 3, 2005

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

The following members were present: Lisa Cramer, Ken Smith, Sandy Ramsey and Cindy Maas. James Montgomery and Cristi Boyle-Barrett were absent. Also in attendance were staff members Gwen Rousseau and Dan Staley and City Administrator Dave Schmidt.

Ramsey moved to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2004 commission meeting as corrected. Cramer seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Transportation Element:

Staley stated they are still discussing the goals and their appropriateness for the transportation element, are they appropriate, is there too much, not enough, etc. Rousseau asked if any of the Commission members had a chance to go over the transportation element and are there any comments or concerns. What she did do is look at other transportation elements, the only thing that she came up with is some of them would make a bigger tie in with land use in the concurrency, just stating that transportation needs to match land use. We do have some information with concurrency; however, we could spell it out a little better. Staley stated the tie in with that as well is with the new zoning in the industrial zone, having 112th be a route for the industrial traffic, is 112th adequate for truck traffic? These are some questions that may need to be addressed. Rousseau stated the other thing that is sometimes mentioned in other plans is what they call the transportation demand management strategies to encourage other types of transportation such as transit, biking or walking. This may be a little difficult for here. Administrator Schmidt stated in the policies and goals there is a lot regarding pedestrian mobility. Administrator Schmidt stated we can take time and schedule this for another meeting this month so everyone can go over this in more detail, get a feel for it and make suggestions if needed. Staley stated their concerns on the goals is are they clear, do they cover everything, and do they read well. Rousseau stated if there are no comments, we can take more time to go over this. Administrator Schmidt stated when you go over this, if there are changes or corrections you would like to see, you can e-mail them to Dan, Gwen or he and they will insert the changes and bring it back. Schneider asked when talking about the concurrency, are you saying more than the draft or more than the original plan. Rousseau stated she feels it should be more spelled out. Administrator Schmidt stated concurrency also means that your development standards are compatible and they flow. The base for us is the land use element, once we establish that land use pattern in the city or the anticipated growth in the city then you build up. You go to the zoning code and find out the density and the performance standards, and then based on the density you can lay out the future street plan. You can look at the street plan in the transportation element and see if it is compatible. Discussion ensued. Smith stated there was one thing in the transportation element and that is the figures on page 27 are not correct. Staley stated he would check these to make sure they get corrected. Gwen will make the changes and e-mail the information to everyone. Staley stated our concurrency

issues are simple, does the urban design element say the same thing as the land use element, does the transportation element say the same thing as the urban design and land use element. In the concurrency for the transportation plan, do we say we are making adequate pedestrian facilities like we did in the urban design, land use and housing elements? Administrator Schmidt stated the one thing we can do is reference the other standards which bring us concurrency. For instance making sure all infrastructures are put in to our future street plan or to our development guidelines and public works standards. Staley stated his concern is do we say this explicitly or do we just state that they are concurrent with all other elements of the plan. What things does the Planning Commission think are important enough to repeat in the transportation element? How much detail do we want to put in the policies and goals? Do we want to leave it generic or do we want it specific. Staley stated those questions should be in the back of you mind as you are reading this. Rousseau and Staley stated they would go back through the transportation element and make changes as she feels necessary. This will not be discussed again until the January 24, 2005 meeting so she will get this to the Planning Commission by next week sometime.

Final Discussion on Park Element:

Administrator Schmidt stated the only thing that needed to be done is to have the tables added into it. Staley stated that has been done. Administrator Schmidt stated then if it is done, we will do a SEPA on it and send it out.

Schedule for additional adoptions and updates:

Administrator Schmidt stated the next big thing we need to review is the zoning code. Rousseau stated they finished the uses for the zoning code. They have not been reviewed by the entire body, only the committee. This will be e-mailed to everyone. This will be put on the agenda for the January 10th meeting. Staley stated their committee is finished with the performance standards so this can be discussed at the January 10th meeting also. Once we get the performance standards and uses done, we are getting close to finishing the zoning code. On January 24th we will discuss the transportation element and the design guidelines.

Administrator Schmidt stated Adolfson and Associates are doing the environmental review for the critical areas ordinance. Hopefully they will have a study ready for use to make changes to the regulations so we can send it back to the Department of Ecology.

The next meeting will be January 10, 2005 at 7:00 PM.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 PM.