

Planning Commission
November 7, 2005

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

The following members were present: Ken Smith, James Montgomery, Cristi Boyle-Barrett, and Lisa Cramer. Sandy Ramsey and Cindy Maas were absent. Also in attendance was City Planner Dan Staley.

Boyle-Barrett moved to approve the minutes of the October 17, 2005 commission meeting as amended. Cramer seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Complete Review Adult Ordinance material:

Boyle-Barrett stated the ordinance that was given to the Planning Commission was based on the Seattle's ordinance and she wanted everyone to compare Auburn's ordinance because that is the ordinance the public safety committee referred to. There are a couple things that Auburn's ordinance has that our ordinance doesn't have that perhaps should be included. Cramer stated on page 3 of the Auburn ordinance it talks about no person granted an adult entertainment establishment license pursuant to this chapter shall operate the adult entertainment establishment under a name not specified on the license nor shall any person operate an adult entertainment establishment under any designation or at any location not specified on the license. She didn't see that in our ordinance and she felt it was important to have that in our ordinance. Boyle-Barrett stated under Section 6.12.070 (A) it does state that but it is not as explicit. The commission would like more language to make it stronger. Planning Director Staley stated he will be writing a staff report after this meeting with the Planning Commission's recommendations and this will be one of those. Montgomery asked if we have to go by this document or can we go by Auburn's. Staley stated we can make recommendations that we feel Auburn's is better. Boyle-Barrett stated she thinks the ordinance that Administrator Schmidt gave us he felt it was more comprehensive, it basically covers the other ordinance, but there may be some gray areas. The only thing she found is our proposed has more definitions than Auburn's but the definitions were not as detailed. Cramer stated one other thing she found in the Auburn ordinance that is not in our proposed ordinance is the statement that references the Washington State Liquor Control Board and what the rules and regulations are about liquor. She feels this should be in ours some where. Boyle-Barrett stated there isn't anything and it does need to be added. Cramer stated she had one more thing, she doesn't know if the panoram or peep show that Auburn talks about is the same as the adult motion picture theatre or the adult arcade. Smith stated he never received the Auburn one, but he would like to know which one is the most hard nose. Boyle-Barrett stated they are both hard nosed, but our proposed ordinance has more definitions and has a lot more legal language, she feels it is better written than Auburn's but it is lacking a few things that Auburn has that we should add. Planning Director Staley asked the commission to write up the changes they would like to see and e-mail it to him. Boyle-Barrett stated she had one more thing and that is whether or not we are removing Section W under our proposed ordinance where it repeals all the other uses. The Planning Commission would like to have that removed. It was decided for everyone to e-mail any

recommendations or additions and then Staley will then forward the corrected copy back to all commission members. Boyle-Barrett had one other issue and that is page 16, Section B(3), it stated documentation that the applicant has attained the age of eighteen years, she feels we should require two pieces of identification because it is so easy to obtain false driver's license. The next issue is on page 17, (10) it says a statement whether the applicant has been convicted of a specified criminal offense. It doesn't state what that specified item is. Auburn's ordinance simply states any rather than specified. Schneider stated does that mean anything that is specified as a criminal offense in the criminal code. Cramer and Montgomery agreed with Schneider. Boyle-Barrett stated the only other thing she wanted to look at is on page 17, (13) it states authorization for the City, its agents and employees to seek information to confirm any statements or other information set forth in the application, does this mean they are actually doing an investigation? Cramer stated she thinks it is just saying if the City needs to verify anything; the applicant is verifying that is okay. Montgomery asked if we came to a consensus has to how far an adult entertainment needs to be from daycares and schools, etc. Boyle-Barrett asked if we should set the perimeter. Staley stated we can recommend a perimeter or we can blank slate it and the Council can come up with the distance.

Thank you for work on Comprehensive Plan:

Planning Director Staley stated he would like to publish a thank you in the Courier Herald thanking the Citizens and the City of Buckley for helping the Planning Commission prepare the Comprehensive Plan. In time for the next meeting each person could come up with a couple items of who we would like to thank and why.

Subdivision Regulations:

Boyle-Barrett would like to bring up at the public hearing it was brought up that Willow Glen, a low-income housing development will no longer be low income housing effective August of 2006. So this is one other reason we need to discuss affordable housing because there will be 20 residents that will no longer have housing.

Planning Director Staley introduced Angela Wingate the former City of Auburn Planner who now works with Investco.

What will these things look like, will there be hundreds of pages worth of stuff so every single detail is written down so the Planner and the City Staff have no leeway. Will they be generally broad but certain areas have detail. This is what we are going to talk about today so we will know how we are going to proceed. Some of the things he sent in the preparation regarding the subdivision regulations was are they going to be user friendly; are they going to be flexible or cover every detail; the responsiveness and how are people going to respond to them; enforceable and consistent which go together; the ability to amend – variances and how much do we allow to happen. We need to keep our goals in mind and then how do we enact those goals.

The one thing we need to know is how to frame this and someone brought this up earlier that we wanted all the goals together all at once. When the website gets up and running

he will have all our goals on the website. It is very important as we go through this process, Staley will be giving ideas on how to frame this so it is easier to answer questions from the public. Schneider stated we need to be aware of the fact that it is easy for people to agree on goals, when it comes to actual application of those goals in rules and regulations, agreement begins to diminish. His opinion on the open, short and flexible, versus detailed write out everything, he thinks we have enough of a vision that we want to have some definite things in there, we don't want it to be so loose it doesn't mean anything. We have also been told by the developers that they like to know what the rules are and then they can usually work with them. If we go too far and try to write rules for every single thing, he feels we will fail because there is always something you don't think of and there is always an attorney that will try to find a hole. His initial reaction is to kind of go middle ground between the two extremes. Boyle-Barrett stated the key word user friendly needs to be in the essence of our comprehensive plan. She agrees with the middle ground, she thinks we have already defined a lot of areas we want detail in. Cramer stated depending on what we are referring to and specific goals it is going to have more detail or not. Some issues will lend themselves to more detail. Boyle-Barrett stated we have worked for 1-1/2 years on this and she doesn't have a problem telling them this is what we want and if they don't like it they can go ask for a variance. Montgomery stated a couple words really jump out at him and they are consistent and enforceable. He doesn't think for subdivision regulations having lengthy in depth regulations is a bad thing. Is it possible for us to do much, he doesn't really know that it is? Staley stated too much is an ill defined term. He feels a 200 page subdivision regulations is too much.

Staley stated what he has heard so far is the user friendly tact, he also hears investment and buy in which is an important thing. Boyle-Barrett asked how responsiveness is defined. Staley stated responsiveness of a subdivision plan has elements of flexibility and elements of what we heard the public say. A lot of this with the public is about values, that is what moves people. The values of the sub division codes are about values, such as the small town, connectivity, the places we make to build a community, design – does it look good.

Montgomery asked how we are going to go about this process and at what point are we going to bring the public in on this. Are we going to establish our goals and detail those all the way out and then say come on in and tell us how you feel, or are we going to say these are our goals that we are trying to achieve based on what the public told us. Staley stated there are two types of information, up in the high level where there is no interaction there is the stuff on the website, what the objectives were, did you meet them, these are the objectives for next meeting. We are not giving them any input; they aren't giving us any input. On the other hand there is the one on one communication. This is all part of the work process.

Cramer stated for her it is much easier to have something tangible to see, even if it is not the end product; it gives them something to go by and gets you started in the discussion. Staley stated he has a partner from school who is a graphic artist, he sent him the CAD drawings of the Buckley streets and structures and things, and he wants to make an animated movie of Buckley. If we can work out the details on how to do some of the

other things, he will be a resource to use and this will be something tangible and can also be placed on the website. Once we get the calculations down for the buildable lands, we can project how many houses we will have in each zone. We will be able to also have this on the movie. Schneider stated as we contemplate our interaction, people may be forgetting that there are a lot of people in town who want absolutely no growth, there are a bunch of people even in our city government that don't want us to upgrade the sewer treatment plant so we can't grow. We need to somehow lay the ground work that this is a plan for growth, it is not a question of whether or not there will be growth, and it is what we want those subdivisions to look like. The conversation needs to be about that which is not an easy thing to do. Montgomery stated whether or not we grow it is not up to us, we have been tasked with creating a plan in the event we do grow. Staley stated we are trying to accommodate a couple different sectors of the population. One of the things he tried to focus on is business owners. Business owners need customers and customers need business. When we are framing our issues about what we are doing with the comprehensive plan we need to know who the beneficiaries are. Who are the targets in the subdivision regulations? The targets are the homeowners, the business owners and the elected officials. Smith asked who are calling a business owner, established businesses or contractors that are coming into town to work. Staley stated business owners that want to stay here, however the construction business will benefit. Staley stated one of the things he wanted to bring up, we know there is a demographic shift occurring in the United States right now, baby boomers are aging. What this means in the first five years we will have one kind of market and then the market will likely change. We are not planning for two years from now; we are planning for 20 years. Smith stated we want diversity along with getting a diversity of people that will also keep the businesses going. Staley stated exactly, what the business owners want is diversity. Boyle-Barrett asked on the goals if we added the diverse housing.

Boyle-Barrett stated as far as the work progress and dissemination of information, one of the things that may be helpful is putting something in the Buckley newsletter that goes around to the businesses. Cramer stated they are always looking for articles to put in there.

Staley stated as far as the work process goes we know we want user friendly, middle ground information, flexibility, and definite standards that are consistent and enforceable. There was brief discussion regarding the connectivity with some of the outer subdivisions such as Elk Heights.

Cramer asked if we should include as one of our goals being citizen involvement, which goes back to the comprehensive plan but we didn't spell it out with all the open houses and getting input.

Staley stated there are a few things in the parking lot that we need to discuss one is the Highway Design Guidelines. Boyle-Barrett stated the Council passed that down to the Community Development Committee and she feels the Planning Commission should be the group to discuss these. Montgomery stated as a member of the Community Development Committee he also feels it should go to the Planning Commission. Staley

stated he will take that to the Council. Staley stated another issue in the parking lot is affordable housing. Boyle-Barrett stated it has to do with the information received at the public hearing regarding the Willow Glen Apartments which are Section 8 low income housing that will no longer be low income after August 2006. Her point of bringing it up is the committee talking about the need and now this makes it a stronger argument for affordable housing.

Staley stated he has some homework: 1) Thank you information, what we would like to say and who we would like to thank. 2) Information for next meeting how do these goals that we are going to start working on relate to each other. 3) Find two comprehensive plan goals for each one of our own goals.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Wolfe Schneider, Chairperson