# CITY OF SEATAC PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes of October 1, 2019 Meeting

Members present: Chair Tejvir Basra, Vice Chair Brandon Pinto, Roxie Chapin, Jagtar

Saroya, Andrew Ried-Munro

**Members absent:** Tom Danztler; Leslie Baker (both excused)

**Staff present:** Planning Manager, Jennifer Kester; Senior Planner, Kate Kaehny, Senior

Planner, David Tomporowski, Senior Assistant City Attorney, Mark

Johnsen; Public Works Director, Will Appleton

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Basra called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

## 2. Approval of minutes of September 17, 2019 regular meeting

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes as written; passed 5-0.

#### 3. Public Comments

Cathy Boysen Heiberg, general manager of family properties owned since the early 1940s, asked if the Planning Commission packet included the draft Concurrency Administrative Guidelines and the memo from Public Works Director Will Appleton on the Road Design Manual. Staff responded that those were being reviewed by the Transportation and Public Works Committee of the Council and are not included in the Planning Commission packet. It was noted that Director Appleton was at the meeting to answer any Planning Commission questions.

## 4. 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Session

Senior Planner Kate Kaehny provided a PowerPoint presentation on the overall project status and schedule. She noted that T-3, the PROS Plan Update, and T-4, the City Center Sub-Area Plan Update, have been withdrawn from the 2019 docket because the draft plans will not be ready in time to meet the 2019 schedule. These will continue into 2020.

Ms. Kaehny announced an open house on all amendments will occur on October 29, 2019 and the public hearing on all amendments will occur on November 5, 2019.

### 4a. Text Amendment T-1: Transportation Concurrency Policy Revisions

Senior Planner David Tomporowski provided a PowerPoint presentation on the amendment including the background, GMA requirements, purpose of the revisions, and overview of key policy changes being proposed. He noted that the Transportation and Public Works Committee of the Council had reviewed the proposed policy revisions on September 19, 2019 and supported them.

Chair Basra stated that he would like to look deeper into the proposal. The Commission agreed and Chair Basra opened public comments on the agenda item.

Earl Gipson asked that a project dry run/trial occur before the adoption of the proposed concurrency program so that there are no flaws in the system. He stated that he didn't think a project could be denied if concurrency was denied.

Cathy Boysen Heiberg asked Director Appleton questions about a statement in the Concurrency Guidelines that a portion of International Boulevard is a Highway of State Significance and therefore exemption from concurrency. Director Appleton requested Ms. Boysen Heiberg meet with him to go over her specific questions.

Director Appleton then spoke to the Commission. He stated that concurrency review currently occurs as part of SEPA, which can lead to inconsistent application depending on who holds the Public Works Director or CED Director positions. He said that this program, as proposed, provides consistency, predictability, and clarity for developers and will no longer be subject to a specific director. This program will provide multiple methods and approaches for developers to meet concurrency beyond widening an intersection. He stated that the Public Works Department is continuing with stakeholder meetings.

Earl Gipson commented that City should show the Commission that concurrency will not cost developers more money. He expressed concern about the proposed appeal process and the recourse provided to the developer in the guidelines

## 4b. Text Amendment T-2: Capital Facilities Plan Update

Senior Planner Kate Kaehny provided a PowerPoint presentation on the amendment summarizing the GMA requirements, current adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards, and proposed updates. With no Commission comments or questions, Chair Basra opened public comments on the agenda item.

Councilmember Pam Fernald asked if the level of service requirements applied to private developments. Staff answered no.

Terri Sankey asked if the figures in the amendments include North SeaTac Park. Staff answered yes.

Ms. Sankey also asked if the Commission was aware that the Port of Seattle wants to create a surface parking lot within North SeaTac park. The Commission asked staff for more information. Planning Manager Jennifer Kester said staff was aware of the parking lot proposal; it was part of the Airport's proposed Sustainable Airport Master Plan. Staff has provided SEPA comments on the plan and would find a time to brief the Commission on the matter at a future meeting.

#### 4c. Map Amendment M-3: Potential Rezone of Military Rd S, North End

Senior Assistant City Attorney Mark Johnsen noted that Chair Basra had previously recused himself from this amendment and will not be participating in the discussion tonight. Chair Basra stayed at the dais to run the meeting.

Senior Planner Kate Kaehny provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the September 23, 2019 community meeting, noting that approximately 50 community members attended and the packet includes public comments received. Ms. Kaehny went over the City's evaluation criteria

for map amendments and staff's initial finding on infrastructure and access, neighboring uses and zoning, topography and environmentally critical areas, and existing vacant land. She reviewed the options under consideration for the Commission: 1) Should the land use designation and zoning for M-3 change? Yes or No and, 2) If Yes, which land use designation and zone should be proposed and where should the boundaries be located. Ms. Kaehny explained the Commission the uses, maximum building heights, and maximum density allowed in existing zoning and potential zoning.

Commissioner Chapin asked how many attended the community meeting and how the amendment was received by the community members. Ms. Kaehny said about 50 people attended and the amendment was not well received.

Commissioner Chapin asked how the community concerns will be addressed and when will the PED Committee review the amendment. Ms. Kester stated that staff will be creating a frequently asked questions sheet to answer specific fact-based questions and that the PED will review the amendment after the Planning Commission makes its recommendation.

With no more Commission comments or questions, Chair Basra opened public comments on the agenda item.

Earl Gipson said that the meeting was not well received by the community members.

Terry Sankey, who worked on City incorporation and lives in the M-3 area, said the community meeting was not well received. She said it was a matter of trust between the City and the homeowners. She stated that the chair of the commission is the son of a developer wanting to build in the M-3 area and that was a conflict of interest and the chair should not be at this meeting. She was concerned that the letter sent to the community announcing the meeting did not include high density residential was a potential zone and asked that a new letter be sent to the community. Ms. Sankey said that there were no retail businesses in the area and the business use on the east side of Military Road S is a medical office with limited public access. She wants the zoning to stay single-family, as do her neighbors.

Donna Thomas was overwhelmed by the 3-month rush to push the amendment through and how the City could consider the desires of a purchaser of a single property over the community's. She stated there was no infrastructure, no groceries, and no businesses in the area to support the amendment. She was concerned with the addition of high density residential as a potential zone. She asked for a City-wide vote on the amendment and asked the Planning Commission to cancel the amendment if no vote will be taken.

Jeanne McDonald, who lives across from the proposed area, said that Jag Basra and Councilmember Forschler spoke to her at the community meeting and indicated they wanted high density housing with retail in the area. She is not in favor of that type of development. She would like to live in a single-family neighborhood.

Councilmember Fernald stated that at a recent Council Meeting a petition had been submitted on this topic and she would like the petition included in the comment packet.

Councilmember Stan Tombs asked how many property owners were mailed notice of the meeting and how many comments were received. Ms. Kaehny said about 250 properties were mailed and about 22 comments received.

Commissioner Chapin asked if Tukwila staff was aware of the proposal and Ms. Kaehny answered yes.

Ms. Kaehny concluded this topic by reviewing the next steps and related meeting dates.

## 5. City Center Plan Update Phase 1: Project Status

Senior Planner Kate Kaehny reviewed the memo that was in the packet. She noted the consultant's recent stakeholder interviews and briefings along with focus group with airport workers. She announced the October 23<sup>rd</sup> Community Visioning Meeting at McMicken Elementary School. With no Commission comments or questions, Chair Basra opened public comments on the agenda item.

Earl Gipson asked what staff meant by "other processes" that are occurring. Ms. Kaehny stated that they were one-on-one meetings and phone calls.

## 6. Director's Report

CED Director Steve Pilcher was on vacation. Ms. Kester noted that due to the technical comments received from the wireless carriers and emerging technology related to 5G deployment, the public hearing on the Wireless Communication Facilities Update scheduled for October 15, 2019 has been postponed to a future date. She will talk with Director Pilcher on a briefing about the Airport's Sustainable Airport Master Plan. She noted that planning staff is working on housekeeping code amendments that will be presented to the Commission late this year or early next year.

#### 7. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Andrew Ried-Munro thanked the public for coming and providing comments on the M-3 map amendment.

#### 8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.