



# CITY OF SEATAC

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Council Chambers, SeaTac City Hall, 4800 S. 188<sup>th</sup> Street  
December 3, 2019, 5:30 p.m.

### MEETING AGENDA

- 1) Call to Order/Roll Call
- 2) Approval of the minutes of November 5, 2019 regular meeting (Exhibit A)
- 3) Public Comment on items not on the agenda. *Comments on agenda items will be taken after the staff presentation and Commission discussion on each item below.*
- 4) Discussion: Accessory Dwelling Units (Exhibit B-Memo)
- 5) Discussion: Short Term Rentals (Exhibit B-Memo)
- 6) CED Director's Report
- 7) Planning Commission Comments (including suggestions for next meeting agenda)
- 8) Adjournment

Public Comments: Those who wish to make comment should sign up prior to the meeting. Individual comments shall be limited to three (3) minutes. A representative speaking for a group of four or more persons in attendance shall be limited to ten (10) minutes. When recognized by the Chair, please come to the podium, state your name, and make your comment.

**A quorum of the City Council may be present.  
All Commission meetings are open to the public.**

*The Planning Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The Commission primarily considers plans and regulations relating to the physical development of the city, plus other matters as assigned. The Commission is an advisory body to the City Council.*

**CITY OF SEATAC  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Minutes of November 5, 2019 Meeting**

**Members present:** Leslie Baker, Tej Basra, Roxie Chapin, Tom Dantzler, Jagtar Saroya, Andrew Reid-Munro

**Members absent:** Brandon Pinto (excused)

**Staff present:** Planning Manager Jennifer Kester; Public Works Director Will Appleton; Senior Planner Kate Kaehny; Senior Planner David Tomporowski; Associate Planner Neil Tabor; Associate Planner Alena Tuttle; Sr. Management Analyst Anita Woodmass; Steve Pilcher, CED Director.

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Basra called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m. after some technical difficulties with the recording equipment.

**2. Approval of minutes of October 15, 2019 regular meeting**

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes as written; passed 6-0.

**3. Public Comments**

Kathryn Campbell, Bow Lake resident and former Council member spoke of a July 11, 2017 Council meeting regarding initiating a rezone of the mobile home park to Mobile Home Park. That proposal was not initiated by the Council at that time.

**4. Public Hearing on 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendments**

Sr. Planner Kate Kaehny began the staff presentation, noting she will be followed by other staff. She explained the Comprehensive Plan and its amendment process. She reviewed the process that occurred this year and the next steps to occur before final Council review and action.

There are five proposals under consideration this year: 3 map amendments and 2 text amendments. Four proposals were withdrawn earlier in the process.

Associate Planner Neil Tabor presented the M-1 map amendment proposal, a request from the Washington State Department of Transportation, involving land acquisition impacts to Poulsbo RV due to the SR-09 project. This proposal will establish a commercial land use designation and zoning on one parcel currently designated/zoned for low density residential. He overviewed the staff's analysis of why this proposal meets the amendment criteria and is recommended for approval.

Associate Planner Alena Tuttle presented the M-2 map amendment proposal, a request from the property owner of the Bow Lake Mobile Home Park to change the land use designation and zoning of a small portion of the property from commercial to high density residential in order to allow for an expansion of the mobile home park. The resulting designation and zone would be

consistent with the remainder of the park. Ms. Tuttle review the proposal in light of the decision criteria and noted that staff is recommending approval.

Ms. Kaehny noted that Map Amendment M-7 is basically housekeeping in nature and staff is recommending approval.

Sr. Planner David Tomporowski presented text amendment T-1 concerning transportation concurrency. He mentioned that the Puget Sound Regional Council had noted that the City should adopt changes such as these to be consistent with the Growth Management Act. Staff is recommending approval of these changes.

Ms. Kaehny presented the other set of text amendments (T-2) which concern the Capital Facilities Plan element. Staff is recommending approval.

The Chair opened the public hearing for comment at 6:05 p.m.

John White, WSDOT, spoke in support of Map Amendment M-1. He reviewed the history of the SR-509 project. He noted the department's goal was to keep Poulsbo RV "whole" and minimize impacts to their operations.

Earl Gipson spoke in favor of the M-2 proposal, noting it is just part of normal operations of the park. He stated the park appears to be stable and will last well into the future. He expressed his concern regarding some of the rumors that have been spreading.

Vicki Lockwood spoke regarding the M-1 Poulsbo RV proposal and traffic impacts. She expressed concern of maintaining a traffic light at their entrance and the joint impacts of this proposal with the new Kent elementary school.

The Chair closed the hearing to further testimony at 6:15 p.m.

Commissioner Reid-Munro asked why UH-900 zoning is being proposed instead of MHP. Ms. Kaehny noted the change was requested by the property owner. She reviewed the difference between the existing NB Neighborhood Business zone and UH-900.

Commissioner Dantzler complimented WSDOT for their efforts to keep Poulsbo RV operational at its current location. He agreed with the concerns regarding traffic. Planning Manager Jennifer Kester noted that staff is coordinating with the City of Kent on future development of the site.

Commissioner Baker inquired about the relocation of Veterans' Drive at I-5 and whether it will go under or over the freeway.

Moved and seconded to approve all the Comprehensive Plan amendments. Passed 6-0.

## **5. Road Standards code amendments**

Sr. Management Analyst Anita Woodmass introduced the proposal to revise the City's Road Standards. These are being presented to provide better alignment with the City's vision and establish consistent application of development requirements. She reviewed the policy basis for

these changes and four key areas of focus: 1) frontage improvements; 2) ROW dedication; 3) deferral of improvements; and 4) ROW cross-section.

In regards to frontage improvements, a change is to require them whenever a single family home or accessory dwelling unit in excess of \$250K value is proposed. Two new provisions are proposed: allowing for a fee in lieu option and addressing situations where LIDs are proposed.

Public Works Director Will Appleton provided illustrations of the variability of current practice. He noted there have been times when full frontage improvements (curb, gutter and sidewalk) have not been required. He also noted there have been times when individual projects provide improvements that may not tie into existing improvements, but they get the City closer to completing a street as desired.

Ms. Woodmass provided an illustration of an erratic street ROW edge and how the proposed changes will address situations such as these. Dedication will be required for projects over \$250K in value and for certain categories of development.

She also reviewed deferral of improvements, which can occur with a bonding option. In terms of ROW cross section, a standard for landscape strips will be added and sidewalk widths along arterials will be increased by one foot.

Commissioner Baker expressed concern of the impact of these standards on development and the ability for individuals to obtain loans. She advocated the City improve its streets to create a sense of place, especially along entryways.

Earl Gipson asked how “stakeholders” were determined and expressed concern over how fast this process is moving.

Chair Basra indicated his support for improving road standards in the city. He feels it is appropriate to ask developers to pay their fair share.

Commissioner Chapin expressed concern of raising the cost of individuals attempting to subdivide their property, especially those that can only create one additional lot. Ms. Woodmass explained what is currently required under today’s regulations, noting that short plats are subject to frontage improvements.

## **6. Director’s Report**

Director Pilcher noted that the Planning staff had held two recent public open house meetings: one at McMicken Elementary School concerning the City Center Plan Update; the other last week here in the Council Chambers regarding the Comprehensive Plan update.

## **7. Commissioners’ Comments**

None.

## **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.



# MEMORANDUM

## COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Date: November 27, 2019  
To: Planning Commission  
From: Steve Pilcher, CED Director  
Subject: Next week's meeting

Some pressing items have prevented Planning staff from being able to present significant new material for planned upcoming work items. This presents the opportunity to have a general discussion on a couple of topics for which future code amendment work may be desirable: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Short Term Rentals (i.e., AirBnB, VRBO, etc.). We haven't been able to prepare materials in advance, but for the short term rental issue, I recommend you look at the following websites:

<https://www.2ndaddress.com/research/short-term-rental-laws/>

<https://www.durangogov.org/800/Vacation-Rental-Information>

In regards to ADUs, there has and continues to be discussion at the State legislature of ways to either encourage or require incentives or loosened regulations for ADUs within cities. Last year, this began as a mandate and was later downgraded to an incentive, with funds being provided to formulate regulatory changes:

RCW 36.70A.040(1):

(e) Authorize attached accessory dwelling units on all parcels containing single-family homes where the lot is at least three thousand two hundred square feet in size, and permit both attached and detached accessory dwelling units on all parcels containing single-family homes, provided lots are at least four thousand three hundred fifty-six square feet in size. Qualifying city ordinances or regulations may not provide for on-site parking requirements, owner occupancy requirements, or square footage limitations below one thousand square feet for the accessory dwelling unit, and must not prohibit the separate rental or sale of accessory dwelling units and the primary residence. Cities must set applicable impact fees at no more than the projected impact of the accessory dwelling unit. To allow local flexibility, other than these factors, accessory dwelling units may be subject to such regulations, conditions, procedures, and limitations as determined by the local legislative authority, and must follow all applicable state and federal laws and local ordinances;

It would not be surprising if this issue comes back again in the 2020 legislative session.

We look forward to a robust discussion next Tuesday. I hope you all have a wonderful Thanksgiving.