



(Note: To be Approved by the City Council on 8/10/10)

# City Council Committee Meeting

## Land Use and Parks Committee (LUP)

### Special Meeting

July 26, 2010

5:30 PM/Council Chambers – 105

**Council Members**

Mia Gregerson, Chair  
 Ralph Shape  
 Pam Fernald

**Present:**

X  
 X  
 X

**Absent:**

**Commence: 5:30 p.m.**

**Adjourn:**

**Others Present:**

Terry Anderson	Steve Butler	Kate Kaehny	*Please see the sign-in sheet for members of the public in attendance
Rick Forschler	Jack Dodge	Daryl Tapio	
Todd Cutts	Mike Scarey	Barry Ladenburg	

**Staff Coordinator: Steve Butler, Director, Department of Planning & Community Development**

AB #	Topic	Disposition
	<b>1. Proposed 2010 Comprehensive Plan Amendment #S-1: Potential Change in the Vision for the SeaTac/Airport Station Area Action Plan.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Informational Update <input type="checkbox"/> Recommended for: <input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Approval with modifications <input type="checkbox"/> Denial <input type="checkbox"/> Referred to
	<p>Comments:</p> <p><i>Steve Butler presented three station area alternatives: (1) Rescind the Station Area Plan, and revert back to the City Center Plan; (2) Conduct a major revision of the existing Station Area Plan; or (3) Retain the currently adopted Station Area Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The following is a summary of public comments and concerns: (1) A market analysis study regarding the alternatives should be done, which should include a method to determine costs between the City, businesses, and property owners; (2) Developers need a plan and regulations that are set and not fluid, which makes it hard to get financial loans; (3) Whether or not there should be a park in this area; (4) New roads are not needed in the SeaTac/Airport Station Area Action Plan; (5) Park and fly operations are needed to jumpstart redevelopment; (6) The City needs to eliminate caps in structured parking, and provide for strong parking structure design standards; (7) City Center is not for the citizens of SeaTac, only for the benefit of developers; (8) There is a confrontational attitude between developers and the City; (9) The City needs to prohibit surface park and fly lots; (10) Alternative Two is too vague, more clarity needed about what is proposed under this alternative; (11) Alternative Three needs to be pulled from consideration.</i></p>	