

**CITY OF SEATAC  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Minutes of November 6, 2012  
Regular Meeting**

**Members Present:** Daryl Tapio, Chairman, Roxie Chapin (Vice-Chair), Tom Dantzler, Jeff Guite, Joe Adamack

Members Absent: None

**Staff Present:** Gary Schenk, Interim Director, Planning and Community Development Department; Mike Scarey, AICP, Senior Planner; Albert Torrico, Senior Planner; Kate Kaehny, Senior Planner; Anita Woodmass, Associate Planner

**1. Call to Order:**

Chairman Tapio called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

**2. Approve Minutes of the October 16, 2012 Meeting:**

On a motion by Chapin, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Adamack, the October 16, 2012 meeting minutes were moved to discussion. Commissioner Adamack noted that the Minutes reported a vote incorrectly. On a motion by Dantzler, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Chapin, the minutes were moved and accepted as amended by a 5-0 Commission vote.

**3. Public Hearing: 2012 Final Docket of Comprehensive Plan amendments**

Mr. Scarey gave a presentation of the proposed amendments, going over the steps in the annual amendment process, summarizing each of the amendments, and focusing primarily on Map Amendment A-1 and A-2. The presentation included the applicant's stated purpose for the amendment, and an analysis by staff of the issues associated with each, generally summarizing the information in the written Staff Report. That information included a comparison of the uses allowed in the current zone and the proposed future zone, the staff recommendation for each proposed amendment, and the factors leading to the staff recommendation for each amendment proposal.

The staff recommendations were presented as follows:

- Map Amendment A-1 (3050 S 150<sup>th</sup> Street): **Do not adopt.**  
Staff offered an alternative recommendation to not act on the amendment, but move it directly to the 2013 Final Docket. This would avoid the 2-year wait period that would apply if the proposal was denied, while allowing time for the City's Riverton Property Site Planning and Feasibility Study to be completed.
- Map Amendment A-2 (19740 Military Road): **Do not adopt.**
- Map Amendment B-1 (informational, update the existing land use map): **Adopt**

- Text Amendment T-1 (pertaining to land use forecasts): **Withdraw**
- Text Amendment T-2 (update the existing land use information): **Adopt**
- Text Amendment T-3 (pertaining to the housing element): **Withdraw**
- Text Amendment T-4 (update Capital Facilities Plan): **Adopt**

The Chair opened the Public Hearing at 6:32 P.M. The following people spoke:

NAME	ADDRESS	AMENDMENT	DISPOSITION
Margie Rose	3049 S 148th St	A-1	Against
Councilmember Pam Fernald	2431 S 133rd St	A-1	Against
Dave Cronk	19415 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Clyde Hill	19449 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Tom Landry	19715 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Jim Thompson	19729 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Dan Winston	19679 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Gary Ryan	19706 40th Place S	A-2	Against
Maudette Richards	19649 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Rosalyn Zylkowski	19477 Military Rd S	A-2	Against
Earl Gipson	17050 51st Ave S	A-2	Other
Jeffrey Lindstrom	19740 Military Rd S	A-2	Supporting
Victor Lindstrom	19740 Military Rd S	A-2	Supporting
Bo Lindstrom	19740 Military Rd S	A-2	Supporting
Claes Hagstromer	11295 Wing Point Dr NE, Bainbridge Is. (SeaTac property owner)	A-2	Supporting

The speakers opposing Map Amendment A-1 (3050 S 150<sup>th</sup> Street) based their opposition on the desire to preserve the residential character of the single family neighborhood, and stated that the City should not carve additional multi-family land out of the single family area.

Speakers opposed to Map Amendment A-2 (19740 Military Road) cited impacts to the Angle Lake neighborhood on the other side of Military Road including:

- change in the character of the area;
- increased traffic on Military Rd. and associated issues including:
  - pedestrian and cyclist safety;
  - safety of children accessing the school bus;
  - increased potential for vehicular accidents;
  - impacts to parking;
- decreased property values;
- loss of vegetative noise buffer;
- loss of views.

Speakers supporting Map Amendment A-2 (19740 Military Road) cited:

- applicant's efforts to select and design a project that would be acceptable to the neighborhood;
- parking would be located within the new structure;
- structures would be better sound mitigation than vegetation;
- project impacts can be mitigated through design;
- need for additional housing density as population increases.

Other comments recommended amending the Zoning Code to limit combining convalescent center/nursing home with multi-family uses.

The Commission Chair closed the Public Hearing at 7:14 P.M.

The Planning Commission then discussed their recommendations for the Comprehensive Plan amendments. The Commission first discussed Map Amendment B-1, and Text amendments T-1, T-2, T-3 and T-4, **voting 5-0 to concur with the staff** recommendations.

The discussion then turned to Map Amendment A-1 (3050 S 150<sup>th</sup> Street). After considering the alternative recommendation (to move the amendment proposal to the 2013 Final Docket) and deciding against it, the Commission **voted 5-0** to recommend that **Map Amendment A-1 not be adopted**, citing:

- impacts to surrounding properties; and
- the fact that neither the applicant nor any party representing him has appeared before the Commission to state his case in support of this proposal.

The discussion then turned to Map Amendment A-2 (19740 Military Road). The Commission **voted 4-1** to recommend that **Map Amendment A-2 not be adopted**. The discussion noted that the nursing home idea was a good one, and that the applicant had tried to deal with some of the community's objections such aesthetic and traffic impacts, and that buildings probably did offer better sound mitigation than trees, but in the end voted to reject the proposal, citing the following:

- the change being considered is a change to the land use, and allows uses other than those proposed;
- approving the requested change wouldn't necessarily result in the applicant's proposal being built but would open the door to other high density residential projects;
- changing the character of the existing neighborhood; and
- lack of community support

#### **4. Old Business:**

##### **A. Continued Review of Proposed City Center Park-and-Fly Code**

Ms. Woodmass discussed the 6 options the Planning Commission will consider as potential recommendations at a later Commission meeting. Those options included:

- Option 1 – Adopt the proposed code and keep existing City Center Road Standards;
- Option 2 – Adopt revised code and keep existing City Center Road Standards;

- Option 3 – Adopt proposed code and keep existing City Center Road Standards and recommend review of the City Center & Comp Plan at a later date;
- Option 4 – Adopt revised code and keep existing road standards and recommend a review of the City Center ad Comp Plan at a later date;
- Option 5 – Pause, take no action on proposed code and review City Center Plan and Comp plan first, and then come back to parking code at a later date; and
- Option 6 – Keep existing code.

Commissioner Dantzler asked some clarifying questions regarding Option 1 and how they would affect the existing road standards, as well as, how this option would affect vesting rights and the ability of projects to move forward. He also asked if a potential project could follow the Development Agreement process.

Chair Tapio clarified that what is before the Commission is not a recommendation on passing one of the options, but rather a preliminary recommendation to keep the process moving forward and hold a public hearing.

Chair Tapio commented that he would like to keep the scope narrow and not create a larger project. He recommended that the Commission reviews and holds a public hearing on the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation and review road standards separately at a later date.

He also commented that given the time that has gone into the process, Option 3 would be the appropriate approach.

Commissioner Adamack commented that he isn't comfortable endorsing new code that he isn't familiar with and would like time to better understand what is being proposed. Staff commented that they could meet with Commissioner Adamack to help him better understand the proposed code changes.

Chair Tapio supports the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee and feels the process needs to move forward.

Commissioner Dantzler made a motion to select Option 3 as the preferred option if the Commission is asked to weigh in on the subject, it was 2<sup>nd</sup> and a brief discussion followed.

The Commission voted 4-0, with one Commissioner abstaining, to select Option 3 as their preferred preliminary recommendation to the Council.

## **5. New Business:**

### **A. Review Draft Amendments to Homeless Encampment Regulations**

Mr. Torrico briefly discussed the minor code amendment to the Homeless Encampment regulations. He explained that the City received a letter from the Second Amendment Foundation who took issue with one section of our Homeless Encampment regulations that restricted the possession of fire arms with the camp. They asserted that this violates state law

and requested that the code be amended. The City Attorney reviewed the letter, our code and state law and concluded that we did need to amend the code.

On a motion by Commissioner Dantzler that the code amendment as proposed by staff should be moved forward, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Guite, the Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the code amendment.

**6. Detailed Commission Liaison's Report:**

None

**7. Community & Economic Development Director's Report:**

None

**8. Planning Commission Comments (including suggestions for next meeting's agenda)**

None

**8. Adjournment:**

By the consensus of the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

.....