

**CITY OF SEATAC
PLANNING COMMISSION**

DRAFT Minutes of February 5, 2013
Regular Meeting

Members Present: Daryl Tapio, Chairman, Roxie Chapin, Vice-Chair, Tom Dantzler, Joe Adamack

Members Absent: Jim Todd (excused)

Staff Present: Mark Johnsen, Senior Assistant city Attorney, Mike Scarey, AICP, Senior Planner; Albert Torrico, Senior Planner;

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Tapio called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Approve Minutes of the January 15, 2013 Meeting:

On a motion by Commissioner Dantzler, 2nd by Commissioner Chapin, the January 15, 2013 meeting minutes were moved and accepted as presented by a 4-0 Commission vote.

3. Old Business: None

4. New Business: At the Chairman's suggestion, the Commission approved amending the agenda to take up the Briefing on the Open Public Meetings Act, Conflict of Interest, and Public records first, and have the Election of Officers second.

A. Briefing on Open Public Meetings Act, Conflict of Interest Issues, and Public Records

This presentation is largely for the benefit of the new Commissioner, Jim Todd. Since Commissioner Todd is absent from this meeting, this item was tabled, to be scheduled for discussion at a later meeting.

B. Election of Officers

On a motion by Commissioner Dantzler, seconded by Commissioner Chapin, Daryl Tapio was unanimously elected to a second one-year term as Chair of the Commission.

On a motion by Commissioner Dantzler, seconded by Commissioner Adamack, Roxie Chapin was unanimously elected to a second one-year term as Vice Chair of the Commission.

5. Detailed Commission Liaison's Report:

Commissioner Dantzler reported that Geoff Bailie passed away in December 2012 following an accident at his home. Mr. Bailie had been a consultant to the SR 509 Extension Steering Committee, and a major contributor to that Committee over the years.

6. Community & Economic Development Director's Report:

Mr. Scarey noted that several Zoning Code issues had come to staff's attention through permit counter inquiries. As these are active inquiries staff would like to bring these forward for Planning Commission review and discussion for possible minor Code amendments, but that the decision to do so had not been confirmed yet.

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

Commission Chair Tapio stated he attend the Council Study Session on Jan. 22, 2013 along with staff and was shocked at the process that the City Council used in the recent decision on the proposed City Center park-and-fly code amendments.

Mr. Tapio stated that the Council Members made comments about the proposed code changes but allowed no discussion or rebuttal. Many of the comments could have been explained and rebutted but the Council chose to not include the Planning Commission, staff, or the affected parties in the discussion. The Council then took a quick vote to not move the agenda bill to the RCM agenda. Then, the Mayor, unilaterally, without asking for a vote, made the decision to not have this on any future Study Session agendas which in effect ended a 3 year project. Three years worth of work was ended very abruptly without having the opportunity for discussion.

Mr. Tapio stated that some of the comments made by the Council Members were questionable arguments and should be further discussed, such as:

- I don't think it's good for existing businesses to allow more people to build parking garages.
- I like the term "negotiate" and want to have property owners enter into a development agreement with the city. They desired a code that people can't build to so that they are forced to negotiate with the City Council. Mr. Tapio stated that the council wants a vague, restrictive code so that the Council can be at the table negotiating the requirements. Mr. Tapio also suggested that we should be having a discussion about whether we can write a code that doesn't force property owners to have to enter into a development agreement.
- One Council member stated that he did some math and based on the parking market having a total of 15,000 stalls and at 1500 stalls per garage that would yield 10 new garages in the City Center. He would not like to see that. Mr. Tapio stated that just because that some rights are given back to property owners does not translate into every surface parking lot in the city will be moved to structure parking garages in the City Center.
- Another Council Member referred to a City Center rendering of a vision for the area from 1999. He stated that everyone liked that vision. Mr. Tapio stated that the Council should provide a vision but the timing for this was way off. A vision should not be provided at the end of a three-year process. He went on to say that the vision was not presented at the beginning of the Ad Hoc Committee meetings or at any one of the meetings during the two year process, nor

at the start of the parking code amendment process, nor at any one of the numerous council update meetings.

Mr. Tapio further went on to say that at the Council Study Session it appeared that a meeting was held outside of the council chambers where a decision was made to end this project. He stated that he did not know who they met with or amongst themselves but that it appeared that the decision was made prior to the Study Session. What staff and the Planning Commission said at the Study Session did not even appear to be part of the discussion.

Mr. Tapio stated that this is not a good way to manage a project. This project likely cost taxpayers over \$500,000. And, the Council just threw it down the drain. Is it worth our time to develop a code and then the Council has a meeting and ends the project?

Mr. Tapio stated that if we (the Planning Commission) take on another section of the Zoning Code, we should not expend any effort until we know what the majority of the Council is thinking. The Council needs to get in the game early and explain their vision. We need to have much better communication with the Council and through the City Manager. We also need to have meaningful feedback at the Council update meetings. At all of the Council update meetings there was virtually no feedback.

Other Planning Commissioners expressed similar reactions to the Council's decision.

Ms. Chapin asked how can we get this issue out in the open where it belongs and have a discussion?

Mr. Dantzler stated that the Planning Commission needs to know the goal of the Council upfront so that we don't end up going in a circle. If the Council doesn't want us to do something then we probably have better things to do. A lot of people put in valuable time and energy and contributed to this project. The Council should provide better leadership and direction.

Mr. Adamack stated that he would like to see the Planning Commission work on substantive agenda items and contribute to improving the city. We all have busy schedules and would appreciate if we have issues to look at and that our contributions would be valued.

8. Adjournment:

By the consensus of the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

.....