



# **CITY OF SEATAC**

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Riverton Room, SeaTac City Hall, 4800 S. 188<sup>th</sup> Street  
March 11, 2014, 5:30 p.m.

### **MEETING AGENDA**

- 1) Call to Order/Roll Call – 5:30 p.m.
- 2) Approve Minutes of March 4, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting (Exhibit A)
- 3) Briefing on Angle Lake Station Area Plan (materials will be presented at the meeting)
- 4) Briefing on Major Comprehensive Plan Update (materials will be presented at the meeting)
- 5) Initial discussion of review process for proposed code amendments and process changes (Exhibit B)
- 6) Detailed Commission Liaisons' Reports
- 7) Community & Economic Development Director's Report
- 8) Planning Commission Comments (including suggestions for next meeting agenda)
- 9) Adjournment

**CITY OF SEATAC  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Minutes of March 4, 2014  
Regular Meeting**

**Members Present:** Joe Adamack, Roxie Chapin, Tom Dantzler

**Members Absent:** Jim Todd (excused)

**Staff present:** Joe Scorcio, CED Director; Steve Pilcher, Planning Manager

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Adamack called the meeting to order at 5:29 p.m.

**2. Approve minutes of February 18, 2014 Meeting**

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes as written. Passed 3-0.

**3. Public Hearing on Miscellaneous Code Amendments**

Planning Manager Steve Pilcher presented the proposed amendment, noting that they fall into three general categories: 1) Hearing Examiner duties/land use permit decision criteria; 2) SEPA substantive authority; and 3) the Comprehensive Plan. He noted there are companion amendments to SMC 1.20, Hearing Examiner Code that will proceed with the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council. However, since the Commission does not have purview over SMC 1.20, it is not a matter for public hearing at this time.

Mr. Pilcher stated that the public hearing had been advertised in the February 14, 2014 Seattle Times; that notice of the proposed amendments was sent to the State Department of Commerce per GMA requirements and no comments have been received; and that since these are procedural matters, they are exempt from SEPA review.

Mr. Pilcher noted that the draft amendments attached to the staff report include annotation, explaining the reasoning behind the various changes being proposed. The Hearing Examiner/decision criteria amendments are primarily intended to update the code to be consistent with State law; to make the code internally consistent; and to avoid having decision criteria in both SMC 1.20 and in the Zoning Code. Regarding the latter, staff is recommending decision criteria be maintained in the Zoning Code only.

The list of policy documents used for the exercise of SEPA substantive authority appears to have been those used when the City first incorporated. Since that time, the City has adopted its own

policy documents (e.g., comprehensive plan), so the list needs to be updated to reflect those documents, while no longer referring to King County plans.

Commissioner Dantzler expressed that the SeaTac Area Update Plan should be retained in the list.

The final section of code amendments will add a new chapter to the Municipal Code to address the Comprehensive Plan. This addition defines the plan and its various elements; states a policy for encouraging early and on-going public input in the planning process; recognizes the authority previously granted to the CED Director for establishing an amendment process; and lists circumstances under which the plan may be amended more frequently than once per calendar year.

The Chair opened the hearing for public testimony at 5:41 p.m. There being no one present wishing to testify, testimony was also closed at 5:41 p.m.

**Moved and seconded to forward the proposal to the City Council with a recommendation of approval, with staff to determine the legal status of the SeaTac Area Update Plan and include or exclude, as appropriate. Passed 3-0.**

#### **4. CED Director's Report**

Planning Manager Pilcher advised the Commission that interviews for the vacant Commission position will be held this Friday (3/7) and the subsequent Friday (3/14). He did not know when an appointment might be made.

CED Director Scorcio asked the Commission for feedback on the recent City Council retreat session regarding parliamentary procedures. He stated he would provide the Commission with the PowerPoint presentation used by Ms. McFarlane. He also reviewed the discussion that occurred during the afternoon of the retreat session, noting that code enforcement is a priority for the Council.

He also noted that in doing some quick research, it appears that the SeaTac Area Update Plan was repealed by King County when it adopted its comprehensive plan in the early 1990s, as it is not included in the current list of plan elements.

#### **7. Planning Commission Comments**

Chair Adamack mentioned that the City Council had recently discussed I-502 and marijuana business regulations and indicated they wished to receive feedback from the Commission. The Commission expressed interest in what changes have occurred since a year ago, when the Zoning Code was amended to not allow any type of marijuana related business.

CED Director Scorcio stated that the Council has asked for the Commission to explore the issue and if appropriate, make recommendations of how the code might be amended. Staff will be

doing research into this matter, such as determining how surrounding jurisdictions are approaching the issue; what level of tax revenues might be expected; and what might be the impacts to law enforcement. Mr. Scorcio noted the Council did not establish a firm date by which they wished to receive a recommendation.

**8. Adjournment**

Moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:05 p.m. Passed 3-0.

.....



EXHIBIT B

DATE 03/18/14

# MEMORANDUM

## COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Date: March 13, 2014  
To: Planning Commission  
From: Steve Pilcher, Planning Manager  
Subject: Discussion of the review process for proposed code amendments and process changes

While developing the Planning Commission's work program last year, the Commission expressed interest in reviewing the existing and developing an improved public involvement process when considering proposed changes to policies, regulations and procedures. The intent was to ensure a better analysis of issues. This issue may have at least partially arisen when the new, updated building and fire codes were under consideration.

Staff would like to discuss this matter with the Commission and receive direction on how it wishes to approach this issue, as it remains an item on the Commission's approved work program.