

Planning Commission Minutes

September 20, 2006 Regular Scheduled Meeting

APPROVED

City Hall Council Chambers

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 P.M.**Planning Commission Present**Randy McKibbin, **Chair**Grant Sulham, **Vice-Chair**

Quinn Dahlstrom

Dennis Poulsen

David Eck

Katrina Minton-Davis

L. Winona Jacobsen

City Staff Present

Bob Leedy, P&CD Director

Christy McQuillen, Planning Commission Clerk

Ellen Talbo, Assistant Planner

A poll determined that a majority of Commission members would be available for the next meeting scheduled for October 4, 2006 to be held at City Hall Council Chambers. Commissioner Jacobsen announced that she would be absent for this meeting due to vacation plans.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes requiring review and approval were those of September 6, 2006.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER POULSEN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2006 AS PRESENTED. APPROVAL WAS UNANIMOUS.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS/CONCERNS: Audience members in attendance chose not to speak.**III. OLD/CONTINUING BUSINESS:**

Miscellaneous Fixes Ordinance- As outlined in the Staff Report dated August 28, 2006, for years the planning staff has catalogued sections of our development regulations which are difficult to interpret due to ambiguous or contradictory language. In some cases staff has been operating under written Administrative Determinations (interpretations signed by the Director) so as to provide consistent interpretation.

The proposed ordinance (1st Draft) would “fix” the various problems, in most cases without changing how the City currently interprets anything. The few departures from past practice are noted. The proposed ordinance would amend the development regulations, Titles 14-19 of the Bonney Lake Municipal Code. The “fixes” are listed in a table. Staff is still discussing these matters internally, so the Commission is advised to

simply continue to absorb the issues. The proposed changes, collectively, do require SEPA review and a Public Hearing which would be scheduled at a later date.

As discussed at the Planning Commission meeting of September 6, 2006, the Commission elected to review and discuss approximately 10 items from the table at each meeting. Therefore, as a group, the Commission reviewed and made comments on the following:

Item #	PURPOSE OF THE REGULATION	PROBLEM WITH THE REGULATION	SUGGESTED FIX	PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS
12	To define "side setbacks" such that the regulations pertaining to them make sense.	<p>Problem #1: The setbacks pertaining to a corner lot abutting streets on two sides differ from those abutting streets on three sides, yet the definition lumps them together.</p> <p>Problem #2: Regarding "a minimum of 10 feet on one side," the definition is written correctly with respect to the R-2 zone but not to the R-1 zone.</p>	<p>Problem #1: Add clarifying words to definition.</p> <p>Problem #2: Eliminate the "10-foot side setback requirement" from the definition. Let the "10-foot side setback requirement" in the R-2 zone chapter speak for itself. (Eliminate duplication).</p>	<p>Ok by majority. No concerns</p> <p>Ok by majority. No concerns</p>
13	To require minimum tree canopy in parking lots.	Current language can be misinterpreted as counting loading and refuse areas in the definition of "maneuvering areas," which would make the requirement too difficult to satisfy.	Specify that "maneuvering areas" excludes loading and refuse areas.	Ok by majority. No concerns
14	To exempt minor tree removals from the permit requirement.	The exemptions could be misinterpreted as prevailing even in critical areas such as wetlands and wildlife habitats. That was not the intent. Such areas need the protection afforded by permit review.	Specify that such actions are not exempt in areas protected by the critical areas code.	The strongest concern came from Commissioner Poulsen who feels the current tree removal code shouldn't be tampered with. Non-exemptions for those single parcels (private properties) that have steep slopes. Staff to follow up on the cross reference text in the Critical Areas Code.

Item #	PURPOSE OF THE REGULATION	PROBLEM WITH THE REGULATION	SUGGESTED FIX	PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS
15	To establish a height limit below which new antennas attached to existing poles could be approved administratively, without a conditional use permit.	Cell tower antennas are usually 6-12 feet tall. They are mounted on the sides of poles near the top. Existing language could be interpreted as defining antenna height to include the entire antenna, making the easier administrative permit process impossible. Height above the top of the pole seems more relevant, and was probably the intent all along.	Specify that the height referred to is that of the antenna above the top of the pole.	After a brief discussion and clarification for this proposed change, Ok by majority. No concerns
16	To exempt incidental signs from having to get a permit.	<p>Problem #1: The code does not exempt sandwich board signs from the permit requirement, whereas by administrative interpretation they are exempt if under a certain total sign area and if other rules are followed.</p> <p>Problem #2: The code requires that incidental signs be removed by 48 hours after the event, but incidental signs and sandwich board signs generally have nothing to do with events.</p> <p>Problem #3: The code lacks clear specifications regarding signs advertising homes in new subdivisions.</p>	<p>Problem #1: Exempt sandwich board signs under a certain size and if placed properly.</p> <p>Problem #2: Remove the "48 hours" clause.</p> <p>Problem #3: Include language controlling subdivision signs, in conformance with an existing Administrative Interpretation.</p>	As a group, a few Commissioners had concerns in response to the proposed changes to the sign code. Businesses rely on advertising and by limiting signage, this isn't beneficial. In particular, directional signage limitations along long stretch of roadways. More thought needs to be given to any changes to this code.
17	To establish rules regarding special event signs.	The clause referred to in Problem #2 above belongs here. It was needed but out of place.	Require that special event signs be removed within 48 hours of the event.	As a group, a few Commissioners questioned enforcement and were undecided whether to decide on 48 hours after an event or next business day or to simply leave the code as is. More thought needs to be given to this code change.

Item #	PURPOSE OF THE REGULATION	PROBLEM WITH THE REGULATION	SUGGESTED FIX	PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS
18	To establish bulk restrictions in the C2/C3 zone.	The C2/C3 zone has no maximum residential density.	Establish the same maximum residential density as pertains to the R-3 zone: twenty units per acre. (This is how the code is currently interpreted.)	As a group, it was questioned if this change would limit the city in achieving density goals. Mr. Leedy said that maybe set at least a limit or look at other municipalities for residential density in Commercial zones. More thought needs to be given to this code change.
19	To establish the maximum residential density in the R3 zone.	The residential density requirement in the R3 zone was clearly meant as a maximum, but as worded it could also be interpreted as being a minimum.	Specify that 20 units per acre is the maximum residential density.	Ok by majority. No concerns
20	To establish the relationship between building permit issuance and payment of water connection charges.	The code fails to establish rules regarding the refunding of water connection charges and the amount to be paid if the applicant reapplies.	Specify that the payment will be refunded but that upon reapplication the current (newer) water connection charges will apply.	Ok by majority. No concerns
21	Same as for Section 20 but for Sewer.	Same as for Section 20 but for Sewer.	Same as for Section 20 but for Sewer.	Ok by majority. No concerns
22	To establish rules regarding building permit fees upon reapplication when a permit has expired.	The code is vague regarding the required payment upon reapplication after suspension or abandonment.	Clearly specify the fee that will be charged in each scenario.	Commission & staff pointed out that something is not clear in regards to expirations. Need clarification before moving forward.

Chair McKibbin indicated that Items 23-28 (on the Table) would be reviewed and discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 4, 2006. This topic is to remain on the Agenda under Old/Continuing Business.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DAHLSTROM, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECK TO TAKE A 5 MINUTE BREAK. APPROVAL WAS UNANIMOUS.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING- None

V. NEW BUSINESS-

Non Motorized Transportation Plan- Commissioners received as part of their packet, the DRAFT Plan dated September 2006. Mr. Leedy said that this is simply for the Commission to review and make any necessary notes. In terms of Adoption, this will more than likely be part of the 2007 Comprehensive Plan Update. Commissioner Dahlstrom asked if table 4.3 could be enlarged and distributed to the Commission.

This topic is to remain on the Agenda under Old/Continuing Business as simply a discussion matter.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Correspondence- None

Staff Concerns- Ms. McQuillen reminded the Commission that an invitation has been extended to the group to attend the Short Course in Local Planning hosted by the City of Sumner scheduled for September 21, 2006.

Commissioner Concerns – Chair McKibbin opened the floor for discussion on a much needed joint meeting with City Council regarding Annexation Area 3. Two options were available, October 10 or October 17.

After a minor discussion, a majority of the Commission members elected to hold the joint meeting with City Council on October 10, 2006 at 6:30PM in City Hall Council Chambers. The Public Hearing is for the proposed Residential Zoning of Annexation Area 3.

Commissioner Minton-Davis reminded the Commission of the Bonney Lake Chamber of Commerce meeting scheduled for September 21, 2006 at 11:30 AM with scheduled speaker, Mayor Johnson.

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DAHLSTROM, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JACOBSEN TO ADJOURN. APPROVAL WAS UNANIMOUS.

The meeting ended at 7:05 P.M.

Christy McQuillen, Planning Commission Clerk
Approved on October 4, 2006