

**City of Puyallup
Planning Commission
Puyallup City Hall – Council Chambers
May 22, 2013
7:00 PM**

(These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of six years from the date of the meeting and are available upon request.)

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Steve Hastings, Vice-Chair Chris McNutt, Commissioners Aaron Couch, Curt Gimmestad, Nancy Johnson, Shelley Krashowetz, Heather Shadko

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Associate Planner – Katie Baker; Associate Planner – Chris Beale; Administrative Secretary – Michelle Ochs

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. A quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Johnson moved to approve the Agenda. Ms. Shadko seconded the motion. The commissioners unanimously approved the agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS

2013 Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Recording start time 00:55)

Ms. Baker gave a brief overview of the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan, and then introduced the privately initiated comprehensive plan amendment for 2013, submitted for a change of the land use designation from Business/Industrial Park (B/IP) to Light Manufacturing/Warehousing (LM/W) and the associated zoning from Business Park (MP) to Limited Manufacturing (ML). There was a brief discussion regarding the zoning designations surrounding the parcel. Ms. Baker explained the criteria described in Puyallup Municipal Code that the applicant must meet. Mr. Gimmestad asked if there is any space in the annexed area dedicated to open space, and Ms. Baker pointed out on the map the portions designated as open space/agricultural.

Jeff Harmer, the proponent, gave a brief background of Schnitzer West, and a detailed history of the property area. He explained what Schnitzer West's involvement had been up to that point and some of the challenges with the infrastructure in the area. Mr. Hastings asked if there would be access to the railway system, and Mr. Harmer replied that there is an opportunity to provide access by bringing a rail spur through the property to the north and that is also dependent on the development that is taking place there. There was a general consensus among the Commissioners to move the application forward to public hearing.

Miscellaneous Code Amendments (Recording start time 27:24)

Ms. Baker reminded the Commissioners that the carryover from their last meeting (May 8, 2013) on this item pertains to Bed and Breakfast allowances and additional information requested relating to ADU's (accessory dwelling units). She gave them an overview of the items that they requested to be changed:

Bed and Breakfast:

Uses that are permitted and permitted conditionally, two rooms or fewer permitted outright;
Allowed in all residential zones;
Number of rooms restricted to eight or less;
Events (wedding, banquets) prohibited on site;

Mr. McNutt asked that events be defined, Ms. Baker stated that it could be left open and up to staff to make an administrative determination. It was decided that the word large would be added before banquets, weddings, etc. Ms. Baker said that she would check with the City's fire code official to see if there are any restrictions on the number of people that can be in the home at the same time. There was some discussion on the landscaping requirements (property shall contain landscaping equivalent to 25 percent of the net lot area). Ms. Baker pointed out that the CUP (conditional use permit) criteria are in place to ensure that property can accommodate the proposed use and all associated requirements.

ADU's:

Mr. Gimmestad stated that if an ADU is located on the second story of a detached structure, he feels that requiring the windows to face internally or the street or alley is impractical. There was extensive discussion on this issue and Mr. McNutt suggested that any ADU in a detached structure located on the second floor should require an ACUP (administrative conditional use permit), where staff would be making the determination on whether the ADU follows the code standard. A majority of the Planning Commissioners reached a general consensus on this issue and Ms. Baker agreed to incorporate this language into the code.

Ms. Baker explained that she had a discussion with the fire code official and that when someone submits an application to convert an existing detached garage into an ADU it would be considered a change of use, which would make it subject to structural building code and fire code requirements that would be applied to any residential structure. She also went over the changes to the code text related to floor to area ratio, using a chart showing the maximum square footage for each zone.

Mr. McNutt suggested changing the length of stay at a bed and breakfast from 14 days to 18 days, specifically for the Fair that takes place in Puyallup each September. A majority of the Commissioners seemed to favor this idea.

Draft Heritage Tree Ordinance (recording start time 01:06:00)

Mr. Beale explained that this draft heritage tree ordinance pulls standards from the vegetation management standards, which is the city's existing document that prescribes standards for landscaping. He talked about the process to nominate a tree for designation where: 1.) a property owner can submit an application with a report on the tree being requested for designation, 2.) the City Council could designate a tree that is planted related to an event, or 3.) a citizen could also make a request regarding a tree that is of significant value to them.

Mr. Beale explained that a tree on private property cannot be submitted for consideration without written authorization by the property owner. There was discussion on the exceptions section of the proposed code and a suggested change was to note that there is a section on

exceptions in the nominations section. Mr. Beale stated that the next step in the process is scheduling a site visit to determine the following criteria: the tree's overall health and condition, and its significance (size, location, historical, unique variety, etc.)

There was some discussion on the planting of new trees on private property and whether an arborist's report should be required on a newly established tree for which the property owner is seeking heritage status. There was some concern related to a tree on private property being granted heritage status, specifically whether in the case of a sale of the home the new owner would have the means to remove it if they no longer wanted it on the property.

There was discussion regarding what could be done to encourage tree planting rather than making it a policy, and the varying types of trees that could be considered a heritage tree (e.g. memorial trees). A majority of the Planning Commission seemed to agree that age, size, and larger, mature trees are the determining factors.

Mr. Beale then covered the notification and appeal process with the Commissioners. During discussion on the notification of registration process, the Commissioners talked extensively about the policies and procedures outlining what options property owners who have a tree on their property that is listed on the existing register. The Commissioners seemed to reach a consensus that staff would contact property owners to find out if they want their tree to remain on the list or if they no longer wanted to participate in the program.

Ms. Shadko asked if there are any penalties or fines involved if someone illegally removes a tree, and Mr. Beale stated that the proposed ordinance does not currently have any provisions for that but he can look into some enforcement procedures and bring those back to the Planning Commission at a future meeting. Otherwise, a tree may be removed if it is deemed by a certified arborist as being in poor health or having structural damage that poses a danger. The removal procedures section of the proposed ordinance is also subject to the same notification and appeals process as stated under the nominations section.

OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS (Recording start time 02:09:52)

Ms. Baker reminded the Planning Commissioners of a couple of dates coming up: the Comprehensive Plan Update Open House being held on June 12, 2013, in lieu of their regular meeting; and the joint meeting between Planning Commission and the Design Review & Historic Preservation Board being held on June 19, 2013.

Mr. Beale updated the Commissioners on the status of the SMP (Shoreline Master Program), and let them know that they would be reviewing that again at an upcoming meeting. He also let them know about the update to the Parks Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan, overseen by the Parks Recreation and Senior Advisory Board. He explained that this update is not required by GMA (Growth Management Act), but rather the update provides opportunities for grant funding.

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Recording start time 02:14:12)

Howard Schick – 502 19th St NW – Mr. Schick spoke of his experience with planting Memorial trees in the City and the steps he has had to take in trying to maintain and keep them.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.