

**City of Puyallup  
Planning Commission  
Puyallup City Hall – Council Chambers  
November 13, 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:** Vice-Chair Chris McNutt, Clay Ciolek, Nancy Johnson, Shelley Krashowetz, Heather Shadko

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Chair Steve Hastings, Curt Gimmestad

**STAFF PRESENT:** Senior Planner – Katie Baker; Associate Planner – Chris Beale; Assistant Planner – Kendall Wals; Administrative Secretary – Michelle Ochs

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. A quorum was established.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

**CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

September 11, 2013

Ms. Shadko moved to approve the minutes as written, Ms. Krashowetz seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 4-0 with an abstention by Mr. Ciolek.

October 23, 2013

Ms. Shadko moved to approve the minutes as written, Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously approved the minutes.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**Wetland Buffers Draft Code** (Recording start time 01:07)

Mr. Beale briefly reviewed the new wetland buffer width protection standards as required by the Department of Ecology (DOE) through the City's Shoreline Master Program (SMP), which has been previously discussed with the Planning Commission. This revised draft code language

would allow for reduced buffer widths from the high intensity impact to the moderate intensity impact, and Mr. Beale used the tables of page four from the draft code to show examples of this. Ms. Shadko commented that it looked as if all previous concerns by the Planning Commission had been addressed in the new draft of the code. Mr. Ciolek asked if the City has to adopt what is recommended by DOE; Mr. Beale replied that although the City may have some local flexibility, DOE would have the final approval in the adoption of wetland buffer widths in the update.

**2015 Comprehensive Plan Update – Land Use Element** (Recording start time 11:05)

Ms. Baker reminded the Commissioners that at their meeting on October 9<sup>th</sup>, they discussed the mandatory components of the Land Use Element and looked over a proposed draft outline. She commented that staff has been following the direction of the Planning Commission by continuing to streamline each element and making it more reader-friendly.

Ms. Baker indicated that the goals and policies section of the Land Use Element had been revised with track changes, with items in green moving to a new location elsewhere in the Comp Plan, and items in red strike-through being removed completely. Mr. McNutt commented that the population estimates seemed high for this region, and asked what will happen if Puyallup does not meet the estimated growth rate. Ms. Baker explained that these estimates were for the urban growth area (UGA) accounting for both natural growth over time and annexations, and that these numbers adopted by the City were allocated by the County in the Countywide Planning Policies in 2011. Mr. Ciolek asked if growth is focused on the UGA rather than the City limits; Ms. Baker replied that staff doesn't plan for growth outside of the UGA. Ms. Shadko commented that she appreciated the streamlined look that makes the element easier to read, and that the maps that are being added in will really complete the new look.

Ms. Baker explained that there is a general policy section in the draft Land Use Element, and then briefly reviewed the other sections. Ms. Shadko commented that she felt the language regarding transfer of development rights needs to be stronger. Mr. McNutt disagreed, stating that the City Council had voted down an earlier transfer of development rights (TDR) program, and that making the language stronger seemed to be in opposition to their vision regarding this topic. Ms. Baker suggested modifying the language to read that the City will look for ways to preserve agricultural land, that may not necessarily include a TDR program, or that they could include it as optional language for a draft that goes to hearing and then a recommendation can be made by the Planning Commission. Mr. Ciolek commented on what he felt was some redundancy of the language in the Built Environment and Health section. There was further discussion about this section and there were diversified opinions on the wording, and whether it is strong enough.

Ms. Baker spoke briefly on the residential land use policies, and there was a brief discussion of sign restrictions, specifically for home based businesses. Ms. Johnson asked for clarification on the difference between a home based business and a small scale commercial activity within the neighborhood; Ms. Baker responded that this section is part of a new policy to promote small commercial businesses within residential areas. Ms. Shadko commented that promoting the small businesses helps walkability in the City. Mr. Ciolek commented on the section on Housing Mix that staff is preparing to remove from the code, and stated that it is important to recognize Puyallup as a predominantly single family residential housing area in the City.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the Commercial Land Use policy section at length, asking for various changes in language in the goals and striking the third goal.

There was extensive discussion regarding mixed uses, particularly in the areas around River Road. Ms. Baker asked if there would be interest in having a goal regarding the design of commercial businesses, and the general opinion of the Commission was that it seemed to be covered in the draft element under community character.

The discussion on the City's regional growth centers (RGC's) centered around whether residential growth should be focused in the RGC's, as well as the section prohibiting new automobile related uses; Mr. Ciolek commented that having some of these auto related uses in the downtown area would be convenient. There was extensive discussion regarding removing the section concerning auto related uses, or possibly changing the language, and Ms. Baker suggested having a couple optional languages at the hearing for the Commissioners to consider.

There was brief discussion on the policy allowing the permitting of adult entertainment facilities and if it had been included previously in the land use element, Ms. Baker explained that it was a new policy included to enforce what is already in the municipal code. Ms. Shadko commented that the section regarding conversion of agricultural lands to industrial use seemed inconsistent with some of the other policies in the element. The Commissioners discussed a possible wording change and where in the Element this section should appear.

Ms. Baker gave a brief overview of the Essential Public Facilities section, which is a new section to this element. She talked briefly about the Water Quality and Drainage section, and Mr. Ciolek asked for a small wording change in the flood plain information section.

Ms. Baker explained that the designation criteria format had been changed from text to table and that staff would work to implement the feedback from this meeting and bring it back at a future date for the Commissioners to review.

#### **2014 Draft Work Program** (Recording start time 2:00:25)

Ms. Baker reviewed the 2014 Planning Commission Calendar, explaining what items would be coming before them in the next year, including Code Amendments and the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Mr. McNutt asked if the Planning Commission Work Program could be published on the City's website, Ms. Baker responded that staff could post it under the Planning page.

#### **CITIZEN COMMENTS** (Recording 2:07:38)

Howard Schick – District 1- Mr. Schick commented on the draft designation criteria table in the Land Use Element, and development standards in the downtown area.

Mr. McNutt recognized students from Emerald Ridge High School in attendance at this meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.