

MILLWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

JULY 25, 2011

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order. Mr. Stravens called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM. Commission members present were: Bobbie Beese, Kelly Stravens, and Laura Burrill. Staff present: Tom Richardson, City Planner, and Ray Oligher, Assistant Planner.

2. Approval of Minutes. Changes were requested for the minutes from the June meeting to help clarify the reasons for approving Special Sign Permit 2011-03. Due to the missing text, there was no motion to approve. The decision to approve was continued to the next Planning Commission meeting.

3. Public Hearing: CPA 1102

Initial discussion centered on examples of rules from other jurisdictions that discussed the amount of change necessary to trigger compliance with the new design standards for the C-2 district. Ms. Beese felt that a percentage of assessed value was not a good mechanism to use. Mr. Stravens liked using a percentage of floor area or percentage of façade that is changed. The Commission's desire was to make sure that the trigger was based on a large or substantial change, although a good definition for the meaning of 'substantial' was hard to perfect. There was definite concern to not create a burden to development in the zone.

The decision was to employ multiple tiers of trigger; all new construction, existing construction with a percentage of original floor area and/or interior remodeling, existing construction that effects a percentage of exterior façade. Change of use, based on a change of building use code, was also considered a valid trigger. Staff will report next meeting on current building use codes. General building maintenance would not trigger full compliance.

Ms. Beese was concerned about the 400' spacing listed in the definition for shared parking. Her feeling was that this space was farther than people would walk and the shared spaces would lose contact or relevance to the use that controls them. With large gaps between parking areas, the neighborhoods will have to absorb the parking load.

Mr. Stravens felt that businesses will make sure there is adequate parking close to the use and few spaces will be left for offsite. Also, Mr. Stravens felt 400' was not a long walk. Developers want more parking. Buildings are easier to lease where there is adequate customer parking. Fewer shared lots will leave more room for businesses. The issue was left at 400' and will be readdressed in the future if there is a problem.

Continuing through the new design specifications that are now part of the zoning document, verbiage surrounding the design of entryways, valid locations for entrances, window coverage as a percentage of a façade, definition of clear view into a building, pedestrian friendly signage, what outdoor business activities require right-of-way permits, encouragement of bulb-outs and

proper location for that text, were discussed and their wording and meaning was clarified to match the intent of the regulation.

It was noted that signage would have to be addressed in a larger scale, at a different time. Staff was tasked with looking at what other jurisdictions allow in pedestrian oriented/scaled areas.

The section on conversion of existing structures, especially the conversion of remaining residential structures for business use, was discussed. New shared parking rules make it easier to meet current regulations while converting an existing structure, instead of rebuilding. New entrances would have to be constructed and paving and stormwater rules would have to be followed. The decision was made to continue allowing this conversion to happen as a way to update structures that are now falling into disrepair.

Staff will look at allowable locations for secure transition facilities and whether distances listed in the statute disallow them in the C-2 zone due to buffers around parks, schools and playgrounds. A map will be created for discussion at the next meeting.

The prohibition against drive-up windows in the C-2 zone was re-added to the list of prohibited uses.

5 minute recess at 7:53 PM, hearing resumed at 7:58.

Side yard setbacks for businesses that abut a street were discussed. Mr. Stravens felt a smaller, 5 foot, setback would be satisfactory for parcels that abut a street. Buildings that are in mid-block are fine without a side yard setback. Language was changed to require no minimum side yard setbacks.

The amount of impervious surfaces on the parcel was discussed. Stormwater regulations have to be followed. Ms. Beese felt that 30% of the parcel should have to be made up of pervious materials, the design of those surfaces should be left up to the building designer. Instead of mentioning two surface figures, one each for building and parking, the regulation should be changed to require 30% of the total space be made up of pervious surfaces.

Due to the late hour, motion to continue this discussion until the next meeting was made by Mr. Stravens, seconded by Ms. Beese. Carried unanimously.

CPA 1103 No discussion.

4. Staff Report.

Discussion of the UGA Local Level of Service document was held until the next meeting.

There was discussion on the Status of the Grant for the Shoreline Master Plan Update. The City has forwarded to Ecology an updated copy of the Grant Proposal and is waiting for a signed copy to be returned.

There was a short demonstration of the street tree information provided by the Spokane County Conservation District as presented in Treeworks, a GIS mapping tool.

5. Public Comments. None.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Monday, August 29.

6. Adjournment. Ms. Burrill moved for adjournment. Motion seconded by Ms. Beese. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Chairperson

Secretary