

# MILLWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING AUGUST 29, 2011 MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order. Mr. Stravens called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM. Commission members present were: Bobbie Beese, Dan Hansen, Kelly Stravens, Josey Booth and Laura Burrill. Staff present: Tom Richardson, City Planner, and Ray Oligher, Assistant Planner.

Prior to any other action, Mr. Booth was welcomed as the newest Planning Commission member.

2. Approval of Minutes. Changes were requested and accepted for the June meeting minutes, Ms. Beese moved to approve, Ms. Burrill seconded, passed unanimously. The July minutes were accepted without change. Mr. Stravens moved to approve, Ms. Beese seconded, passed unanimously.

### 3. Public Hearing: CPA 1102

The public hearing on CPA 1102 was reopened and initial discussion centered on how to quantify the amount of change that would trigger compliance with the new design standards for the C-2 district. As directed at the previous meeting, staff compiled a list of the International Building Use Codes for use as a possible trigger mechanism. There was general feeling that the IBU codes were too fine grained to use as a measure and the idea of using change of use as a trigger was dropped. There was general feeling that percent of internal or external change would be adequate, but the amount of change, and how it would be measured was hard to interpret.

Unintentional changes to historic buildings, caused by badly formed triggers, were the next subject of discussion. It was felt that any triggers should be written to allow changes of use, or interior updates while still protecting historic facades. From this discussion, there was consensus that the city needed to create an overlay zone, as part of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan update process, to protect buildings in the historic district, no matter what zone they fall into.

When considering proper percentages of internal or external change, Mr. Booth asked for clarification on how buildings with multiple tenants are treated. Mr. Richardson explained that in the case of multiple businesses in the same structure, the controlling entity was the business that was physically the largest. If that business were to change to the extent that a trigger was exercised, the remainder of the building would have to be brought up to code. There was also a long discussion on how to, and whether there was a need to, codify what constitutes "significant" change. The amount of work necessary to meet the 50% rule was eventually left to the discretion of city staff, with the knowledge that there was an exception path that a builder could take.

The final decision was to drop change of use as a trigger, but to keep changes of over 50 percent of interior space, or changes of over 50% of the exterior facade. The wording on the trigger for

exterior changes was clarified to indicate that the rule applies only to changes to the building façades that are visible from the street.

Exceptions to the design rules were then discussed. The wording was cleaned up to clarify when a designer/builder could come to the commission with reasons why their specific update should not be held to the letter of the regulation.

Ms. Beese questioned whether changes were needed in the Main Entrances section of the design rules. The question concerned whether an entrance had to be maintained on the facade facing an arterial street, whether or not this was the main entrance. There was the feeling that the sidewalk was being abandoned unless an entrance existed on the street side. After discussion, the verbiage indicating that you can have your main entrance at the front, side or rear was kept, and if the business owner wanted no entrance on the arterial, it was their decision. The vague clause requiring direct pedestrian access to all entrances was removed.

The section discussing site coverage, 17.18.100, was removed since final lot coverage percentages are driven by other site considerations, such as parking and landscaping. In addition, the paragraph denying stormwater controls within 50 feet of the river was removed and replaced by the statement that all development requires compliance with the Shoreline Management Act.

As directed at the previous meeting, staff provided documentation presenting what signage other jurisdictions allow in pedestrian oriented/scaled areas. Staff also provided maps of allowable locations for secure transition facilities and whether distances listed in the statute would automatically disallow them in the C-2 zone due to buffers around parks, schools and playgrounds. These items will be continued at the next meeting for discussion.

CPA 1103 No discussion.

#### 4. Staff Report.

There was a short discussion of the Local Level of Service document which was created as part of the Spokane County UGA update process.

There was discussion on the current status of the Shoreline Master Plan Update. We are waiting on data from DNR and F&W to complete the characterization of the shoreline in Millwood. Still 30 days left on Ecology comment period on phase 1, defining the city's legal shoreline responsibility. Short discussion on the next phase and what will be included in the public visioning session. At the time of the meeting, the Mayor had not selected the members of the Technical Advisory Committee, which will work through the documents that are created by staff, and comment prior to presentation to Ecology.

The documentation for Phase I and Phase II will be provided to the Planning Commission for the next meeting.

A plaque for recognition of John Newman's service on the Planning Commission was given to Mr. Stravens for delivery.

A Planning Short Course is scheduled for Friday, 9/23, 1:30 – 4:30 on the Riverpoint Campus. Staff will confirm time and date and invite everybody on the Commission.

5. Public Comments. There was recognition from the public in attendance that it was good to see the Planning Commission at full staffing for the first time in a long while.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Monday, September 26.

6. Adjournment. Mr. Hansen moved for adjournment. Motion seconded by Ms. Burrill. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

---

Chairperson

---

Secretary