

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

September 26, 2007
7:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Robertson, Commissioners Ferris, Lai, Mathews, Sheffels

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Bach, Orrico

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Inghram, Lacey Madche, Department of Planning and Community Development; Kris Liljeblad, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chair Robertson who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Sheffels, who arrived at 7:05 p.m.; Commissioner Orrico, who arrived at 7:42 p.m.; and Commissioner Bach.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram provided the Commissioners with copies of the prospectus for the Northern WRIA-8 mitigation bank. He said the document is intended to serve as a public comment rather than a staff document.

Mr. Inghram said an open house for the Meydenbauer Bay park project was conducted on September 25. He presented the Commission with copies of the draft alternatives which were released on September 20 to the steering committee. He said the steering committee will be considering the public comments and providing the Commission with some feedback in October.

The final report and recommendation of the Bel-Red corridor project steering committee was presented to the City Council on September 24. Co-Chair Terry Lukens helped staff present the recommendation. The Council identified a few topic areas concerning which they want staff to provide more details on October 1. The Council is expected at that meeting to hand off the recommendation to the various boards and commissions.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

7. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Chair Robertson reported that the Light Rail Best Practices Committee met on September 25. The group received a presentation from Sound Transit, were updated regarding the September 13 open house, and developed and confirmed a list of topics to be studied. The group will be given a tour in the near future of the possible routes the East Link project could take through the city.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Process-Based Land Use Code Amendments

Legal Planner Lacey Madche explained that process-based amendments are non-substantive by their very nature; they deal exclusively with how staff administers the Land Use Code and the processes used by the land use division.

Ms. Madche said staff has identified three categories into which the proposed revisions fit: unnecessary language, state law inconsistencies, and efficiency improvements.

Beginning with the first category, Ms. Madche called attention to some unnecessary decision criteria language found in three different processes: conditional use, planned unit development, and division of property. The meaningless language suggests to third parties that there is something in the code that would prohibit the specified action, when in fact there really is not. The proposal is to delete the language.

The second proposal in the unnecessary language category seeks to amend the Land Use Code to treat hotel/motel and religious institutions as unspecified uses for purposes of determining required parking. The Land Use Code contains parking minimums and maximums by use, but for those three uses there are no maximums, only minimums. Staff has found that the minimums do not comport with what is really happening from a review standpoint; a parking analysis is relied on rather than the code provisions.

With regard to the second category, inconsistency with state law, Ms. Madche said the first proposal is to include text from the Land Use Code relating to amendment and revocation of final plats. She explained that local governments are required to use state law as a guidance for how to divide property. The city has been relying on state law without having any actual references in the Land Use Code.

The second proposal under the second category is intended to make sure that all of the timelines comport with the Growth Management Act. In the last couple of years there has been legislation added that changed some of the requirements, and the intent is to make sure the Land Use Code tracks with those.

The third proposal of the second category relates to the City Council taking action on Land Use Code amendments without review from the Planning Commission. The purpose is to address circumstances where emergency action is required to be taken without Planning Commission input. While not intended to be the general practice, the provision is needed for precautionary times.

With regard to the efficiency category of improvements, Ms. Madche said the first proposal is to remove from the Land Use Code the provisions that require homeowners to have a home occupation permit. She explained that the city regulates home occupation uses on a complaint basis. Staff has found that the established decision criteria are not really decision criteria at all, rather they are performance standards. Planners who take in applications for a home occupation have no way of knowing if the business is actually going to comply with the performance standards. Under the proposal, the same regulations will apply, but there will be a different process for which they are applicable.

The second proposal in the efficiency improvements category is to amend the Land Use Code to allow the city to issue land use approvals during Process II appeal periods where no parties have submitted written comments. Where there are no registered parties of interest, the only two parties legally allowed to file an appeal are the applicant and the city, and in most instances where an approval is being sought it will not be the applicant filing an appeal. The proposal is intended to speed along the review process for the benefit of the applicants.

The last efficiency improvements proposal seeks to amend the land use to allow the city to provide notification by electronic mail and to publish the availability of documents through the city's official webpage. The amendment will save the city the cost of having to publish in the newspaper and will save staff time as well.

Chair Robertson asked how the proposed change to the parking standard for hotel/motel and religious institutions will affect existing developed parcels. Ms. Madche said the proposal is to treat hotel/motel and religious institutions as unspecified uses. That means that each use will be addressed on a case-by-case basis given that the parking demand for each of those types of uses is very particular and fact-specific. The proposal will not be creating any nonconformities for existing uses. For churches, the requirement to provide one parking stall for every five seats is unrealistic; the average per car occupancy for churches is 1.3, but each location is different.

Chair Robertson asked how much a parking analysis costs, and Ms. Madche said she did not have that figure but noted that the standard practice is to require a parking analysis. The proposal is to revise the code language to track current practice.

Answering a question asked by Chair Robertson, Ms. Madche said the proposal to allow the city to provide notification via electronic mail and on the city's website will not negate the SEPA requirements to publish in the newspaper. Certain quasi-judicial decisions made by the Council are required by state law to be published in the newspaper, and the proposal would not affect that. Staff has found that electronic notifications are more efficient for staff and for those who receive the notices.

Chair Robertson voiced concern regarding the proposal. She cited the Sound Transit case in which a property owner had their land condemned and the only notice of the hearing was an electronic posting on a website. No notice was mailed directly to the property owner. Ms. Madche said the intent of staff is to continue mailing out the blue bulletin, and postcard notifications that informs applicants or interested third parties that an application has been reviewed or a decision has been made. Instead of sending the actual decisions, however, the notices will indicate that hard copies can be obtained at City Hall. Notification by email would only occur where specifically requested.

Commissioner Ferris focused on the proposal to permit the City Council to take action on Land Use Code amendments without review from the Planning Commission, and comparing the proposed revisions to the language of 3.64.160.B with 20.35.400 concluded that the City Council

must always conduct a public hearing prior to taking action. He suggested the language should indicate that if the Planning Commission conducts the public hearing, the Council requirement to do so has been met. Ms. Madche agreed. She explained that 20.35.400 references two different items, first that the process shall include a public hearing, and second that the City Council must take action. The language does not require the City Council to conduct the public hearing, though under state law it can. The standard and typical practice is and will continue to be for the Commission to conduct public hearings on all Land Use Code amendments. She agreed to clarify the language.

Commissioner Sheffels asked if the Council is required to give notice of a public hearing just as the Commission is required to. Ms. Madche said the same noticing and timeline provisions apply to the City Council except where the Council has declared the need to enact an emergency ordinance.

Chair Robertson noted a preference for continuing to mail notices by post but allowing for full reports to be posted online, provided the mailed notices make reference to where additional information can be obtained. Ms. Mache clarified that the proposed noticing provisions would apply only to Process II decisions.

Mr. Inghram interjected that the impetus for moving toward more electronic noticing results from the demise of the *Eastside Journal*. Publishing in the *Seattle Times* is both more expensive and less effective. The question is whether the city should pay more for less effect, especially for issues that are of little consequence. He agreed that there are a lot of people who do not have email and ready access to the web, but suggested those same people are probably not regular readers of the legal notices published in newspapers. For major projects, staff talks directly with newspaper reporters in an attempt to get stories published; that is far more effective at getting the word out.

Commissioner Sheffels proposed revising the language to specifically reference Process II issues. Ms. Madche replied that there are numerous references throughout the Land Use Code; trying to piecemeal the desired revision through the individual processes would result in a very lengthy and time-consuming code amendment. The decision was made to put in a new section defining what mailing means and what publication means. The proposed language does not require the city to use one method or the other, it simply sets forth tools to be used.

B. Downtown Mobility Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Mr. Inghram noted that the package of Comprehensive Plan amendments for 2007 has been expanded by the Council to include the issue of downtown mobility. He said the action was taken by the Council pursuant to the belief that projects need to be considered and included in the Comprehensive Plan prior to the major Comprehensive Plan update in 2011 by which time much of the downtown growth will have occurred. The Downtown Implementation Plan and the 2020 downtown study identified a number of transportation projects, but the development that is occurring currently and that is projected to occur in the next two or three years necessitates taking a closer look at some specific intersections and street segments.

Mr. Inghram said the Transportation Commission will be provided an update on September 27 and may delve deeper into some of the technical transportation aspects. The Department of Transportation will provide the necessary technical analysis to support the considerations of the commissions but will focus primarily on the Transportation Commission. Suggestions and comments from the Transportation Commission will be fed back to the Planning Commission for consideration either before or at the time of the public hearing on the proposed amendments,

which is anticipated to occur on December 12.

By including additional projects in the Comprehensive Plan, the city will be able to effect how the downtown develops over time. Both NE 4th Street and NE 6th Street in Wilburton have previously been discussed and are included in the package.

Commissioner Ferris noted that the consolidation of Dodge Eastside and Jeep and the subsequent move to the old Michaels Toyota site have left vacant the property through which NE 4th Street would go through. Mr. Inghram said he is not aware of any permits having been submitted for that property. He said the city is continuing to talk with KG Investments, the property owner, regarding the potential for redevelopment.

Answering a question asked by Chair Robertson, Mr. Inghram said staff may come to the Commission in the fall wanting to advance some of the components of the Wilburton study.

Kris Liljeblad, Assistant Director, Transportation Planning, allowed that there is limited right-of-way in the downtown area; in most cases, what is seen is what the city will get. The proposed amendments are tied to getting the most out of what is available. The projection for downtown employment by 2030 is 79,000 workers, a figure which will bring with it a substantial need to improve flows into, out of and around the downtown. The number of residential units in the downtown is also projected to increase substantially, but if afforded transit opportunities those residents will not overly severely impact the overall transportation picture. The combined daytime population for the downtown for 2030 is close to the current citywide population.

Commissioner Sheffels asked how many downtown residents actually work in the downtown. Mr. Liljeblad said there are ways to estimate the number but declined to hazard a guess. He agreed to see if that data exists. Commissioner Sheffels said her guess is because the real estate in the downtown is so expensive, few of those who work in the downtown will be able to live there. Mr. Liljeblad said there is housing available in the downtown that is considered to be affordable, though the supply is limited.

Mr. Liljeblad agreed that the travel growth relative to the projections is a bit daunting. The daily person trips are expected to increase 126 percent over the 2004 base by 2030, and peak hour vehicle trips are projected to increase by more than 100 percent. He pointed out, however, that the projections do not assume a continuation of the existing trends; transit ridership is expected to grow significantly, but there will also be an increase in the number of vehicle trips. It can be assumed that people will need to begin making different travel choices in the downtown, not unlike what downtown Seattle experiences.

Mr. Liljeblad reminded the Commission that the NE 4th Street extension would offer significant relief to NE 8th Street as well as 116th Avenue NE between SE 1st Street and NE 12th Street. There are currently a lot of trips on 116th Avenue NE that do not want to be there but which must use it to get north or south. An assumption is being made among staff that 120th Avenue NE will also be improved along with the extension of NE 4th Street to help provide an alternate north/south connection.

The NE 6th Street/HOV extension has not been given a lot of airplay. Mr. Liljeblad said the idea is to extend the NE 6th Street HOV ramps across the freeway to provide continuity with 116th Avenue NE. That would allow bus traffic with an origin or destination at the transit center to continue all the way across the freeway then use 116th Avenue NE to go north or south, allowing them to avoid intersections on NE 4th Street and NE 8th Street at 112th Avenue NE and 116th Avenue NE. The transit benefit could be a time savings of at least five minutes. The NE 6th

Street HOV extension would also benefit routes having a destination to the east of the downtown.

Consideration is also being given to the potential of an additional pedestrian connection in the same corridor. The desire is to connect through the same area but go all the way east to the BNSF corridor and connect there.

Mr. Liljeblad said one topic that is getting more consideration broadly in the metro area is high-occupancy tolling. Part of the consideration is that by 2030 there will be no way the HOV lanes on the freeways will function without either making them three-plus total lanes or imposing a toll on them. The NE 6th HOV connection is one place there could be access to the HOV lanes exclusive of having to deal with the general purpose traffic at the other interchanges and as such could play into a future tolling strategy.

With regard to Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street, Mr. Liljeblad commented that the northwest corner of the intersection is prime for redevelopment. Because of the increased level of pedestrian activity at that intersection, particularly on the westernmost lane, traffic backs up as pedestrians in the crosswalk prevent vehicular turns from happening. Frequently the backup extends to and beyond NE 10th Street. What is being considered is an exclusive right lane that would allow through movement to occur on the next lane over. Adding a lane would make the intersection wider and therefore more difficult for pedestrians to cross, so additional alternatives will need to be considered.

Commissioner Ferris pointed out that the proposal is completely contradictory to the Great Streets project recommendation for the downtown. Mr. Liljeblad agreed. He said one of the concepts raised during the Great Streets project is a scramble phase that would permit all pedestrians to cross the intersection in any direction; when the light is green for vehicles, no pedestrian movements would be permitted. It would not be impossible to implement that approach, which could help eliminate the need for an additional lane. Another option under discussion is the elimination of all left turns in the downtown during peak times.

Commissioner Sheffels noted that in places like London pedestrian undercrossings have been created to avoid pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. Mr. Liljeblad said a tunnel connecting Bellevue Place with Lincoln Square is being designed.

Turning to the intersection of Bellevue Way and NE 4th Street, Mr. Liljeblad said the focus is on right-turn lanes along the Penny's and Safeway frontages for eastbound and westbound traffic, and a dual left-turn lane to facilitate northbound traffic on Bellevue Way accessing the parking garage on the back side of Bellevue Square.

Mr. Liljeblad informed the Commissioners that by 2030 NE 2nd Street will play an increasingly important role by having a freeway connection to I-405. The concept is to construct a new overcrossing to connect with 116th Avenue NE and to include freeway ramps to and from the south. The proposed changes to the intersection of Bellevue Way and NE 2nd Street recognize the increased continuity.

Mr. Liljeblad said the proposal for the intersection of NE 8th Street and 106th Avenue NE entails realigning the lane geometry to fit better with the turning lanes, all while preserving the sequoia tree.

Commissioner Ferris commented that the focus of the proposed projects is all on vehicular mobility. There is nothing mentioned about dedicated transit lanes, pedestrian lanes or bicycle

lanes. By 2030 there should be a much greater emphasis on transit occupancy, and on pedestrian and bicycle use. The easier the city makes it for people to drive around in their cars, the more they will choose that mode. Mr. Liljeblad said that is a fair observation and added he hoped the continued conversation will elevate those considerations. He explained that as staff has worked toward accommodating the needs of 2030, modeling was done for travel demand purposes based on the assumed land use development patterns. The modeling results were handed to the traffic operations staff for an opinion as to how manageable it would all be. They looked very closely at the lane geometries and how the signal system operates. Many of the proposed projects evolved from their analysis of how to make traffic move better. The decision to focus on pedestrian movements rather than vehicular movements is one that may ultimately be made, but in order to do so it will be necessary to act sooner rather than later to preserve the necessary right-of-way as redevelopment of the downtown continues to advance.

Mr. Inghram pointed out that at the Comprehensive Plan level the focus will be on the need to preserve rights-of-way and on the need for ped-bike facilities. Mr. Liljeblad agreed and added that the Comprehensive Plan language goes so far as to identify expected improvements for pedestrian accommodations, but is not so specific relative to transit except to identify the desirable percentage of the total trips transit should carry. There is little said in the plan language about how everything is to be accomplished. More specific language is need relative to transit, namely how feeder buses are to support light rail if there is a station in the downtown, and how pedestrians are going to access the station, and how the rest of the system will work. There is every expectation that more downtown planning for the 2030 horizon will be put on the work program.

C. 2007 Comprehensive Plan Amendments Briefing

Mr. Inghram said if there are issues the Commission wants to look at in more detail, there could be an additional study session item added on October 24. The agenda for that meeting may also include additional information about the downtown mobility CPA. The expectation is that the public hearing on the amendments will be slated for December 12. The November Commission meetings will largely be consumed by the discussion of the Bel-Red corridor.

Mr. Inghram said the main thing being investigated regarding the Factoria SRO amendment is some of the traffic issues. Specifically, the focus is on the SEPA issue of whether or not there is a significant traffic impact associated with the proposed amendment which would allow a higher FAR for an office development on the site currently developed with a movie theater. Peak traffic times for movie theaters are around 3:00 p.m. or 4:00 p.m., and then again at around 7:00 p.m. The peak time for office complexes is between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. During the two-hour PM peak period, the total number of trips for the movie theater is actually higher than it would be with an office building, so the net appears to be a reduction in the number of PM trips.

Commissioner Ferris asked if there are studies that show the actual number of parking stalls needed to accommodate areas well served by transit is less than what otherwise would be needed. Mr. Inghram said he would look into that.

With regard to the Courter Enterprises CPA, Mr. Inghram reminded the Commissioners that the property is located in OLB zone, which permits auto dealerships only along 116th Avenue NE . Auto dealerships are currently allowed in the GC zone, in some LI zones, and in CB through the conditional use process. Dealerships are also permitted in the downtown. The Courter Enterprises Honda dealership is the only nonconforming use. One option is to study auto dealerships citywide to determine if there is a better way to address the use universally; another option would be to consider the use as it pertains specifically to the Factoria subarea.

Mr. Inghram said if the conclusion reached is that auto dealerships should not be allowed in the OLB zone, expect for along auto row, the long-term vision for the Honda dealership will have to be on moving somewhere else in the city or outside of the city.

Commissioner Ferris noted that the previous Commission discussions regarding the Courter Enterprises CPA covered the flexibility allowed by city code for continuing nonconforming uses. The conclusion reached was that the level of flexibility is quite high in terms of upgrading facilities and keeping current with market trends. The Commission recognized that it would be problematic to allow the auto use at the specific Courter OLB location if auto uses are not permitted generally in OLB. Mr. Inghram said the rub is that auto uses are permitted in the OLB zone in a specific part of the city.

Chair Robertson said the Commission was also unclear on the question of whether the Commission has the authority to sever the two Courter parcels and craft a split recommendation for the Council to review. Courter Enterprises has asked to be allowed to expand their auto dealership use to an adjacent property which is not covered by the grandfathering rules. Some clarity on that issue is needed as the process moves forward.

Chair Robertson suggested giving consideration to analyzing the need for the office services that exist on the adjacent property. She said as Factoria Mall grows and more residents move to the area, professional office uses may be more valuable than auto dealerships.

Commissioner Ferris said the point is well taken but pointed out that additional offices could potentially be constructed on the SRO property, and the owner of one of the buildings where T-Mobile is located has indicated a desire to redevelop with additional office space.

Mr. Inghram said the St. Margaret's Church CPA anticipates a change to 3.86 acres of land in the Factoria subarea from Single Family High to Multifamily High. The site is bordered on the east by apartments, on the west by a high school, and on the south by another church. The church and St. Andrews Housing Group are working together on a proposal for affordable housing on the site.

Mr. Inghram said consideration was originally given to a CB zoning instead of Multifamily High. However, the Land Use Code allows for a bonus for including affordable housing in Multifamily zoning. Staff had concerns regarding the CB proposal because the Factoria subarea policies focus commercial activity in the core area of the mall, Loehmanns Plaza, and the SRO site. Zoning the subject property as CB would be outside those bounds. The proponent was encouraged to work within the confines of the Multifamily High designation, and everyone appears to be on board with that suggestion. There is a permit path in place that would allow the thrift store use to continue operating under the Multifamily High designation.

Mr. Inghram noted that staff has been delayed in getting some of the requested information from the City Attorney's Office regarding the Mercer Slough CPA. Currently, the impression staff has is that the concomitant agreement in place for the property prohibits any immediate changes to the property. At a minimum, a rezoning process would be required before anything could happen.

Mr. Inghram shared with the Commission the schedule for final review of the Comprehensive Plan amendment package.

9. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Inghram reiterated the need for addressing affordable housing as part of the Bel-Red corridor study. He asked if the two will be coming forward together. Mr. Inghram said it is his understanding that they will. Affordable housing is mentioned in the final report and was raised at the September 24 Council meeting. Additionally, staff will be going to the Council on October 15 with a discussion about affordable housing citywide. Staff sees Bel-Red leading the way toward implementing some of the new tools that have been under discussion.

10. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Robertson said she recently met Hossein Khorram at a social function. She reminded the Commission that Mr. Khorram was the proponent for a 2006 Comprehensive Plan amendment focused on a development on NE 8th Street that was to include underground parking. He noted that after all the discussion at the Commission level, the city would not allow him to underground parking at the site. She suggested that since the Commission had made a big deal about putting the parking underground, the Commission should have been told the city would not allow it. She asked to have some follow up.

Mr. Inghram agreed to dig into the issue a bit further and provide a report to the Commission at a future meeting. He said he also talked with Mr. Khorram who said the reason for denial was because he would not be allowed to include the underground parking stalls as part of the ownership of the condominium units without providing for fire separation between the parking stalls. The combination of fire code and building code requirements for separation of space between units resulted in the outcome.

Commissioner Orrico commented that the decision to go with town homes rather than condominiums likely was made on the basis of economics.

Mr. Inghram said Mr. Khorram argued that the 1200 Bellevue Way town home project was permitted by the city to include fee simple ownership, even though there is a common parking area below. Mr. Khorram believes the city has changed their ruling on how the code applies in those situations.

11. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

12. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Jerome Burns, director of development with the St. Andrew's Housing Group, 2650 148th Street, said the organization is working with St. Margaret's Church to be the developer and manager of an affordable housing project on their site. The project will represent a new build and the intent is to apply for funding from ARCH, even though city policy precludes monies allocated to ARCH from being used for new construction. He said the assembly of funding for affordable housing is a bit tricky. An application for funding from ARCH has been submitted on the expectation of having the Council approve it in January, which meshes with the ARCH process. There is the potential that the City Council might look at approving the package of Comprehensive Plan amendments at a later date. If that occurs, potential conflicts of interest in proving funding for a project that has not received CPA approval could be problematic. He asked if it could be possible to approve the St. Margaret's Church CPA separate from the balance

of the package.

Mr. Inghram said staff is asking that question as well. The general GMA rule is that cities can adopt changes to their comprehensive plans only once each year, thus all of the proposed amendments are bundled into a single package for adoption. The potential delay is that the Bel-Red Comprehensive Plan amendments may not be ready by January. There are some exceptions to the general rule, so there may be opportunities to adopt the St. Margaret's Church CPA by January. The Comprehensive Plan amendment for the site must be adopted prior to the Council considering any allocation of funds to the project.

Commissioner Ferris pointed out that toward the end of 2006 the Commission held a similar discussion after Wilburton came in at the last minute after the balance of the package of CPAs was ready to go. The decision was made to move ahead with the amendments that were ready and to delay the Wilburton amendment; the Council exercised its power to declare an emergency for the Wilburton amendment. The same logic could be applied to the 2007 package; a number of the amendments are straightforward and ready to go and they could be pulled out separately and set for Council approval on the advertised timeline.

Mr. Inghram said staff has had the same discussions and is engaged with the City Attorney's Office. What it ultimately comes down to is a question of risk for the City Council and the potential that someone could appeal their decision.

Commissioner Ferris pointed out that the cost of developing affordable housing is continuing to go up. If the St. Andrew's project is delayed, it will result in higher development costs, but not necessarily higher rents to offset those costs. If the present funding cycle is missed, the project could be delayed for up to a year, and the delay would simply mean more taxpayer dollars will need to be spent to support the same housing units.

Mr. Burns said ARCH has indicated support for the project, and the timing and sequence of the project and submission for funding in the current round fits well with the projected cycle of other project developments coming downstream. If the cycle is missed, there will be additional costs to face after a year delay, and other projects will be in line competing for the same funds.

Commissioner Sheffels asked if every item in the package of amendments has to be presented to the Council for action at exactly the same time, or if the package elements can be presented to the Council over time. Mr. Inghram said there are two issues that link the timing of the different projects together. One is the GMA requirement to take a single action annually. The second is the environmental review, which is intended to look at the cumulative impacts of the entire package of Comprehensive Plan amendments considering within a single period. He said he could check into the feasibility of moving the hearing for the St. Margaret's Church amendment up to an earlier date, but noted the city does not normally hold a public hearing until it is ready to issue and publish the SEPA determination. Commissioner Sheffels suggested that there is a compelling reason to do everything possible to bring about more affordable housing options in the city.

There was consensus in favor of having staff investigate what it would take to move the St. Margaret's Church amendment public hearing up on the calendar, and whether or not there would be merit in having the Council declare an emergency for the amendment.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Robertson adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Paul Lawson
Staff to the Planning Commission

2/13/08
Date

Janice Robertson
Chair of the Planning Commission

2/13/08
Date

