MINUTES - Regular Meeting

Thurston County Planning Commission
Wednesday, October 3, 2001
County Courthouse Complex
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Building 1 - Room 152
Olympia, Washington 98502

1. Call to Order

Chair Bower, followed by introductions of Planning Commission members called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

   a. Attendance

      Members Present: Bob Bower, Tom Cole, Liz Lyman, Peggy Paradise, and Thomas Smith
      Members Absent: Barbara Frost, Brian Fagernes, and Janet Reiner
      Staff Present: Jennifer Hayes and Sandy Norton

   b. Approval of Agenda

      The agenda was approved as submitted.

   c. Approval of Minutes

      Commissioner Lyman requested “floating” be removed, “of” changed to “on” and “carries” be changed to “carriers” on page 5, paragraph 3.

      Commissioner Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Lovrien to approve the minutes for September 19, 2001 as amended. Motion carried.

2. Public Communications

   None.


   Jennifer Hayes briefed the Commission on the Tumwater Urban Growth Area Zoning Ordinance amendment proposals. This is the first of the three briefings for the 2001 Development Regulation Amendments. There are a total of 12 proposals for the Tumwater UGA. Ms. Hayes referenced the staff reports, which were made part of the Commission mailing, and provided a flip chart which highlighted the effects, the rationale, and the pros and cons of the most significant proposals. Ms. Hayes stated that under the Countywide Planning Policies, the zoning codes for joint planning
areas/urban growth areas are supposed to consistent with the zoning codes for the cities so that upon annexation people will be under the same or similar regulations as they were under the County’s jurisdiction. Staff has had recent conversations with the Board about consistency among each of the urban growth area codes and the Board has expressed an interest in seeing the Urban Growth Area codes to be more consistent with the County’s rural area code.

Ms. Hayes also stated that the Countywide Planning Policies have not changed, and they direct the City to notify the County when the City adopts a change to their zoning ordinance. The change is forwarded to the Board for consideration of being placed on the docket for the following year. In 2000, Tumwater adopted approximately 19 code changes that could also be made for the urban growth area. Those changes were brought to the Board. The Board removed some items from the docket and agreed to pursue the proposals made part of the Commission mailing.

Ms. Hayes stated the staff report information comes from working with City staff, reading their staff reports they did for their City council, looking at records of decisions, looking at City council subcommittee work, and doing independent research. Review panels were formed for some of the proposals, which included members of the public who commented on early drafts. Staff tried to put a new perspective on each proposal from the County’s point of view and to protect the interests of Urban Growth Area Residents.

The proposals discussed, in order of significance, for the Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance amendments, are as follows:

1) Removing 25% Residential Density Bonus for Critical Areas (Green Staff Report)

Ms. Hayes explained how developable land area is calculated and provided background to the proposal as noted in the staff report. The pros and cons of this proposal are as follows:

Pros: Urban Growth Area would be consistent with the City in how density is figured; would be more consistent with other urban growth areas; and would be consistent with policies protecting critical areas.

Commissioner Cole expressed a concern with the transfer of development rights. Ms. Hayes stated that the change would not affect the use of transferred development rights.

Cons: Fewer units would potentially be built on sites with critical areas.

Commissioner Lovrien stated that another con was that the government is taking more private land without compensation.
Commissioner Cole asked if the City of Tumwater has verified that with the reduction in the number of units they still could satisfy population growth totals. Ms. Hayes stated she would put that question to city staff.
Commissioner Lyman asked about the amount of land involved for all undeveloped single-family residential lots. Ms. Hayes said she would try to come up with some figures.

Commissioner Bower requested the presence of the City of Tumwater staff to answer the Commission’s questions and to shed some light on some of the issues. Ms. Hayes said she would ask them to the next briefing.

2) Calculating Residential Density: Critical Areas and Stormwater Facilities (Pink Staff Report)

Ms. Hayes stated that this proposal would affect all residential zoning districts and the real impact of this amendment is whether or not stormwater ponds are included in developable area of a site for density calculations. The change gives an incentive to developers to build an attractive and usable stormwater facility for passive or active recreation. Ms. Hayes stated that the City of Tumwater would like to see more of these types of stormwater ponds for recreational opportunities in subdivisions. The amendment would no longer allow non‐amenity stormwater facilities (like fenced ponds) to be included in what is considered the developable area of a site.

**Pros:** Optional and site specific.

**Cons:** Could reduce maximum density on sites where facilities can’t be included in developable area.

Commissioner Cole expressed concern with the safety of unfenced ponds.

Commissioner Bower asked that the health issues of stormwater ponds and what is in the soils/water be addressed.

Commissioner Lyman stated that if the City is trying to encourage recreational use she hopes they look at what kind of recreational use to protect the integrity of the stormwater facility in allowing it to function the way it is supposed to.

Ms. Hayes said she would look into the health, safety, and function issues further for the next briefing.

3) Permitting Accessory Dwelling Units in the R/SR Zoning District (Blue Staff Report)

The issue is permitting accessory dwelling units in the Residential Sensitive Resource District. All of the other residential districts allow accessory dwelling units.
Pros: Source of efficient and affordable housing; increase of property owner income; and the critical area regulations would still apply.

Cons: More impervious surface and more potential of disturbance of sensitive resource from the increased density on site.

Commissioner Lyman asked why the City is trying to increase the density in one area and then trying to remove the wetland bonus in another area. Ms. Hayes stated that city staff and the city planning commission were also concerned with these issues, and did not, for example, recommend removing the density bonus. The city had also looked into minimum lot sized for ADUs in the R/SR district, but the council in the end voted to allow them throughout the district.

Commissioner Lovrien stated that sewer would be needed before this can be done because of the lot sizes in the urban growth areas, so impacts on septics may or may not be an issue. When the sites annex, they’ll be permitted under city code to have ADUs anyway.

Commissioner Lyman stated she feels the impervious surface/impacts issue needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Smith stated that the City does not seem to be consistent in allowing this proposal and then removing 25 percent of the density bonus for critical areas.

Ms. Hayes stated that staff feels that this proposal is a reasonable amendment because of the other types of accessory facilities currently allowed in the district, the relative low demand for ADUs, the fact that the critical area ordinance still applies to protect sensitive resources.

4) Administrative reduction in minimum residential density requirement (Yellow Staff Report)

Ms. Hayes stated that this change was made to encourage infill and be more fair to property owners with small or odd-shaped lots. The City-adopted language (Option A) and a more flexible proposal by County staff (Option B) were presented. Ms. Hayes stated that staff is recommended Option B.

Pros: Encourages infill and provides administrative flexibility.
Cons: Tumwater language too complicated; no public review of administrative decisions.

Commission agreed to Option B.

5) LI District: Auto Sales Areas and Recycling Collection Center (Salmon Staff Report)

Ms. Hayes stated that auto sales areas are car lots and recycling collection centers are larger
industrial recycling facilities, not grocery store drop off points. The proposal is to have auto sales areas permitted only in LI Districts. Recycling collection centers would be allowed as a special use in the LI district. The code already allows this use the heavy industrial districts. **Pros:** Meets intent of light industrial zone.

Commission had no questions/comments.

6) Senior Housing Facilities (Purple Staff Report)

Ms. Hayes outlined the purpose and effects as indicated in the staff report, permitting this type of facility in several zoning districts.

**Pros:** Clarifies code and “catches up” to city’s 1998 and 2000 code changes to allow for these facilities; addresses an important housing need.

**Cons:** Adds another regulated land use to administer.

Commissioner Cole expressed a concern with the monitoring of facilities that have obtained a special use permit to ensure the facility is not converting into a facility that may require state or federal licensing. The definition should not include facilities that are state-licensed.

Ms. Hayes stated she would check on the definition.

Commissioner Bower suggested that parking standards be added for senior housing facilities.

The Commission had no questions on the following amendment proposals: a) Fence Height on Through Lots; b) Parking Requirements for Residential Care Facilities; c) Definition of Entertainment Facility; d) Clarification of where Manufactured Homes are Permitted; and e) Clarification of Multi-Family, Commercial and Industrial Setbacks.

Ms. Hayes stated that she would invite city of Tumwater staff to the October 17 Planning Commission meeting to discuss follow-up issues on removing the 25% density bonus, encouraging stormwater ponds as amenities, and permitting ADUs in the R/SR district.

4. **Planning Commission and Staff Updates**

*Joint Planning Commission Meeting*

Ms. Hayes stated that the Lacey Planning Commission would host a joint meeting hopefully in November to discuss the joint plan updates.

*Transfer of Development Rights Application*
Ms. Hayes stated that the County has received its first application to the transfer of development rights program. The proposal is for 70 acres of land in the Long Term Agriculture District west of Rochester. There is one house on the property so the Applicant would get 13 transferable development rights. The Board is meeting October 8, 2001 in an odds and ends session to look at the easement and hopefully sign off on it.

Low Impact Development Forum Proposal

Commissioner Lyman stated that at the last meeting she mentioned the idea of having a low impact forum. She and Commissioner Paradise met with Commissioner Oberquell and Commissioner Oberquell was receptive to the ideal. Commissioner Oberquell brought the ideal to the other Board members and the Board was interested and would like Commissioners Paradise and Lyman to brief them on the topic. A briefing is scheduled for November 20, 2001 at 2:00 p.m.

5. Calendar (Tentative)

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2001.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Bob Bower, Chair
## REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### SUMMARY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF REQUEST</th>
<th>ISSUE/REQUEST</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/24/01</td>
<td>What percentage of SEPA projects were in the UGA last year?</td>
<td>Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/01</td>
<td>How much money are the cities paying to the County for Parks?</td>
<td>Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/01</td>
<td>Is a Planning Commissioner prohibited to testify as a member of the public on issues before the Commission if they are not acting as a member of the Planning Commission?</td>
<td>Lyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/01</td>
<td>Amount of funds diverted from Roads and Transportation to the Sheriff’s Office Traffic Safety Unit.</td>
<td>Bower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>