



PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

MEETING SUMMARY

Regular Bi-monthly Meeting
Thursday, June 1, 2017, 6:30pm
City of Sammamish Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Shanna Collins, Pos. 3, Chair
Larry Crandall, Pos. 4, Vice-Chair
Eric Brooks, Pos. 1
Jane Garrison, Pos. 5
Matthew Petrich, Pos. 6
Nancy Anderson, Pos. 7

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Roisin O'Farrell, Pos. 2

STAFF PRESENT

Kellye Hilde, Planning Manager
David Goodman, Management Analyst
Steven Chen, Traffic Engineer
Cheryl Paston, Deputy Director of Public Works
John Cunningham, JA Cunningham Consulting
Victor Salmon, Transportation Solutions Inc
Kevin Johnson, Permit Technician

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Shanna Collins called the Sammamish Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:32 pm.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Vice-Chair Crandall motioned to approve; seconded – **Approved 6:0** The Agenda was approved as read.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Vice-Chair Crandall motioned to approve; seconded – **Approved 6:0** The minutes were approved as distributed.

Public Comment: Non-Agenda: (3 Min Individual / 5 Min Representative)
No Non-Agenda Public Comment

Public Comment Closed

OLD BUSINESS 6:37 PM ([Bookmarked Video Link](#))

Title 24 Amendment Proposal – Public Hearing

Staff commenced presentation:

Overview:

- A “biennial review” cycle that coincides with the City’s budget. The proposed code includes a two-year “biennial” review cycle that will replace the annual docket review currently used. Moving to a biennial review cycle will allow the City to better allocate resources to fully analyze amendment proposals.
- A two-step review process for amendment proposals. The proposed code delineates a two-step process for the review of amendment proposals: the docket review, which will serve as a preliminary review, and a legislative review for those proposals that the Planning Commission and City Council are interested in analyzing further.
- Clear guidelines and responsibilities for review. The proposed code better outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the acceptance and review of amendment proposals.
- Streamlined code. The proposed code significantly reduces the length of the chapter on amending the Comprehensive Plan, and introduces the amendment process in a logical, linear manner.

Commission and Staff began discussion

Commission asked if having the Director review proposals to see if they will fit into staff time, as is proposed in the draft code, represents a change from past practice.

Staff responded that it isn’t a change and that it allows for a more efficient allocation of staff resources.

Commission asked if staff knew why the Future Land Use map has such specific land use designations instead of being more general as it is in other jurisdictions, and what the benefit of being so specific might be.

Staff responded that this is the way it has been since the first Comp Plan in 2003, but they are unaware of why this was done. From the perspective of the City, the benefit to having it specific, is that it creates an extra step to changing the current zoning map, which helps keep the map consistent over time.

Commission mentioned they are concerned about the extreme discretion of the Council to deny applications for Comprehensive Plan amendments, and that the process seems arbitrary and capricious.

Staff responded that the Growth Management Act establishes the importance of the general update that occurs every eight years. The update is suppose to last for the entire eight years, to create consistency for the City’s land use and policy decisions over the period of time the Comprehensive Plan is in effect. This is the reason that there is such a high level of scrutiny for changes between the general update, and why the Council has such discretion when deciding whether to approve an amendment or not.

Commission Opened Public Hearing – 7:05 PM

Paul Stickney – 504 228th AVE SE

Topic: Comprehensive Plan Zoning Changes, and Comprehensive Plan Requirements, two-year review

- Define what a “small” zoning change is.
- Comprehensive Plan mandatory elements vs. suggested elements.
- How many cities are on a two-year cycle?

John Cunningham – 2400 Gold Creek Ct SW

Topic: Future Land Use Map vs. Zoning Map

- The Planning Advisory Board made the maps so specific so that the city knew exactly what future growth was going to look like in the city.

Mary Wictor – 408 208th AVE NE

Topics: Comprehensive Plan Timeline, Errata Sheet

- The first docket since incorporation was not allowed until last year.
- The City should implement an errata sheet to allow for small errors and changes to be made.

Commission Closed Public Testimony – 7:22 PM

Commission and Staff began discussion

Commission asked what other cities are on the two-year cycle. Commission believes that Shoreline and Bothell are.

Staff responded that they are not sure at this time.

Commission asked if staff has any idea as to how many applications for Comprehensive Plan amendments the City has received in the past.

Staff responded that it is generally in the range of four to six, including both City and citizen applications.

Commission likes the idea of the errata sheet for suggesting minor changes and wondered if these would be considered unofficial changes until they were adopted?

Staff responded that the errata sheet changes would only become official once the council accepts them, and this can only be done once a year at a maximum, along with any other changes the City wishes to make.

Commission began Title 24 amendment update and deliberation

Vice-Chair Crandall motioned to approve the Title 24 update as presented to the commission, Commissioner Garrison seconds. Commission began deliberation.

Commission asked staff if by creating an errata sheet that it would create the ability to make minor changes more often to increase consistency and response time?

Staff responded that the changes on the errata sheet would still need to go through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, along with all other amendment proposals.

Commission asked staff why some of the citizen suggested changes to the Comprehensive Plan during the last docket were denied, and under what circumstances the City could initiate text changes or clarifications instead of a citizen.

Staff responded that having staff take a proposal to Council does not ensure that it will receive more serious consideration; during the last cycle, multiple City amendment proposals were turned down.

Chair Collins indicated that she was in favor of an annual amendment process over the proposed biennial process. She felt that making people whose proposals were not placed on the docket wait two years to apply again was too burdensome, and that the new members of City Council should be able to review recently

submitted proposals that were not placed on the docket sooner rather than later. Commissioners Anderson and Garrison agreed. Commissioner Crandall favored allowing City Council to determine the appropriate review schedule, and suggested that having a biennial process would allow a more deliberate consideration of issues affecting growth in the City.

Chair Collins motioned to amend the proposal to remain with an annual process as opposed to a biennial process, Commissioner Garrison seconds. **Motion Approved 4:2**, Commissioners Brooks and Crandall dissenting.

Commissioner Petrich motioned to amend the proposal to include an errata sheet process for amending the Comprehensive Plan, Chair Collins seconds. **Motion Approved 6:0**

Vice-Chair Crandall motioned to approve Title 24A to replace Title 24, as proposed by staff with the above approved amendments, Chair Collins seconds. **Motion Approved 4:2**, Commissioners Brooks and Crandall dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS 7:47 PM ([Bookmarked Video Link](#))

Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Transportation Element Update - Work Session

Staff and consultants commenced presentation:

Overview:

- Staff and consultants will present on a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment from the Department of Public Works related to the Transportation Element. This was one of the proposals that the City Council approved to be on the docket.
- The proposed amendment would update the City's concurrency project list and the City's Traffic Impact Fee. Additional changes include an updated traffic model to reflect growth and the annexation of Klahanie.

Commission and Consultants began discussion

Commission asked how the intersections outside of the city, such as State Highway 202, are looked at and whether there is coordination with City of Redmond and King County.

Consultants responded that there are ways that the City works with other agencies and that those intersections are looked at as well, specifically regarding the growth of the other cities and how that may impact traffic in Sammamish.

Commission asked if the impact fee is a part of this update.

The consultants said that it is not, as it is something that is handled separately by the Council.

Commission asked how the historic traffic counts are going to be used and incorporated into the update.

The consultants said that that data is not going to be deleted and will be used during the analysis, but the data in the Comprehensive Plan will reflect current data.

Commission asked why the amendments are so specific about Park and Ride options, such as the Microsoft Connector Bus.

The consultants responded that the GMA requires an inventory of existing facilities and services.

Commission pointed out some errors to be fixed and items to be changed or added to the proposal:

- T-47 references the Mars Hill Church; it should reference Central Washington University.
- There is a reference to two Park and Rides being located outside the city in Klahanie, which is now part of the city.
- T-72 should reference that there are three high schools on 288th Ave SE.
- Some of the charts and maps do not have keys.
- The freight map on T-19 does not seem to connect properly.
- Street names are illegible on maps due to size and scale.
- The cross sections on T-4 are not large enough to read and the cars and the people are not to scale.
- On T-92 it mentions that aesthetics is a function of the street, but it is not ever mentioned again.
- References to other pages do not match.
- Park and Ride map only shows one lot, yet many are listed.

Public Comment: Agenda: (7 Min) – 8:31 PM

Mary Wictor – 408 208th AVE NE
Topic: Transportation Comprehensive Plan

Public Comment Closed

Motion to Adjourn: Commissioner Garrison motioned to adjourn; seconded. **Approved 6:0**
Meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm.

Chair: Shanna Collins
PC Coordinator: Kevin Johnson

[Video Audio Record 6/1/17](#)

Roberts Rules of Order applied: [RONR (10TH ed.), p. 451, 1. 25-28]