PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA
August 29, 2013
6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL
Chair Daniel Key, Vice Chair Paul Max, Jennifer Gilbert-Smith, Ed Holmes, Bill Judd, Sean Smith, & Alex White.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

CITIZEN COMMENTS - Note: The Citizen Comment period is to provide the opportunity for members of the audience to address the Commission on items either not on the agenda or not listed as a Public Hearing. The Chair will open this portion of the meeting and ask for a show of hands of those persons wishing to address the Commission. When recognized, please approach the podium, give your name and city of residence, and state the matter of your interest. If your interest is an Agenda Item, the Chair may suggest that your comments wait until that time. Citizen comments will be limited to four minutes for Citizen Comments and four minutes for Unfinished Business. If you require more than the allotted time, your item will be placed on the next agenda. If you anticipate, in advance, your comments taking longer than the allotted time, you are encouraged to contact the Planning Department ten days in advance of the meeting so that your item may be placed on the next available agenda.

CONTINUED BUSINESS- Action Required
2. Discussion and Direction to Staff and Consultant on the Draft Hawk Property Subarea Plan in Preparation for October Planning Commission Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING -None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS –None

NEW BUSINESS – None

ATTENDANCE VOTE

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Same rules apply as stated in the 1st CITIZEN COMMENTS)

COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS OF COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

ADJOURN

Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City at least 24 hours in advance.
For TDD relay service please use the state’s toll-free relay service (800) 833-6384 and ask the operator to dial (253) 480-2400
Web Page: www.covingtonwa.gov
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Key called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Chair Daniel Key, Vice Chair Paul Max, Jennifer Gilbert-Smith, Bill Judd, Sean Smith and Alex White.

MEMBERS ABSENT - Ed Holmes

STAFF PRESENT
Richard Hart, Community Development Director
Salina Lyons, Principal Planner
Ann Mueller, Senior Planner
Larry Rabel, Kent Regional Fire Authority
Kelly Thompson, Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
A Special Item of Business was added to the agenda. A correction was made to a typo on the last page of the minutes.

1. Commissioner Smith moved and Vice Chair Max seconded to approve the revised consent agenda and the corrected minutes for July 18, 2013. Motion carried 6-0.

SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS
Richard introduced Lisa to provide a brief overview of the 7:08 pm.

A handout was distributed to the Planning Commission outlining the location. She described two possible alternatives to the existing use. She outlined the Minimum Urban Village and the Maximum Urban Village. Both alternatives provide trails, housing, shopping, and roadway improvements.

She also outlined mitigation measures that included erosion control measures and critical area protection including buffers. Both measures include transportation measures which would improve emergency vehicle access.
CITIZEN COMMENTS

Michelle Rogers – 26219 191st Pl SE – She is a resident of the city and would like to know if the city will require off site road adjustments for all of the children who attend Cedar Valley, Jenkins Creek and Covington Park. She works for another city in the transportation department and she is concerned that 191st does not have adequate stop signs or crosswalks. There are a large number of children coming from this development and she would like to know how the city intends to address that. She has some ideas that she will write in to suggest: including roundabouts and cross walks. She would also like to know if her road would be kept as “local” (as in emergency vehicle access only) and she wanted to know if the street would be gated or how traffic would be prevented from speeding down the street.

Chair Key thanked Ms. Rogers for her questions comments and explained that staff would summarize her comments and that she would find the discussion of her comments in the future EIS.

Commissioner White clarified that both Cedar Valley and Jenkins Creek do not provide bus transportation and are considered “walking” schools.

Matt and Elaine Kellner - 25830 193rd Pl SE – Their property is adjacent to the Hawk property. They would like the city to be aware of significant motorized traffic on the unofficial trails just north of their property including motor bikes and occasionally a full size jeep. They would like to know how the city will address this problem and discouraging the problem from getting worse. They are concerned about quality of life. They moved to Covington in 2006 and would like to see green belts and open spaces continue regardless of which plan is adopted. They also ask the city to maintain current buffer space on the south side of the new lake. They would like to see this area maintained as trees when developing the new trails. They also wanted the city to be aware of the types of wildlife in the area. They have seen rabbits, raccoons, bobcats, coyotes, eagles and hummingbirds. They would also like to know the impacts of traffic on the area. Their concern is additional access might further increase the traffic and create more of a backup.

Tonya Benton – 20518 SE 261st Place – She asked that her neighborhood, Forest Creek Estates, be added to the list of property owners to receive mailing notification. Ms. Benton was asked to leave her contact information and/or contact information of the Homeowner’s Association.
CONTINUED BUSINESS

2. Overview of the Draft Hawk Property Subarea Plan and Draft Planned Action EIS. Opportunity for the members of the public to provide public comments before the Planning Commission on the draft documents.

Bill Stalzer gave some info at 7:34. A number of questions were asked about transportation. There are 4 areas that traffic improvements are necessitated by this plan. Signal with left turn lane....

Richard added was that our intention

Alex talked about the fill in the pond and that it will be substantial, then have future development placed on that. The final shape of the plan is part of the reclamation.

Lisa, the site has an approved permit to reclaim the site and part of the reclamation plan is to fill in the pond and to revegetate the area.

Sean – can you talk more about erosion control. Lisa says there is analysis of surface water and existing conditions. Come from the stormwater manual. Goals and policies – page 10 talks about 19.5 uses words like ensure and encourage. Why are those words chosen? He is curious how those are decided upon? One other comment, is there someone going to research the impacts to property values.

Lisa the idea how strongly you want to word a policy is recommendations that the Planning Commission can make. Fiscal and economic impacts are not required under SEPA. It is not a topic in an EIS.

Bill – when SEPA first was approved in the 70’s the economic analysis was part of it. It became controversial

Richard when new development is proposed – that is not part of the analysis. If the council is going to approve some kind of development,
Sean – it might be something to add to the scope of the study. What is a bulb out? Richard – it is for traffic calming.

Bill Judd – when you choose the language, is there a balance between more work, more cost.

Bill Stalzer – lets discuss that at the workshop on the 29th.

Salina – when you comprehensive plan policies, you don’t want to put yourself in a bind. Richard it is not unusual to have works like “encourage”

Daniel – quick definition – iconic retail? Bill Stalzer- Cabela’s is an example. Retail associated with a particular brand, not necessarily low end or high end. There will be an emphasis on iconic retail. Richard = recognizable.

Daniel – what are some of the design guidelines as another entrance to Covington.

Salina – the policy is based on feedback and will be funneled into the design standards.

Daniel 11- surprised 6.14 at policy level street names and routes.

Daniel 5.12 – grammatical challenge.

Vice Chair Key – on page 2 describes amenities, lake vs pond. Revised zoning on 19 we added MR zoning permitting under senior citizen assisted housing. Community Residential facility vs community residential care facility. Why is it CUP?

Salina – these residential facilities tend to be rehab centers. These tend to be in and out rehab centers. It is not uncommon for these to be conditional use permits. The state has defined these.

Daniel – physical fitness recreational club? Also has a question on page17, reason for the points taken out on the blue section... separate regulation for mixed residential commercial uses,

19-

21- theaters? New use in chart?

We are going to want to talk a little more about 8:13
Sean, along those same lines...

27 – park and ride facilities.. something magic about 125spaces. Lisa it was the # in the traffic model. Jennifer – is this a viable idea, has any research been done. Lisa – no direct discussions, but they have been sent the EIS. Salina – even if there is not metro, this would allow a meeting place for carpools. Richard, if you don’t show it as a possibility, it won’t happen.

29 –Another gross floor area, adding winerys and breweries.. Bill –this is manufacturing, not retail.

34- fire related? Setbacks...

Section 112 – wondering why no changes in height in the two alternatives.

121 – Sanitary sewer – didn’t see any clarification that there is no sewer currently.

125 –Mitigation for ground water. Why is Kent referenced? During scoping, the city of Kent

131.10 –no reference for electric utilities

Sean – 126 – plants and animals, no endangered species observed. There is a new culvert mitigations program. If those barriers are removed, salmon could potentially be there.

PUBLIC HEARING

3. New Clearing and Grading Regulations Section 14.60 of the Covington Municipal Code (CMC) and Proposed SEPA Threshold Changes

Daniel opened the public hearing.

Salina outlined the memo for the clearing and grading. During the 15 day comment period, we received comments from the Dept. of Ecology. An editing error was found that will be corrected. We did not .... 8:35. The 1, 3, and 4th comments were incorporated.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. Planning Commission discussion and Final Recommendation to the City Council on Proposed Clearing and Grading Regulations
Vice Chair Max Moved and Commissioner Smith seconded to recommend to city council the adoption of.... Motion passed 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Discuss Codification of Shoreline Development Regulations in Accordance with Adopted Shoreline Master Program

Ann

ATTENDANCE VOTE-

Commissioner White Moved and Commissioner Gilbert-Smith seconded to excuse Commissioner Holmes. Motion passed 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT – NONE

COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF

Salina –thanked Chair Key..

Richard – Special meeting on the 29th – reception for Daniel, please come early. The first meeting on Sept has been cancelled 9/5. Public open house on the hazard mitigation plan. Another small glitch we have 4 terms up on August 31st. Those position need to be refilled by the city council. Interviews on August 27, the council can’t make the appointments because we won’t have a quorum.

Next meeting on the 19th is the state of the city address.

ADJOURN

The August 15, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Kelly Thompson, Planning Commission Secretary
Memo

To: Planning Commission
From: Richard Hart, Community Development Director
       Ann Mueller, Senior Planner
CC: Salina Lyons, Principal Planner
Date: August 29, 2013
Re: Discussion and Direction on the Draft Hawk Property Subarea Plan in Preparation for October Planning Commission Public Hearing

At the Thursday, August 29, 2013, Planning Commission special meeting commissioners will provide direction to city staff and the consultant team for a preferred Hawk Property Subarea Plan based on the range of densities encompassed by the two action alternatives analyzed in the Draft Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and the proposed zoning, allowed uses, development and design standards contained in the Draft Subarea Plan.

The Hawk Property Draft Subarea Plan and Draft Planned Action EIS were made available to the public for review and comment on July 26, 2013. A full copy of the subarea plan was included in the August 15, 2013 Planning Commission Agenda Packet, as well as the first chapter of the Draft Planned Action EIS. Links to the full length documents are posted on the city's webpage on the Hawk Property.
http://covingtonwa.gov/city_departments/communitydevelopment/northern_gateway_study.html

Comments on the Draft Planned Action EIS were due at the end of the 30-day formal comment period which closed at 5pm on Monday, August 26, 2013.

At tonight’s special meeting the Planning Commission will:
• Hear a summary of the two action alternatives analyzed in the Draft Planned Action EIS and the major elements of the Draft Subarea Plan.
• Hear an overview of the written comments received during the 30-day comment period and the oral comments given on August 15th at the public meeting.
  o These comments will be further reviewed by the city’s consultant team and responses will be provided in the Final Planned Action EIS.
• The city’s consultants will provide responses to questions and comments asked by Planning Commissioners and four citizens who spoke at the August 15, 2013 public meeting about the Draft Subarea Plan.

• Discuss and provide sufficient direction to city staff and the consultant team regarding the range of uses, their location within the subarea and density that the Planning Commission would like to see occur on the Hawk Property. The consultant team will take the Planning Commission’s direction and make changes to the Draft Subarea Plan and develop a Preferred Hawk Subarea Plan for the public hearing before the Planning Commission on October 17, 2013. The preferred alternative will specify the allowed intensity of uses, zoning, development standards and design guidelines for the Hawk Property Subarea Plan and will be analyzed in the Final Planned Action EIS