

**SULTAN PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**319 MAIN STREET**

**February 5, 2008**

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chairperson Latimore.

Planning Board members Present: Kurt Latimore, George Schmidt, Jeff Cofer, and Charles Van Pelt.

Staff Present: City Administrator Deborah Knight, and Planning Board Secretary Tami Pevey.

Consultants Present: Reid Shockey and Bradley Collins, Perteet Engineering; Andy Lane, Comp Plan Land Use Attorney Andy Lane

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No Comments/No Public

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

None given.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS AND STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

**#1 – Comprehensive Plan and CFP Updates, Reid Shockey, Perteet Inc.**

Reid Shockey presented a PowerPoint presentation to provide the base information that Perteet Engineering is using to build the plan. He explained this discussion is to address questions in the past as to how they came to their findings. The planning board had also requested at an earlier meeting to see the changes made in response to their requests at meetings. Reid stated he is keeping track of the requests and is bringing them back to present to the board.

Reid Shockey reviewed the status and restated the goal is to update the 2004 comp plan focusing on the capital facilities element per the growth management board. He wants it to be a transparent process so that everyone can be involved. Tonight's objective is to validate the adopted land use plan of the city and address the issue of whether future growth and jobs can fit into that land use plan.

A lengthy discussion was held on population/employment/housing. Reid Shockey discussed the numbers and stated the numbers are provided from the buildable land study completed by the county as well as L&I employment. He is attempting to agree with the county numbers to be consistent, but also rechecking to make sure we agree with those numbers.

Mr. Collins stated there is a process for the city to weigh in on the county's buildable land study, but that time has passed. He also explained the Office of Financial Management updates housing each year, but the last census was completed in 2000.

Administrator Knight asked about internal consistency as 2006 or housing from 2006, population from 2000, and employment from 2007. Reid Shockey explained consistency with the most current data available.

Attorney Lane explained for the growth board and the state board it is important to show how we calculate the numbers to get to 2025, as long as we know what we need. Administrator Knight added the numbers can be adjusted and the future is the focus. Mr. Shockey felt confident the numbers are correct and can be validated.

PB Latimore referenced a table on page 6 of the forecast and requested inserting a sentence above the table to show the updated numbers for population from 11,591 to 11,119; as well as a brief caption to the discussion held this evening, as well as the source of the information.

PB Latimore then reference page 17 requesting a footnote and a reference be added to update last year's employment from 1500 down to 1010 jobs and to source it as well.

PB Van Pelt questioned when the city will expand to its UGA. Mr. Collins explained it varies from city to city but they will have a clearer picture at the 10 year mark from 2025. Administrator Knight stated per the current comprehensive plan those areas won't annex

until everything else is built out as that is how it is written. Mr. Shockey felt this was an ill advised strategy because development doesn't follow that type of thinking. He stated you want your policies in place at the county development within your UGA as well. Mr. Collins added that growth is not uniform. Attorney Lane stated new money coming in will support infrastructure and it may make more sense to annex outside of the area specified. Discussion continued regarding when the UGA will be annexed in and the factors to continue considering. Mr. Shockey stated once you know your jobs and housing, your capital facilities element is easier to define. Administrator Knight raised the issue of facilities in locations where we expect it, when we expect it. Mr. Shockey stated the goal is to promote growth and expansion and available buildable land is the focus.

Population slide: Administrator Knight pointed out the table on page 6 asking if unincorporated is inside the UGA; when it was determined that it is, she suggested removing footnote #1 for consistency. Mr. Collins clarified that the totals go across, not down and that the unincorporated area goes up over time and it takes into account that growth will occur before the area is annexed. A question was also raised about the source and it was clarified that it was from the 2007 buildable land report which was adopted by SCT; Ms. Knight suggested that be referenced for consistency.

Income Slide: Mr. Shockey explained these figures are prorated from two figures. PB Van Pelt asked if it was safe to say that the city will grow and match the county figures as people move. Administrator knight stated they need to cross check with Pat Dugan's report and Mr. Shockey confirmed he was in contact with Mr. Dugan. PB Van Pelt stated the income confirms the housing you get; all in agreement.

Housing Affordability Slide: Administrator Knight questioned in this information will be in the report and Mr. Shockey stated it will be added. Mr. Collins and Ms. Knight questioned what this slide was attempting to show. Mr. Shockey explained he was attempting to show the median income versus the housing needs to match to identify the range of housing needed and what the demand will be. The goal is to offer affordable housing. Discussion held and most in disagreement and felt this slide was missing the market. Mr. Collins clarified it shows what is affordable, but not what is available. Many felt that Sultan does have enough housing stock as older homes offer lower income buyers an opportunity to move to Sultan and increased equity buyers can stay in Sultan.

Discussion held on average home in Sultan shows the average income can afford it and that this information needed to be reflected in the comprehensive plan. Also discussion in average household size and it was determined that again the county numbers were being used, but consensus among the group to ensure that the numbers were correct and consistent throughout the reports.

PB Latimore suggested creating a table of critical numbers to ensure consistency along with a clear description for each of these numbers to address discrepancies. The list created included the following:

Population, household size, employment, acres of buildable land, land zones, gross acres to include rivers and streets, but not right of way.

Discussion held on demand versus buildable land compared and the conclusion is that the current UGA is not oversized. Attorney Lane pointed out the supply is 25% higher than demand, but he also added that it doesn't assume all develop will be built out at 4 units per acre. Mr. Collins made a suggestion that buildable acres shown by density or zone type would be helpful in this situation. PB Latimore suggested also helpful to see what has been subtracted. Mr. Collins suggested a box to indicate how you do that. Administrator Knight stated the referenced code amendment has been dropped by the council and it needs to be corrected in this report as it still references it.

Commercial land use was discussed and Mr. Shockey explained unzoned areas need to be zoned and a public institutional zone needs to be added. He also stated the water plant needs to be changed from its current economical development zone status.

Occupational Slide: Mr. Shockey stated the numbers were taken from L&I as well as the county buildable lands report. PB Van Pelt suggested a footnote to show the figures don't match due to information not reported to L&I. Administrator Knight questioned if our zoning allows the type of growth discussed and if it had been connected back through to other reports. Mr. Shockey stated this table will be in the report along with a footnote. Mr. Collins added the comp plan prompts you to track it to ensure this.

FIVE MINUTE BREAK FROM 9:15 P.M., RESUMING AT 9:20 P.M.

After the break Mr. Shockey touched based on the remaining slides in his presentation and opened the floor to further questions.

PB Schmidt felt the process is to receive these technical memos with edits and revisions so that it will all be pulled into the comp plan at the end. Mr. Shockey stated he was proceeding by technical memo to capture the essential pieces and essential questions; sometime in September a revised comp plan w/amended supplement EIS will be issued for public comment incorporating all the technical memos; then at the end of the year a revised comp plan with all revised considerations.

PB Schmidt referenced page 4 and stated the analysis needs to expand what was resolved and be specific; Administrator Knight had the same thought. He then referenced pg 7, table 2, and stated the first page acronyms are used and they needed to explain what those are; On page 8, table 3, suggested placing the year at the top; in the presentation we start off with the housing profile and it is an awkward setup felt there and you need to flip back and forth to figure it out.

Administrator Knight referenced underneath the housing profile, the population there doesn't jive w/table 1 and is not consistent.

PB Schmidt referenced page 9 discussing affordable housing, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, last paragraph doesn't make sense; us census found "which us census?" He then referenced the top of page 10 the sentence needs to be clarified "sultan should afford more..." based on what? Housing needs to be balanced approach, not just focused on affordable housing. Mr. Shockey stated \$160,000 is the median income versus \$180,000 median home price, a lot of revision based on that discussion; term affordable housing is a big deal, you have to talk about it, you have to have a policy; policy in plan. Mr. Schmidt stated this makes it our key policy and possibly our only policy.

PB Cofer stated he had read this quickly this afternoon and came away with a much greater understanding for the necessity of these policies and a lot of clarification on what we're doing here. Well written and easy to follow. Your words our focus is on capital facilities because we're assuming everything else in the 2004 plan is fine. Flag for me because I hate to make any assumptions. Make sure we're looking at everything else?

Mr. Shockey stated calculated statement on my part; some citizens truly wanted to reopen the comp plan; trying to let everyone know what we're doing is getting this in compliance with the hearings board. Attorney Lane added in doing so it may necessitate focus on other areas; focus on capital facilities plan as that is the focus of the hearings board.

PB Van Pelt thanked Mr. Shockey for his work tonight and will have another shot at this in a couple weeks.

### **ACTION ITEM**

#### **1. Approval of the January 22, 2008 Minutes**

PB Schmidt, page 2, third paragraph "10,000" foot level, not 1,000 foot level.

PB Latimore, page 2, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "as it is required in state law" not the comp plan; page 3, bottom line wished to change it to "He saw no emergency reason and no traffic analysis mandated keeping the roadway there"; page 7, paragraph 6, #5, insert "are part of the product here" to the first sentence.

On a motion by PB Latimore, seconded by PB Schmidt the minutes were accepted as amended; all in agreement.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No public present

### **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion by PB Schmidt, seconded by PB Van Pelt the meeting was adjourned; All in agreement. Planning Board meeting ended at 9:52 p.m.