

SULTAN PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

February 16, 2010

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Frank Linth –Chairman
Steve Harris
Jerry Knox
Bob Knuckey

CALL TO ORDER: Frank Linth calls the meeting to order at 7:02

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: See above

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Presentation added by the Mayor to Agenda

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No comments

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

No comments from Board

HEARINGS AND ACTION ITEMS

H-1: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's), Sultan Municipal Code (SMC) 16.25

The Issue before the Board is to conduct a public hearing on removal of Accessory Dwelling Unit provisions from SMC.

Rules for conducting a hearing was read into record by Chairman Frank Linth.

No public comment on the hearing.

Recommendation is to remove SMC 16.25 and proceed to Council.

Motion made by Bob Knuckey to have SMC 16.25 removed and proceed to Council and was seconded by Jerry Knox. All Ayes.

A-1: Accessory Dwelling Unit: Recommendation to City Council.

Recommendation to Council is the removal of these provisions, it will also need to approve a motion to either recommend a second Public Hearing to be held by the Council or to recommend that the Council proceed with action on the recommendation without an additional Public Hearing (as provided by SMC 16.134.050 J).

The Board's recommendation is that council should remove 16.25 from the Sultan Municipal Code with a second public hearing possible. Motion made by Jerry Knox and second by Steve Harris. All Ayes.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

D-1: Park, Recreation, Open Space (PROS)

The issue before the planning board is to provide input and feedback on the public involvement process to develop the park and recreation open space plan (PROS Plan).

Emily Terrell from PMC World, in partnership with R.W. Droll & Associates presented the scope of work for the Public Outreach Program for the PROS plan and are looking for direction from the Board. The scope of work can be found on file at the City,

On a consensus by the Board the recommendation is for PMC to proceed as the scope of work was presented and staff will bring back other recommendations at next meeting on March 2, 2010.

D-2: Comprehensive Plan, 2011 Update Process: Land Use Element Goals and Policies; Continued Review, Discussion, Board Input.

The issue before the planning board is to continue its review of the proposed goal and policy changes to the land use element of the 2004 comprehensive plan and provide direction to staff.

The following changes were discussed and changes made by the board;

Topic 2. Regional Coordination and Cooperation

Vision 2040 Goal: The region, countywide planning bodies, and local jurisdictions will work together to set populations and employment growth targets consistent with the regional vision

LU 3.7 Rural/Urban Transition Area (RUTA)

LU 3.7.1 Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure compatible land uses in areas along contiguous boundaries. (MPP DP 18-19)

LU 3.7.2 Identify steps to limit development in resource areas (MPP DP 29-32)

LU 3.7.3 Jointly create a Rural/Urban Transition Area (RUTA) with Snohomish County to preserve the existing, undeveloped character of the lands adjacent and north of the urban growth area.

LU 3.7.4 The purpose of the Rural/Urban Transition Area will be to prevent properties from being subdivided or otherwise altered into a use or pattern that:

- **could not be developed for additional urban uses** - should there ever be a need, and that
- **would detract** - from the rural, agricultural character and productivity of existing activities.

LU 3.8 Interlocal agreements with Snohomish County

LU 3.8.1 Phase annexations in accordance with efficient provision of necessary services. Support annexation proposals that meet the following criteria:

Editor's Note: Add criteria for annexations 11-24-09

- a. The annexation achieves the growth, ~~social~~ and economic needs and goals for the city as set forth in the comprehensive plan; (Remove "social" per PB 02-16-10)
- b. The city can eventually provide effective and efficient urban levels of public services;

- c. The city has an adopted land use plan for the annexation area;
- d. Residential areas can achieve urban densities unless wetlands, critical areas or other environmental constraints preclude these densities, Editor's Note: The planning board requested staff simplify this statement. The idea is to allow annexations of residential properties that won't meet urban densities because the land is constrained by wetlands and/or critical areas. This is a concern for Sultan since the annexation area is impacted by wetlands and other critical areas. Staff recommends adding "wetlands, critical areas or other" per PB 02-16-10

LU 3.8.2 Enter into an interlocal agreement with Snohomish County to jointly agree upon and coordinate the:

- *the proposed boundaries* - of the Sultan urban growth area, and
- *suitable zoning protection* - of the lands within the proposed urban/rural transition area.

LU 3.8.3 Continue to participate in the activities of regional entities as deemed appropriate, such as the US 2 Safety Coalition, Snohomish County Tomorrow and Snohomish County Cities and Towns.

Editor's Note: Add policies for siting essential public facilities consistent with WAC 365-196-550.

LU 3.9 Essential Public Facilities

LU 3.9.1 Define essential public facilities consistent with the Growth Management Act.

LU 3.9.1 Site essential public facilities consistent with the Growth Management Act, Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Planning Policies.

LU 3.9.2 Cooperate with Snohomish County and neighboring cities to share essential public facilities and increase efficiencies of operation.

~~LU 3.9.3 Do not unduly impact any ethnic, cultural or class group by essential public facility siting or expansion. Editor's note: The planning board struggled with this statement. Staff reviewed WAC 365-196-550. There is no requirement to consider the social impacts on any particular group of citizens when evaluating a request to site an essential public facility. Staff recommend deleting LU 3.9.3 (PB 02-16-2010)~~

LU 3.9.4 Determine a facility to be an essential public facility if it has one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. The facility meets the Growth Management Act definition of an essential public facility;
- b. The facility is on a state, county or local community list of essential public facilities;
- c. The facility serves a significant portion of the County or metropolitan region or is part of a Countywide service system;
- d. The facility is difficult to site or expand.

LU 3.9.5 Siting proposed new or expansions to existing essential public facilities shall consist of the following:

- a. An inventory of similar existing essential public facilities, including their locations and capacities;
- b. A forecast of the future needs for the essential public facility;
- c. An analysis of the potential social and economic impacts and benefits to jurisdictions receiving or surrounding the facilities;
- d. An analysis of the proposal's consistency with County and City policies;

[e. An analysis of alternatives to the facility, including decentralization, conservation, demand management and other strategies;](#)

[f. An analysis of alternative sites based on siting criteria developed through an interjurisdictional process;](#)

[g. An analysis of environmental impacts and mitigation;](#)

[h. Extensive public involvement.](#)

Mayor Carolyn Eslick presented the Mayor's expectations for Staff and Planning Board in regards to their roles in assisting the Council with their goals.

Presentation-1: Expectations for Sultan Planning Board and City Staff:

The Revised Code of Washington provides direction to municipalities for planning boards, commissions and staff to work together as a planning agency.

D-3: Planned Unit Development (PUD), and Lot Averaging: Concept and Approach for Code Amendment including State Environmental Policy Act Notice.

The issue is removal of PUD provisions of Sultan Municipal Code (SMC) and construction of Lot Averaging provisions to take the place of PUD provisions. The consensus of the Board is to proceed with Lot Averaging. Staff will prepare a draft of a Lot Averaging Code for the next meeting.

D-4: Planning Board Work Topic List:

Board member Jerry Knox suggested that the dates of discussions and hearings be added to the list. The consensus of the Board was to accept the list with the changes made.

SUMMARY OF MEETING RESULTS AND ACTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING

- The Board's recommendation is that council should remove 16.25 from the Sultan Municipal Code with a second public hearing possible.
- Recommendation for PMC to proceed as the scope of work was presented and staff will bring back other recommendations at next meeting on March 2, 2010.
- Proceed with Lot Averaging.
- Accept the list with the changes made

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

No public comments

BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS

Bob Knuckey: It was a good meeting and is happy with the direction the meetings are going.

Steve Harris: Wants to continue meetings with the public on economic planning.

Frank Linth: It was a good and productive meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:02 pm on a motion by Jerry Knox and second by Bob Knuckey the meeting was adjourned.

Frank Linth, Planning Board Chairman

Rosemary Murphy, Planning Board Secretary