

GMHB EXHIBIT 251

2024-06-12 Planning Commission Transcript

0:01

we are live thank you good evening and welcome to the June 12th 2024 special

0:08

hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Angela bazo chair and tonight's hybrid

0:13

Planning Commission meeting is brought to you by Zoom I welcome everyone and thanks for joining Commissioners if you

0:19

could please have your microphones turned on for the roll call and Deputy city clerk could you please call the

0:25

role thank you chair chair vazu

0:30

here Vice chair Murphy here commissioner RAB here and commissioner accuse here

0:39

and let the record show that commissioner uh Victor rashis uh requested an excused

0:45

absence thank you um our first item of business is public appearances this is the

0:51

opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about issues of concern um is there anyone who's signed up for

0:58

appearances that wishes to address the commission Madam share as of 4M this

1:05

afternoon I did not have a request to speak okay thank you since there are no appearances we're

1:12

going to move to special business um the first item of special business is to

1:17

review and consider approving the minutes of the May 29th and June 5th special meetings
Hy I have a motion to

1:25

approve the minutes so moved I have moved by Vice chair Murphy can I get a

1:33

second second second by regab any

1:40

discussion hearing no discussion Deputy city clerk can you please call a roll on

1:46

the vote thank you chair chair bazo

1:51

I Vice chair Murphy I commissioner

1:56

cues I and commissioner rig I thank

2:02

you okay and with that vote we approve the minutes and move forward um the first

2:09

item whoops that's the first item the second item um today is the special business

2:19

agenda Bill 2416 the comprehensive plan periodic review deliberations and with

2:24

that I'd like to welcome senior planner Adam Zach to give us a quick briefing

2:30

thank you um we got a got a quick slide deck tonight um we'll get through it uh

2:37

pretty quick and onto uh deliberations uh just a moment

2:45

here um so hopefully you can all see my screen um so tonight we're continuing

2:51

your deliberations uh from uh May 29th and June 5th on the

2:58

overall comprehensive plan periodic review

3:03

um our our purpose tonight is to to complete deliberations with a focus on the land

3:10

use housing and economic development elements and ultimately tonight we're hoping to wrap up uh the planning

3:17

commission's recommendation to the city council regarding the the total comprehensive Plan update so that would

3:23

include the elements that we reviewed last week um transportation Capital facilities us

3:29

Utilities in the Parks and open space elements so all of the elements that we've been updating we're hoping to get

3:36

your recommendation on um this comprehensive Plan update um

3:42

for those in the public that may be just joining us at this stage um is is required by the growth management act um

3:49

we're required to periodically review the um the comprehensive plan um at this

3:54

point it's every 10 years um and the purpose of that update is to update the

3:59

is to um extend the planning Horizon for the plan um so that it plans for the

4:05

next 20 years uh 2024 to 2044 and with that we update the growth growth

4:11

projections so the number of housing units that we um are um expecting in

4:17

that 20-year period and then also the amount of employment growth that we're expecting in that 20year

4:24

period and then in that during this update too we're addressing those new GMA requirements um and that's

4:31

particularly true for housing one of the elements that we'll be looking at tonight um and and those new regulations

4:37

or new requirements rather um were enacted by the legislature over the last few years and then ultimately we need to

4:44

complete the comprehensive Plan update um the periodic review by the end of this year the deadline is December

4:51

31st um we've been at this for two years um everybody on the commission has seen

4:58

this slide in the next two slides a couple of times now um summarizing kind of the work that we've been up to for

5:04

the last two years um if you're if uh members of the public watching this would like to get an in-depth review of

5:10

these steps um we went through this in detail on May 29th so I'll skip ahead um

5:17

the important thing to keep in mind here is that we are here in the legislative

5:22

process um this year wrapping up the planning commission's recommendation to the city council um this is not the end

5:30

of the process um so following the planning commission's recommendation the

5:35

city council will then review the periodic review or review the update um

5:40

and they they still have the opportunity to make changes to the plan um prior to

5:46

adopting it um the city council will get their first uh initial briefing on your

5:52

recommendation the planning commission's recommendation um we're expecting that next month um to get on the agenda there

5:59

um at the same time that the council is reviewing the elements that are before you today that you'll be making a

6:06

recommendation for um we will also be preparing some code amendments to

6:11

implement this updated plan um most of which will be working with the housing

6:16

workg group um to develop those um initial drafts of code amendments and

6:21

that'll be uh coming back to the Planning Commission um probably in September of this year um for your

6:28

review and the legislative review associated with those development code

6:34

um changes and all of that needs to um get through the city council and adopted

6:40

before the end of the year um when again there's that uh State mandated due date

6:45

so the bottom line is there's a sign there's uh several steps remaining in

6:50

this process this update process as a recap of where we uh what

6:57

we touched on last week um um there were several motions made um amending the

7:02

transportation element and making some findings um and one of those motions was

7:08

one one motion was tabled um and a tabled motion requires a majority vote

7:13

from the Planning Commission to resume consideration of that motion um and just as a process Mo note there's another

7:20

option to lay the motion on the table which essentially requires a first and a

7:26

second um and that would call an immediate vote on on that motion um and

7:31

that tabled motion was um the the language shown here about Transportation

7:36

element uh policy 4.9 um the full text was provided in the Planning Commission

7:42

bill so as we get through the um as we get through the discussion tonight um

7:48

return it if you want to return to that motion um this is the process by which you can um by which you can do that um

7:55

if if the motion is is uh tabled and never turn to it would just be kind of

8:01

left on the table um and that that's okay too if if there's no discussion um

8:07

if the Planning Commission doesn't want to pick it up but just as a note I wanted to provide that like how how do

8:13

we resolve that table motion so tonight we'll be looking at or

8:19

we'll be focusing on the the remaining three elements of the comprehensive plan

8:26

um these three elements were held for this meeting to give you the most amount of time to review and and consider um

8:32

any changes you might want to make to these drafts um because these are the most um particularly housing and

8:39

economic development are some of the most substantive changes um made in the policies of the comprehensive plan so we

8:46

wanted to give you some uh make sure that you had um several weeks to review those uh review drafts um so we'll be

8:54

looking at the land use element which was primarily updated to reflect changes made elsewhere in the plan so as we've

9:01

been going through and making changes like to the housing element or updating the transportation element there's been

9:07

corresponding changes to the land use element um the housing element would be a repeal and replacement of the existing

9:14

housing element with a new element um addressing housing and primarily the

9:21

that new element is was drafted to address those updated GMA requirements

9:26

um there these are um new housing requirements that the legislature has enacted um in the last two years um so

9:34

we needed to kind of overhaul that element um and then the economic development element is a is a new

9:41

element entirely um there is not an existing Economic Development element in

9:46

the plan and this this was a u this was directed by the city council in the

9:52

scope of work um to establish some policy direction for um the city's

9:57

future Economic Development efforts so it it outlines kind of the the program

10:03

uh for addressing uh Economic Development and should help kind of coordinate those efforts moving forward

10:10

so those are the three elements that are before you today um there were there were three

10:15

staff recommended motions in Planning Commission Bill 2413 um you've already addressed the

10:22

first two of those staff recommended motions um and I just wanted to bring up this this third motion um tonight um

10:30

again that's kind of the the final motion that needs to be made to make your recommendation for the um the entire

10:38

comprehensive plan um as amended to the city council um so we can go through and

10:44

make those tonight just on a process note we can go through and consider any

10:50

proposed amendments um by motion and amend those uh make those amendments and

10:56

then the Final Act would be to uh recommend the the total comprehensive

11:01

plan um as amended um the next steps uh for this uh

11:09

we're planning to conclude deliberations tonight um and then as I mentioned we're

11:14

tentatively planning on bringing the city council an initial briefing um on

11:20

July 16th and then in September we'll be coming back to the Planning Commission to begin reviewing the implementation

11:27

ordinance um and those are those develop code changes to um make the updated

11:33

policies uh a reality um so those are the the kind of high level next

11:40

steps um and that concludes my presentation uh tonight I can answer any

11:45

questions you might have or we can get into deliberations the Commissioners have any

11:53

questions for Adam Zach okay seeing none

11:59

um based on public comment you know I know the planning Commissioners have proposed a handful of motions for

12:05

changes to the draft comprehensive plan elements um in in addition there's a few

12:11

motions on the table to add to the findings in preparation for transmission

12:17

to city council um I would like to begin our deliberations tonight by first addressing any motions that recommend

12:24

changes to the comprehensive plan elements themselves and then finalize the element for referral to city council

12:31

then address findings um and then make the motion to refer the draft after we've moved through that process uh any

12:39

objections or can I get a general thumbs up to that

12:44

flow great thank you um with that then um I think just to

12:51

move to addressing commissioner's proposals around making changes um I'd

12:57

like to start with Vice chair Murphy if you don't mind uh chair Murphy do you want to introduce your proposed

13:04

amendment uh yes I would um in light of

13:10

some of the public comments and upon further reflection I thought that it

13:15

would be wise to um slightly revise

13:20

policy uh land use goal

13:28

27.6.2009 revised that would be great

13:38

yeah and basically the changes are designed to reflect two things one

13:45

instead of um requiring certain policies that these would be studied because this

13:52

is really in its infancy to some extent as far as a policy is concerned and it

13:58

would also negate the concerns of requiring uh regulations to implement

14:05

this um uh with with the comp plan and the second component is to instead of

14:12

referencing duplexes Tri triplexes and specific housing types to Simply tie

14:18

that to the state mandates which does include those but it does include others

14:25

chair Murphy Vice chair Murphy excuse it's going to take me a minute to get used to saying that instead um sorry to

14:32

interrupt you uh just for clarity do you mind if we just formalize the motion and I believe you're making a motion to

14:39

modify 27.6.2009

14:59

an energy efficient built environment by studying ways of reducing greenhouse gas

15:05

emissions from the construction Heating and Cooling of residential structures by

15:11

encouraging smaller single family residential housing units moderate density housing
consistent with State

15:19

mandates and the use of Green Building Materials and techniques you have a

15:24

second

15:30

I'll second it for discussion thank you okay chair Murphy please continue Vice

15:36

chair Murphy please whatever whatever just Murphy's fine all right Murphy

15:42

please continue okay um as I was saying there's two things there one is uh to

15:48

avoid the concerns expressed by public comments that that has originally

15:53

drafted it could require implementing regulations and so changing it to

16:00

studying I thought made more sense also this is was something of a last minute

16:06

change and uh I think it makes more sense to have that this addressed in a

16:12

study format rather than U making a specific uh requirement in the in the uh

16:19

as a goal and then the other issue was simply to tie the uh tie the type of

16:26

housing to the state mandates um which does include the listed houses housing

16:31

types but I think also address concerns expressed by the public comments my goal

16:39

specifically is to try to preserve this um goal because I think is a very good

16:45

one uh and one that is as I indicated is

16:50

Forward Thinking uh and I think should be part of our our our city policy

16:59

thank you any other further comments commissioner

17:06

accuse yeah I think there's a disconnect in how we all might be viewing this when

17:11

I looked at the school um I didn't think and I continue to not think it requires

17:17

study because my understanding was we're talking about required growth growth that's assumed is going to happen and

17:24

we're talking about per capita expenditure of energy

17:29

um so it's already been extremely well studied that Apartments have lower per

17:35

capita energy use per person than single family homes I think we know that so I I

17:41

want to make sure given our limited staff resources that we are spending our resources very wisely and not studying

17:49

items that are have already been well studied um the counterargument might to

17:54

that might be some folks might say well I reject the notion that we're going to grow

17:59

it's not a per capita thing so I think that the concept of per capita is missing from the school entirely

18:06

um so I'm conern and I'm also concerned about studying something that's already been

18:14

studied thank you commissioner regab um I I agree with the you know

18:20

there I think there's better ways to allocate limited City resources than to study this um I I like the direction

18:30

this is going um you know but I mean our three public comments they all opened up

18:35

with remove this goal um I appreciate it being acknowledged this was a late

18:40

addition um I you know I I'd be reluctant to support this

18:46

but I could support maybe putting a finding saying hey um this may be a way

18:52

to partially address um public comment but yeah I'm

18:58

kind of little reluctant to make a big change to the document this late in the

19:06

game thank you any final

19:15

comments hearing none um as it relates to the motion on the

19:22

table proposing to replace goal 27.6.2009

19:28

ways of reducing green greenhouse gas emissions from the construction Heating

19:34

and Cooling of residential structures by encouraging smaller single family residential units moderate density

19:40

housing consistent with State mandates and the use of green materials and techniques
Deputy city clerk can you

19:47

please call the role thank you

19:52

chair Vice chair Murphy hi

20:00

commissioner accuse nay chair bazo

20:07

nay and commissioner RAB nay motion fails

20:15

31 thank you okay um the next

20:23

motions to make changes to the document have been proposed by commissioner

20:29

gab commissioner I know you sent out uh a new round of motions it looks like the

20:34

majority of those proposing changes to the document live in the economic development element is that accurate uh

20:42

yes five of the eight correct would you like to start introducing the Motions

20:47

one at a time sure um would it be possible for uh senior planner Adam Zach

20:54

to put them up um um let's

21:03

see and I'm happy to group well let's I think we can group the first at least

21:11

two um so these are just these are Corrections of factual errors in the

21:17

document um one and two are I'll just put one and two together really we can

21:24

read them um the rationale behind them is more housing priced in the middle range change that to more middle housing

21:32

um that is the terminology we find in House Bill 1110 for you know those I did

21:37

some control FS on the document there um you know and I think it it's hard to get

21:43

you know we can't we can't articulate the price right the market determines that so I think it's just a little

21:49

clearer and it's a little you know it's using the actual language of that legislation as opposed to implying that

21:57

this is priced in a middle range of something um so yeah I'll I guess that

22:03

I'd like to put forth one and two together with that explanation uh so so

22:09

moved to put one and two that's moved motion to make the

22:15

edits recommended in numbers one and two is there a second second moved in seconded a discussion

22:32

uh hearing no discussion um there is a motion on the table to approve changes

22:37

to the economic development element uh to revise the header on page

22:43

12 of 21 line 16 from more housing pric in Middle range to more middle

22:50

housing and also to revise the text on page 12 line

22:55

17 to read recent from recent legislation will encourage the

23:01

development of more housing priced in the middle range to recent State legislation man
mandates encouraging

23:08

more middle housing Deputy city clerk can you please

23:14

call the role sorry as a point of order before you do um correct me if I'm wrong uh

23:23

Adam or commissioner but the that included

23:28

the the reading there included one motion that wasn't made right yes number

23:33

three is a a step a little step you know it's that plus something else so yeah it was just one
and two as

23:40

highlighted thank you for that uh

23:45

catch do we need to restate the motion for clarity I have it in the minutes um

23:52

according to the document that's on your screen right now thank you

24:02

commissioner accuse I commissioner RAB

24:10

I chair vazo hi and vice chair Murphy

24:17

I thank

24:23

you commissioner reg do you want to continue sure so number three same theme

24:28

um but it also corrects recent legislation will encourage to recent

24:33

State legislation mandates encouraging it clarifies that that's State legislation um we don't know if it will

24:41

encour it will encourage development but it mandates that we encourage it through

24:47

our comp plans and code um so once again I just tightening it up for members of

24:54

the public who who read it um just as a um process if we could state that as

25:02

making a motion and state your motion and then we can get a second understood have discussion that would be great

25:08

apologies sorry I move that we okay I move make clear for

25:14

Deb I move that we um put motion number three as displayed

25:22

um before the commission there's a motion is there a

25:27

second second it's been moved by commissioner

25:34

regab and second and by Murphy discussion

25:41

please uh commissioner accuse yeah I I struggle with this

25:48

language I don't think I can support it the reason being um it it almost strikes a a a defensive

25:57

or I don't know if it's defensive or combative tone um the word mandates it's it's i' I've

26:06

heard it used with a pejorative tone um and and it almost suggests

26:14

that that we're not doing it willingly that we're not as a community welcoming

26:20

middle housing that we're only doing it because the state is forcing to us to

26:26

and so I think we should keep the language as is and not accept the

26:32

revised language thank

26:42

you commissioner reab before I'm sorry I'm trying to do a

26:47

better job of process uh commissioner Murphy do you have anything to add before I let commissioner regab speak

26:53

further

26:58

I I do I think Kate brings uh commissioner Hughes brings a good point

27:04

um and I wonder if it would be better stated something along the lines of

27:11

um it's required as opposed to the more combative term

27:17

mandates um if if uh if the moving party would be

27:25

interested in any kind of changes along those lines

27:33

are you making a friendly amendment to modify mandates to yeah I'm not sure if

27:39

I I'd like to hear from commissioner Hughes if that mitigates her concern because I

27:46

understand what she's saying um can I can I hear the

27:53

text I would just take the word mandates out and put requires uh or I would even

28:01

just take it out just say recent legislation encourages more middle

28:09

housing commissioner Reb there's a proposal for a friendly amendment I would support

28:18

requires um you know if we do that there's four

28:24

mentions of that in House Bill 1110

28:30

yeah I I can work with requires I just I feel like the the mandates term it it strikes a tone that we might not want to

28:37

strike as the city I think that's a reasonable Middle

28:45

Ground I'm I'm okay with the friendly amendment to requires encouraging so I

28:51

believe the revised motion would be to change page 12 line 17 to recent State

28:59

legislation requires encouraging more middle housing is that accurate okay great any further

29:08

discussion hearing none Deputy city clerk can you please call the

29:17

role just one moment while my fingers catch

29:22

up language okay Vice chair Murphy

29:30

I chair bazo I commissioner RAB I and commissioner

29:38

access I thank

29:45

you okay next

29:51

motion um I guess four and five are on the same tone that I think of the same

29:59

theme so I'll I'll move four and five together um I would like to make the motion to put number four and five as

30:06

shown on the screen in front of the commission

30:14

second uh commissioner Reb did you want to open discussion

30:19

sure yeah our I mean our public comment you know raises some good points um you

30:25

know they mentioned Eon Hill Central District UD District they all have that

30:30

density they're all near Transit um but there's still plenty of cars there um having lived myself in Capitol Hill

30:37

personally I can I can relate to those comments um so I think will be less

30:42

likely to own a car there's that's not I think that's just incorrect um so I

30:49

think we ought to remove that um yeah I won't take too much

30:56

time by chair Murphy thank you um I think there is

31:02

some uh validity to the public comments and the motion um but I also know from

31:10

personal experience that there are people who either reduce the number of cars they own or they they choose or

31:19

they may choose um to uh not own a car or not have a car in that period so I I

31:27

think the the issue is with the word will and I would be inclined to alter to

31:35

leave that and simply change the will to May um and wherever will occurs insert

31:48

May uh are you proposing a friendly friendly Amendment to the first of the two edits

31:56

changing will be likely to own a car to may be less likely to own a car

32:07

yes um I want to note that I want to make sure we get to commissioner accuse

32:12

before I Circle back with commissioner RAB and I also have a comment um commissioner

32:21

accuse um yes and I think I speaking to both

32:27

rights now so process-wise I'll just make my statement and you can tell me if

32:33

I have to remake it for the motion itself um I I like the motion as is I am

32:40

in wholesale agreement with um commissioner RAB that there's not a

32:46

basis in fact or data for this statement um I've also lived on Capitol Hill and

32:52

dense areas and not dense areas and uh my experience is being a gardener and

32:57

and people who are doing labor jobs often are required to have cars to get

33:03

to and from their place of work so um my experience is that it's more like the um

33:10

office workers or people that are hybrid workers um that might take public

33:15

transportation more frequently than people uh in the labor the laboring job

33:21

so I I disagree with the statement and and that's why it wouldn't also be really amenable to saying May

33:28

I like it as is okay

33:35

um well before I make a comment commissioner regab uh do you w

33:42

to address the friendly Amendment proposed you can I'll stick with I'll stick with Will

33:50

um yeah commissioner ACC raises a good point and I think the May is is kind of leaning in a d

33:58

a specific Direction so okay yeah we're

34:03

both we're both scientists right so there's no there's no fact there's no data behind it so I agree with commissioner

34:10

accuse well this is fun um my comment as a participating commissioner is um I'm

34:17

not entirely sure that there's data around whether or not it does or doesn't occur um as it relates to the first one

34:25

where the proposal is to strike will will be less likely to own a car uh while I agree that we could

34:33

strike it and that would be reasonable the next one the next statement um

34:40

attracting residents in and near Town Center who are more likely to choose not

34:45

to own a car one thing I will tell you as someone who's participated in transportation and in particular trying

34:52

to evolve our transportation networks to encourage Transit use is that um your

35:00

ability to create towns and areas and spaces where

35:05

people can have a smaller uh what I like to call in wildlife biology terms home range like where they may not

35:11

necessarily require owning a car and then have other options like when I

35:17

lived downtown and didn't own a car and actually didn't own a car until a month ago as it turns out for the last five

35:24

years uh where you where you live close enough that you can get away with not owning

35:30

one um and thereby adjust your economics where we might be trying to encourage

35:35

that and by encouraging it we increase density the second statement um leans more towards likely

35:44

to choose and creating situations where people are more able to and potentially

35:49

more likely to especially as the pressures on our economics increase um

35:55

and so while I I personally think if we took the Amendments as is um I have a

36:03

hard time taking both of them I'd rather take them individually because I'm not super support I'm fine with number one

36:10

as recommended I don't support number two because I think what we're trying to do is actually encourage viewer cars

36:17

ultimately that's what ultimately everyone's trying to do that from the state department on down um so

36:28

we've gone around the room one and a half

36:33

times uh chair Murphy before I recognize commissioner RB for a third time and

36:40

accused for a second time I want to give you an opportunity to weigh in given that it doesn't sound like your friendly

36:45

amendment was accepted no it wasn't um I tend to agree with you I'm

36:54

I'm um a little shagrin that we're addressing these together because they

37:01

are different um and I

37:07

would tend to to approach this differently and address them one at a

37:17

time commissioner accuse um yeah I want to acknowledge the

37:24

statement that chair bazo made because I I'm wholly in agreement that we want to

37:29

encourage Transit and we want to encourage car-free uh Lifestyles for

37:35

those who can what I'm struggling with is that um that the it it's written as

37:43

both a choice and will be less likely to and I'm I'm personally not

37:50

seeing the white collar Blue Collar thing I think exists in both and that's why it's problematic for me um

37:59

yeah I didn't I didn't need a car when I lived on Capitol Hill I got one when I had a child

38:06

but you know I my my friends who worked labor had cars and it wasn't a choice

38:13

and it wasn't a likelihood it was a musthave um so I think there are I think

38:19

there are different ways different potential policies to address um

38:24

encouraging people who aren't required ired to drive for their jobs to take

38:30

transit um I I just do not want to discriminate or make assumptions out

38:35

about people who are required to have cars to do their

38:45

jobs uh final thoughts from commissioner regab I'd be amenable to breaking them

38:50

up if someone proposes that as a friendly amendment I think you can propose it and

38:57

we can get a second all right so proposed to break four and five

39:02

separate second uh motion to separate discussion

39:09

and voting has been moved and seconded do we need to take a vote

39:14

Deputy city clerk on that or can we

39:27

it would be much easier for me if you would just if if reab and accuse would agree to withdraw their original motion

39:34

and then reab and Murphy can make a Motion sounds great so agreed agreed thank

39:43

you a lot less typing on this in and catching up with you guys wait okay I

39:49

move to bring number four on it alone

39:55

second there's a motion on the table to correct the text on page 12 of The

40:01

Economic Development element lines 18 through 19 to strike will be less likely

40:08

to own a

40:13

car moved by commissioner RB and seconded by chair Murphy any further

40:19

discussion on this

40:24

one seeing none uh Deputy city clerk can you please call the

40:31

role thank you Vice chair Murphy hi commissioner accuse I chair bazo I

40:42

and commissioner riab I thank

40:47

you motion passes 4 z uh commissioner regab you want to make

40:54

the next motion yep um I miss wish to um what to move number five as shown above

41:01

before the commission been

41:09

moved is there a second second moved and second the motion to

41:16

remove the statement on line page five line 14 of the economic development

41:22

element that reads are more likely to choose not to own a car

41:32

any further discussion on this one seeing

41:39

none oh sorry chair Murphy slow on the on the clicker um following up on uh

41:48

chair bazo's comments I think the issue here is not Choice has and and

41:57

commissioner accuses comments the issue is not choice but there are people that may have the ability to not own a car

42:05

and so I'm wondering if that could be rewarded to reflect that rather than simply striking

42:15

or not striking it

42:28

are you making are you proposing a friendly Amendment well I don't have language in mind um I was more seeing if

42:37

there was interest in trying to solve that

42:42

riddle let's see what commissioner Q has to say yeah that'd be good I think some

42:49

new verbage could solve it um because I

42:54

do agree that there are people who are attract Ed to walkable there there's a

42:59

walkability score on rental sites and home purchase sites for a reason some folks do not

43:07

want to have a car in their lifestyle and if they can they would choose to live in town center because it's

43:13

walkable um so I don't think that's really a debate and I could see a

43:18

way um I I'd almost think you could change it to say instead of well choose not to

43:25

own a car you could you could strike that language and say we we'll choose to

43:31

move um to a more dense area because of the

43:38

walkability and and and and the lack of need of a car or something you know it's

43:44

it's it's flipping on it on its head and it's saying that density is desirable for some people and using Transit is

43:50

desirable for some people and it takes that choice word out of it that's the word that's bothering me

44:04

commissioner regab any followup thoughts I mean it it seems reasonable but at the

44:09

same time I think we're diverging a little too far from the public comments so I would yeah I but I would hope we

44:19

can just vote on it as is let's let's this is it's not a goal

44:25

right this is this is the narrative

44:53

Commissioners Murphy or accuse anything further

45:01

hearing none Deputy city clerk can you please call the role thank you chair chair bazo

45:11

he commissioner accuse I Vice chair

45:17

Murphy nay and commissioner RAB

45:22

I motion fails uh split

45:32

thank you uh commissioner

45:39

regab your revisit um is at least in my notes

45:48

proposed as an edit to the transportation element

46:00

may may I be recognized to well okay I guess I'll I'll move this revisit number

46:06

one this yeah and see if we want to discuss it

46:12

um I think just to clarify with Adam Zach and the deputy city clerk did we

46:20

table this particular discussion or we never discuss this right necessarily

46:25

okay I just want to make sure it's not a uning

46:31

um yes this is not the motion that was tabled last week right this was just a

46:38

discussion as part of a broader discussion at the last week okay um so

46:46

then commissioner bab could you could you please propose a formal

46:53

motion that we can second and then move to discussion yeah like to move uh that

46:59

we put number one under the heading revisit from last meeting um up for

47:05

consideration with the

47:14

commission uh I have a motion to revise the second to last paragraph of page 21

47:21

of the transportation element from the Mercer Island lot is typically full

47:27

occupied during weekdays a number of users of this lot do not reside on the

47:32

island to according to the fourth quarter 2017 Park and Ride utilization

47:37

report prepared by King County the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekday a number of the

47:44

users of this lot do not reside on the island photographs and public comment from mid 2024 assert the lot is often

47:51

less than full do I have a second

48:01

okay I'll I'll second for discussion that's only because

48:07

commissioner Murphy's hand was up and I thought he wanted to talk about it so now well what I wanted to talk about was

48:14

the question that I thought we posed to staff was whether there was any more

48:20

current data

48:27

Adam Zach do you have do you have a followup to that um I

48:35

do not have the data in front of me I

48:40

believe Allison might have found something um yeah I pulled up the related to this

48:49

I pulled up the parking plan and in one of the exhibits there was new data from

48:57

2023 I don't remember the exact date of when they went out to the park and ride

49:03

to look at it but um it was in the last year and they found at that visit it was

49:08

just a one-time visit in the middle of the day I think around noon um that there was approximately I think it was around 66%

49:16

utilization of the spaces at the parking ride thank you commissioner

49:24

ques yeah that resonates with my experience um just visually I would say

49:30

that before that time you know early early covid days it would probably have been closer to

49:37

10% and um I'll just repeat the comment I made last time for the um benefit of

49:42

our discussion that um I don't think it's good to make policy on an item

49:47

that's in flux or to change policy on an item that's in flux and given um Boeing

49:55

Amazon Google a lot of agencies with very large um worker populations are

50:01

requiring people to return to work at least a couple of days a week um I think

50:06

we're going to see that number shift Higher and Higher and there are people um on the east side who could

50:13

park at Eastgate that choose to par on merer island because it makes their commute shorter and and that's why the

50:18

lot was always full when I tried to get there after dropping my kids off at daycare so um

50:26

uh yeah I just I I disagree with the amendment because um it it's something in flux I think it's something that

50:33

maybe we could address in the next comp plan update if we find that that lot continues to um not have full

50:50

utilization um I you know I think I I acknowledge

50:58

that one of the things that I appreciate commissioner Reb's attention to

51:04

accuracy uh in the data which is why we have the citation here of the 2017 Park

51:11

and Ride utilization report which is prepandemic

51:18

um I I I think I recognize the need for

51:25

accuracy um I'm also in agreement with commissioner acc's statement about being

51:32

careful about when we're making changes to policy pieces right now that

51:37

are pretty grossly in flux like use of Transit uh Park and

51:44

rides uh return to work um there's so much of that right now that's so in

51:52

flux there's a balance in how we State this you know I'd be more inclined to just recognize that pre pandemic the lot

51:59

was typically full and the number of users a number of users don't reside on the lot um but I'm

52:06

I'm not sure that there's it's necessary to insert into the comp Bland photographs and public

52:14

comment assert uh assert what it does I'm just I'm not sure if that strengthens

52:19

anything in one way or the other so end ramble and are there further or

52:26

final thoughts before we vote on this commissioner ragab i' I'd be amendable

52:31

to you know replacing that last sentence with the information researched by

52:38

um um by deputy director van gorp I think that's you know a a a study by a a

52:45

state agency um you know probably holds more weight

52:51

than photos and public comment um but I figure we have we have we've got those

52:57

three pieces of data um let's let's let's give the source of that first one

53:03

and okay we can we've got 2023 data let's let's let's give it there and then

53:09

to the policy topic I mean this is once again this is kind of the the the beginning of it it's not a specific

53:14

policy goal so um

53:19

yeah can you be can you make a specific

53:25

recommendation um so that we can be clear about what the motion is I know

53:30

you pointed to what um deputy director van gorp indicated I'm just trying to

53:36

pull up the comment Matrix and staff response to see if I can find it but if

53:43

you could maybe be more specific about that that would be

53:50

helpful bear with me I'll I'll try yeah I'll I'll try to pull it up too um 7 Seconds commissioner

53:59

again

54:05

uh I I can't find anything with a control F

54:11

2023 right hold on just for a sake of fairness let me just check real quickly

54:19

on deputy director van gor please feel free to jump in if you know where it

54:25

lives um I'm just finding it um okay so the data I was referencing is in the

54:33

Town Center Parking plan which is on the city's website I can pull it up on the screen here that's

54:49

helpful find my share screen button for some

54:55

reason there

55:01

is so this is the second to last page of the parking plan there's some

55:07

information on parking U utilization research the city had done

55:13

it was on June 8th of 2023 at

55:18

noon um and you can see the parking ride there is shown in yellow it says down

55:23

here there was utilization of 67% at

55:29

noon um on that day I don't know what RPD utilization

55:39

means residential parking District you're right

55:45

yep so yeah I think 67% is the data point for the parking ride from a year

55:51

ago um and this can be referenced it's the Town Center Parking plan

55:58

this is a adopted plan of the Cities so it's

56:12

official um okay what was the date on that item 2023

56:21

yeah this plan was adopted in November of 2023 that um data point was from June

56:27

8

56:46

2023 what was the percentage 67 percentage

56:57

okay

57:02

um I think just for clarity commissioner ragab if you are encouraging a friendly

57:09

Amendment it sounds like you would amend your revision to read according to

57:18

the fourth quarter 2017 Park and Ride utilization report prepared by King

57:23

County the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during

57:29

weekdays a number of the users of this lot do not reside on the island the following sentence is edited

57:37

the 2023 Town Center Parking plan reports a weekday utilization rate of

57:45

67% at 12m I would be amendable to that friendly Amendment

57:51

67% at 12m we've got the data

57:57

okay um CH could I ask that that last sentence be repeated

58:05

sure the 2023 Town Center Parking plan reports weekday utilization of 67% at

58:14

12:

58:20

p.m. uh this one was moved by riab second by me

58:27

commissioner accuse yeah I app I appreciate the

58:33

addition of 12 pm but I'm I'm not quite sure that's how we want to word it because I think what we're trying to avoid is a false equivalency of a

58:40

full-blown study versus a one day data point which is essentially

58:45

anecdotal there's no statistical significance of that data point um just

58:52

to nerd out a little here I did saying at 12 pm though seems a that's very specific for a comp plan policy

58:59

statement um so my preference would be to say like a what do you call like a

59:06

drop in study or a pop in you know it's not anecdotal but it's a a a snapshot

59:15

you know one day study a point in time yeah a point in time yes thank you van

59:22

gorp for the win yeah appoint rather than saying 12 pm I'd rather say appoint in Time study on this

59:28

date showed and and and then I would also um you know complete that sentence

59:35

saying suggesting post pandemic parking uses and

59:43

flux because I think that's the point we're trying to make that parking use is INF flux and we may be trying to fit a

59:48

square pig and a round hole here um but yeah I think point in time might

59:55

be more appropriate than a specific

1:00:02

time commissioner regab I I don't I think I don't want

1:00:07

to get too deep in the weeds um u a suggestion to incorporate commissioner

1:00:13

acc's S one um how about we just say a snap a 2023 snapshot in time noted a 67%

1:00:20

utilization we're not making any postulations based on that we're just saying these are the facts but it's a

1:00:26

snapshot in time not a full-blown study and I'm I want to move past this I

1:00:34

didn't think we would be hung up on this this long apologies um I think just for clarity

1:00:41

around the motion I want to make sure I'm clear about the language you all are proposing the final

1:00:49

sentence the 2023 Town Center Parking plan reports a single point in time time

1:00:56

weekday utilization of 67% both Commissioners get regb and

1:01:05

accuse agree to that language Vice chair Murphy do you want

1:01:12

to say anything else about this before we take a vote uh no ruvy um then the motion on the table for

1:01:20

a vote is to revise page 21 of the transportation

1:01:28

element to read according to the fourth quarter 2017 Park and Ride utilization

1:01:34

report prepared by King County the Mercer Island lot is typically fully occupied during weekdays a number of the

1:01:42

users of this lot do not reside on the island the 2023 Town Center Parking

1:01:48

report parking plan reports a single point in time weekday utilization of 67%

1:01:58

Deputy clerk can you please call the RO yes and thank you for clarifying the

1:02:06

motion that's very helpful commissioner accuse

1:02:15

I Vice chair Murphy I commissioner RAB hi and chair bazu nay

1:02:28

motion passes 31 thank

1:02:33

you uh that concludes the Motions proposed by Commissioners to make

1:02:38

changes to the actual elements of the comprehensive plan at least

1:02:46

as submitted in advance of the meeting before I move on to findings do

1:02:53

any other Commissioners want to take up any changes or business regarding changes especially

1:02:59

uh in response to public comment before we take up

1:03:07

findings Vice chair Murphy um I don't want to take up uh any

1:03:12

specific um proposed changes I did want to

1:03:19

comment a couple of things in General on The Matrix that was created if this is

1:03:25

the appropriate time um I was thinking well why don't you go ahead um

1:03:33

and we'll see where to fit fit it in okay um so the

1:03:40

Matrix says many of these things are policy choices um but most of them were not

1:03:49

really policy choices except in the broadest sense if we were the state

1:03:54

legislature for example um and so I'm a little bit

1:04:00

concerned about that presentation by the staff as being a policy choice for us um

1:04:07

the city does not have a policy choice to ignore or not

1:04:13

Implement um the legislative uh requirements of the

1:04:18

middle housing bill and the other GMA reforms and many of these comments

1:04:26

proposals um that were presented by citizens who feel strongly about the

1:04:33

single family nature of the island and simply are not consistent with the

1:04:40

various pieces of legislation uh and to be insisting on

1:04:45

preserving pure single family neighborhoods or promoting a goal along

1:04:51

those lines is not consistent with the control in legislation and frankly is

1:04:58

not helpful to what we're doing um we can acknowledge that those people

1:05:03

believe sincerely that that's what they would like to retain for the island but

1:05:10

we can make policy that is inconsistent with the law

1:05:31

um commissioner accuse yeah I just want to concur with

1:05:37

um vice sh Murphy's statement um I really appreciate that staff took time

1:05:45

to respond to commissioner's feedback um

1:05:50

I would love to have a little blue ribbon commission um like a staff PC uh

1:05:56

joint session on on how we can do this in the future um that will be most

1:06:02

effective because I well I understand um

1:06:07

the idea that it's a policy choice and that um and I also understand what Vier

1:06:14

Murphy is saying that it's not a choice it's the law um I think what I was looking for was really two columns there

1:06:23

um one that said is this editorial or is it policy

1:06:29

related and then one that said what are the relevant policies um and and then

1:06:35

maybe even a third one that said this is clearcut you know versus this is open to

1:06:41

interpretation um because the other thing that I struggled with is some of the items that were labeled word smithing um I think actually could

1:06:49

affect the interpretation of the policy or or how staff might interpret what the direction

1:06:55

and um you know intent is really important and people

1:07:02

can uh I guess uh discern all kinds of intent from similar statements if

1:07:08

they're vague so I think I think sometimes word smithing is uh is policy

1:07:15

related because it captures intent and sometimes it is not so um yeah to close

1:07:22

Blue Ribbon commission to figure out a great comment table for next time and kudos to staff and thank you very much

1:07:29

for responding to our request for the

1:07:34

table commissioner again I mean so are we I mean there are

1:07:40

I think I agree some of the things that are policy Choice are tied to those

1:07:47

requirements I guess not mandates requirements um but there were some policy choices that we as a commission

1:07:56

made um one one example that comes to mind is smallscale retail development or

1:08:03

studying that so I mean that may perhaps

1:08:08

we articulate you know I agree most of what the majority of the changes we made were

1:08:14

driven by those um requirements but there were some and I think that was a theme in the

1:08:22

public comment is in some cases we leaned Beyond those I mean we got a lot of comments saying you know within the

1:08:29

law or according to you know the GMA only

1:08:35

so I'd be reluctant to just write everything off that was marked by staff

1:08:41

as a policy Choice as something that's required by law

1:08:46

um I I don't I I I Don't Want To Tread I think I'm treading I want to tread

1:08:52

lightly here and not you know give the impropriety of or the the the

1:08:59

anyway yeah just that there I think there were some policy choices that in the in the view of of

1:09:07

our public commenters that were you know what whether it was or was viewed as

1:09:13

Beyond um what was required by those state laws

1:09:25

um we are on the topic of the um public comment Matrix if you will

1:09:34

um and I feel like all three Commissioners pointed to some issues

1:09:39

with that Matrix um Adam and Allison I believe that that tool I'm G

1:09:48

to regard it I guess I'm regarding that as a tool the Planning Commission requested of you
um and also request of

1:09:55

the staff make some initial recommendations um I suppose as a

1:10:01

commissioner I wasn't intending to refer that tool to council for use necessarily

1:10:06

it was a more of a tool to be used between staff and the commission to frame what we just
did regarding motions

1:10:14

to make changes and also what we're about to do which is make some

1:10:20

findings um or support that but I wasn't I I certainly

1:10:26

hadn't intended that you refer that product forward necessarily uh what did

1:10:31

you think you guys were going to do with it like I'd like some clarity from staff about what
you're going to do with the

1:10:36

comet Matrix sure so the by including it in

1:10:44

the uh Planning Commission Bill uh then it is entered

1:10:51

into the record right and to the council um if they wanted to see that they could

1:10:57

refer to the planing commission bill um so that the comment

1:11:04

Matrix kind of live within the plan here

1:11:17

okay um does that does that answer your question

1:11:25

uh yes I think what it says to me is that uh commissioner Q's point about hey

1:11:32

next time around let's take some time to really fill this out in a manner that we can all feel is a consistent has a voice

1:11:41

has responses that make sense that the commission can either vote on or align

1:11:46

around or whatever uh similar to also what commissioner Murphy was pointing to

1:11:53

um like some clarity around a statement a policy Choice uh doesn't necessarily

1:11:58

clarify who's making the policy Choice um and so uh I agree that in the future

1:12:08

uh we probably want to get a lot tighter about um the tools that we create and

1:12:15

use to support each other in U making some of these changes and findings um I

1:12:21

think in the state that it's in I don't love it I don't I don't even like some of the comments but um I think it would

1:12:27

take quite a bit of effort for us to revise line by line um to make changes

1:12:33

at this point and so I think

1:12:40

um I suppose it might be a decent time for me to propose like I think this is a

1:12:46

good transition piece to maybe make some findings I'd like to propose a

1:12:52

finding um actually for the record and I did send it

1:13:01

to Adam Zach I'm wondering if you'd be willing to put that finding up on the screen and I can read

1:13:12

it uh I'd like to make a motion to propose a finding in our findings report

1:13:21

um my finding is that a number of public comments expressed opposition to several

1:13:26

Planning Commission driven changes included in the new draft of the comprehensive plan the Planning

1:13:32

Commission took up several amendments to the draft in response to public comment but not did not elect to make all

1:13:38

changes recommended by the public we encourage city council to review public comments during their consideration of

1:13:44

the draft plan

1:13:51

second motion's been made and seconded um I think I proposed this motion

1:13:57

because I suspected we were going to get to a place where we were going to need to signal to council that comments were

1:14:05

made that we didn't address

1:14:12

um and I wanted to make sure that we actually acknowledge that uh that

1:14:18

comments were May that we didn't address um and that we are allowing Council uh

1:14:23

the space to take on some of those policy discussions uh as as is necessary for their role uh

1:14:31

commissioner cause uh I would like to offer a friendly

1:14:38

Amendment um in the first sentence where it says a

1:14:44

number of public comments Express opposition to several Planning Commission driven

1:14:49

changes included in the new draft of the comprehensive plan um I would like like

1:14:55

I would prefer I'll go for it either way but I would prefer if that's said to

1:15:01

several Stat manded or Planning Commission driven changes and I don't

1:15:07

care what order those are in if you want to lead with Planning Commission or state man state

1:15:15

required um I just want to add state state required in there somewhere

1:15:21

because they're the public comments were both both right I I I agree with um

1:15:28

commissioner RB that we did make some policy recommendations but there were also and there's public opposition to

1:15:35

both the policy recommendations we made and the state required

1:15:40

ones what if we modified it to read opposition

1:15:47

to strike the word several insert

1:15:58

State mandated and Planning Commission driven

1:16:05

changes it's just addressing many of the changes is that consistent with your

1:16:10

amendment I would use or instead of and to make a distinction thank you yes

1:16:17

I agree with that all right I'll accept that

1:16:22

um Vice chair Murphy

1:16:28

um yeah I think that solves one of my main concerns because as we observed um

1:16:36

I think the week before last there were a great many comments or not a great meaning

1:16:44

there were a few comments characterizing what was happening has

1:16:49

being the Planning Commission was driving all these changes

1:16:55

and in fact as we observed then I observed in commissioner ACC and others

1:17:01

observed that that was a mischaracterization of how this was a

1:17:07

put together and B what the reality was um so I think

1:17:13

that helps um mitigate that um

1:17:26

yeah I I think that's solves the

1:17:31

problem thank you commissioner

1:17:36

regab I I think we're kicking the can up to the state um I I understand there was

1:17:44

opposition to that but let's let's own this draft right I don't know I mean if

1:17:51

not then let's I don't know it it seems like

1:17:56

I we received comments about we also received comments about the process you know that's I I don't know

1:18:04

it just I I think Planning Commission

1:18:12

driven policies i' I'd feel more comfortable

1:18:18

with it if we said Planning Commission or state mandated Planning Commission policies

1:18:24

some of which driven you know like let's put us put our name first um and then I don't I don't

1:18:33

know I guess we don't we we're we ought not to get into the specifics right um I

1:18:42

think that that Matrix makes it much easier for Council to look at them than just a you know than like a 71 page PDF

1:18:48

so I think that's helpful I mean I don't know I'm I'm just

1:18:54

rambling at this point are you making a friendly

1:19:01

Amendment or are you complete am I done um I'll make a

1:19:07

friendly amendment to say a number of public comments expressed opposition to Planning Commission driven

1:19:15

policies some of which were state mandated I don't think

1:19:22

I'm gonna accept that okay peace

1:19:29

okay any further discussion before we take a vote commissioner regab is that a new

1:19:40

hand okay actually could you put that back on the screen so I could read it for the

1:19:46

vote please since we changed it and I didn't write it

1:19:52

down thank you the motion on the table is to make a

1:19:59

finding that a number of public comments expressed opposition to State mandated or Planning Commission driven changes

1:20:06

included in the new draft of the comprehensive plan the Planning Commission took up several amendments to

1:20:12

the draft in respon in response to public comment but did not elect to make all changes recommended by the public we

1:20:19

encourage city council to review public comments during their consideration of the draft plan

1:20:25

Deputy city clerk can you please call the

1:20:31

role Madam chair for purposes of clarification um and based on your

1:20:38

original motion I put at the beginning of that um a motion was made by at Tazo

1:20:44

seconded by accused to propose of finding that quote and then your

1:20:49

statement that's correct thank you

1:21:00

Vice chair Murphy hi commissioner

1:21:08

RAB abstain commissioner accuse

1:21:16

I and chair bazo I thank you

1:21:25

motion passes three commissioner ra

1:21:31

oh commissioner Q thank you for recognizing me chair um

1:21:38

there was one other um public comment that I was debating bringing up but I

1:21:44

just want to raise it to see if others are interested in discussing um it is potentially word

1:21:52

smithing but potentially also meaningful to policy and that's um in the

1:21:58

transportation element um 410 there was some discussion about

1:22:05

needing to articulate the need of off street parking

1:22:11

um and I'm wondering if there isn't a an addition of

1:22:17

ADA in that policy um uh or if that is just intuitively

1:22:25

obvious to our planners and we don't need to mention

1:22:30

it can you be more specific about either what comment you're referring to I'm

1:22:38

referring to um public comment there's three of them that basically say the

1:22:43

same thing it's public comment 2.2 3.2 and 8 is it under and all through it's

1:22:51

under transportation and it is under goal

1:23:22

4.10 um

1:23:27

you started your comment by saying do we need to

1:23:33

discuss um are you making a are you requesting discussion around that

1:23:41

comment I am requesting a I guess a thumbs up thumbs down on whether there is appetite to

1:23:47

discuss that topic and potentially Wordsmith that item a little bit because

1:23:53

I wasn't sure how the motion should read so I did not propose a motion um and and

1:23:58

I also kind of had a question for staff if the Ada issue is wholly covered elsewhere and it's

1:24:05

unnecessary to make that point here okay commissioner regab you put your hand down are you wait were you GNA

1:24:13

comment about this particular issue or did you want to bring up something different um may I be yeah may I be

1:24:19

recognized you I'm recognizing you um we did looking through our minutes from

1:24:24

last week um we did make a finding relating to

1:24:29

this um I believe that I proposed um I'm I'm happy to read it if

1:24:38

if desired maybe that addresses the comment I'm not sure but we did we did

1:24:45

touch on something in our I guess now working

1:24:52

document does staff mind pulling up 41 just so we

1:24:57

can see what we did with that I

1:25:03

apologize if I did

1:25:11

not so for this is transportation element policy 4.10 uh is here all right

1:25:19

thank you for refreshing my memory I withdraw my comment thanks Adam thanks commissioner

1:25:27

riab okay lot of material lot of material this time there is right just

1:25:33

wanted to make sure that one was covered where am I what am I doing here oh what we're doing is we're finalizing our

1:25:39

recommendations and findings so that we can forward that to the council after the end of today's meeting that said

1:25:44

commissioner RAB you have made you've proposed a couple of findings shall we address those uh I I hope I can find a

1:25:53

second for them yeah yes I have two left and then I'm done start all right

1:25:58

housing element um housing element number one I move that we add to our findings six public comments were

1:26:05

received on go 25h um two of those mentioned it could be used as a way around G far permeable surface height

1:26:11

floor limits facade height parking requirements and property line offset requirements among

1:26:16

others um looking for a second to

1:26:22

discuss I I want second this just to acknowledge the public comment um and have a brief discussion moved and

1:26:30

seconded discussion um the reason I'm bringing this forward is I think you I don't

1:26:37

think this was the intent of go 25h um but it was and I didn't see this until

1:26:43

it was mentioned to me by a a mercer Islander at our open house um but as

1:26:50

worded this goal could be you know if it gar permeable surface all of these

1:26:56

residential design standards that were apparently a lot of effort was put in

1:27:02

2017 um many of those if not all of them are not safety related so this could be

1:27:07

used as a way to just move around those I wanted to flag that that this you know

1:27:13

whether someone wants to do this or wants to avoid this um this is a potential implication of go 25h and

1:27:20

thank the public for catching that for us commissioner

1:27:28

accuse yeah I just wanted to comment that I I believe we already discuss this one um and I don't know that we

1:27:35

formalized it as a policy or not so I'll ask staffer perhaps commissioner riab um if we

1:27:44

because I I I noted in several of the staff responses to these comments there were and I I I grouped a lot of them

1:27:51

that that had kind of similar themes to them um that the reason that we have to

1:27:59

revisit the development standards or is it it's called out for it's called for

1:28:05

in this it's it's mandated it's required by the state

1:28:10

um and and staff has stated that this issue this concern is going to be taken

1:28:17

up in the revision of the development code so I I feel like we we

1:28:24

have acknowledged the issue and and that we have said here is the place where we

1:28:29

will resolve that so I I think it was a fair public comment um and I wanted to

1:28:35

acknowledge the public comment um but I do think we already have a solution to that and I don't think we need a

1:28:44

finding Vice chair Murphy anything to add no I agree with uh commissioner

1:28:51

accuse

1:28:57

if there commissioner RAB final thoughts just just to clarify 25h this was one

1:29:05

that we as the Planning Commission added at you know to the housing workg

1:29:13

group recommended section right this didn't come from the housing workg group

1:29:21

right does anyone recall um would it would it be helpful for me

1:29:27

to give a little background here uh yes please so yeah first let me let me share

1:29:33

my share 25h I think that might be helpful to see what that policy says um

1:29:40

it just this will also maybe jog some memories here so policy 2.5 is talking

1:29:47

about um some of the approaches that we'll use to encourage construction of

1:29:53

new affordable hous housing one of those proposed strategies is relief from

1:29:59

development code Provisions that do not affect health or safety requirements so

1:30:05

that's the that's the policy that uh the Planning Commission arrived at that was

1:30:10

one of the policies that was added by the Planning Commission following the housing work groups uh work um during

1:30:18

the planning commission's review um but the the comment in The Matrix the staff

1:30:24

comment was basically that as as we implement this policy we would we would

1:30:29

make the decisions the city could make those decisions about which development code Provisions it may um it it may

1:30:38

Grant some waiver to typically that would be something like a reduced setback or um you know for currently for

1:30:47

um accessory dwelling units we allow some additional gross floor area um for

1:30:53

those accessory dwelling unit so it could be something like that um but that would really those decisions would be

1:30:59

made by the Planning Commission and the city council ultimately at the time that we implement the policy so hopefully

1:31:06

that helps kind of get get us all square on on where we're at with

1:31:16

that commissioner accuse yeah I just wanted to add that the housing work

1:31:22

group is very fast process we had three one-hour meetings and members of the

1:31:27

housing work group did not add a lot of text to what staff had already provided

1:31:33

and so I think it was good for the Planning Commission to take a look and add a few minor things here are there

1:31:39

that are you know policy is that help interpret how we want to

1:31:45

handle um handle these issues in the code so Ju

1:31:51

Just to say you know even though something was received from the housing work group it's it's it's not like we

1:31:57

spent the hours that this group spends debating And discussing the nuances it's

1:32:04

a it was a very quick

1:32:19

process there are there's no further discussion

1:32:25

the motion on the table is to add to findings six public comments were

1:32:32

received on goal 2.5h two of those mentioned could be used as a way around gar permeable

1:32:41

surface height floor limits facade height parking requirements and property

1:32:46

line offset requirements among others Deputy city clerk can you please

1:32:53

call the RO

1:33:05

excuse me thank you Cher vazo

1:33:12

nay commissioner RAB I Vice chair Murphy

1:33:18

nay and commissioner accuse nay motion fails

1:33:30

31 commissioner RAB all right last one then you don't

1:33:35

have to hear me uh proposing stuff um land use number one um I move to add to

1:33:42

our findings that there were four public email comments calling for a vision statement referring to single family

1:33:47

homes and consistent with the city's vision statement and two additional comments with the same theme

1:33:54

um nine commenters at the open house also called for a similar Preamble with similar themes to the housing

1:34:01

element I have a motion to add a finding is there a second

1:34:26

uh I'll second for the purpose of debate commissioner RAB um I think the reason I thought of

1:34:33

bringing this up is you know this is something as a commission we didn't really I don't I at least from my point

1:34:40

of view I don't think we thought about this um you know Finding City's vision statement tying this you know 8 to

1:34:47

10year document to it um in addition I thought it was also important because

1:34:54

this spans two different mediums through which we receive received public comment

1:34:59

um some of it you know at the open house um people are talking about a

1:35:04

preamble and then in our written email comments so I think it's I think it's important it's it's maybe not the

1:35:10

easiest to pull out so I thought this was another one that we ought to you know wave a big flag to City Council on

1:35:16

and say hey there's some there's some talk about aligning this with the vision statement maybe giving a you know

1:35:24

because these goals are tough to read I mean I find them tough to read and I've been doing this for a year um so if I'm

1:35:31

just skimming the document I think it's helpful to see uh anyway so that that's what it is

1:35:37

it spans two different mediums of public comment and it was a recurring theme between them and it's something that I don't think we even thought of as a

1:35:45

commission commissioner Murphy yeah th this Falls um well first

1:35:52

of all I think the purpose of findings is to maybe call attention to things

1:35:58

that we want the council to focus on or to look at um but this one in particular

1:36:06

falls into the category that I spoke to earlier of something that is really uh

1:36:13

pushing back on the various pieces of

1:36:19

legislation uh that we are obligated to apply and

1:36:24

utilize and the notion of promoting and preserving single family only

1:36:30

neighborhoods is really inconsistent with that legislation and I don't think it's worthy of calling attention to the

1:36:38

council uh that that's something that they should be looking at incorporating into the

1:36:48

compant commissioner accuse I just wanted to concur with Vice

1:36:54

chair Murphy um just having sat on the housing work group council is keenly

1:37:00

aware of this topic keenly aware of the desire um for some in our community

1:37:06

to put up some resistance to the state requirements um and and I think they're

1:37:12

already aware of it I don't think it's something we need to call it as a finding

1:37:24

um I suppose just to lend my voice to the discussion

1:37:32

um I while I appreciate the comment and the sentiment I also recognize man these

1:37:38

comp plan revision all this comp plan stuff is hard and complicated because

1:37:44

there's so many places we have to look and tie things together and so I recognize that it feels like if it feels like

1:37:49

a burden to the public which based on public comment at least some of them it feels like it um it's because it's hard

1:37:56

stuff and I think we do our best to simplify um my understanding based on

1:38:03

watching and reading including consistent reference to the scope of work defined by Council itself did not

1:38:11

necessarily take up vision statement revisions um and I and while it was

1:38:18

recognized that the public felt like that was a as something to address uh it

1:38:25

was not recognized as something that would actually support this comp plan revision and the council chose not to

1:38:31

take it up as part of the scope of work so

1:38:36

um and comment are any final words before we

1:38:44

vote seeing none uh the motion on the table is to add a finding that there

1:38:51

were for public comment four public email comments calling for a vision statement referring to single family

1:38:58

homes and consistent with the city's vision statement and two additional comments with the same theme n

1:39:03

commenters at the open house also called for similar Preamble with similar themes to the housing

1:39:10

element Deputy city clerk can you please call the role thank you madam

1:39:16

chair chair bazo nay commissioner accuse nay

1:39:25

commissioner RAB I and vice chair Murphy

1:39:31

n motion fails

1:39:40

31 Commissioners uh that concludes all of

1:39:46

the Motions that were proposed prior to this meeting um

1:39:54

given conversation and discussion are is are there any further findings or motions to

1:40:00

be made by Commissioners uh we'll start with commissioner ragab real quick one um

1:40:06

relating to verbal comments at the public hearing um we did have Senator

1:40:12

Wellman Express um you know some concern with that we were not in

1:40:19

person is there I guess maybe I'm just asking like is there a planned date for

1:40:25

these meetings to be come back in person um I fig it showed up in our minutes we

1:40:31

had a a you know state senator comment um but but we ought to discuss it at

1:40:40

least um hi Allison hi I'm happy to comment on

1:40:46

that um I think that's something we could revisit at this time if if the commission desires to

1:40:54

um I think the city facilities are at a point where it

1:40:59

is likely possible to meet in person if we want to sometimes or all of the time I think I'd be happy to talk with

1:41:06

Commissioners about their preferences around that um I mean I know many of you

1:41:12

have jobs and so there's an element of you know if you're in person it takes a little more planning to be there on time

1:41:19

and all that so that's something to consider I know you know the online format can just be

1:41:25

more accessible for a lot of reasons so you know I think I'm happy to take temperature from people and and see

1:41:31

where we're at with that and if there is interest in moving towards Summer all of the meetings being in person that's

1:41:36

something we could pursue starting probably this fall um is it possible for commission

1:41:43

meetings to be hybrid I mean we state that they're hybrid even though they seem all online is it possible yeah I

1:41:49

mean right now there is an option for people in the community to show up at the community Center and view the

1:41:54

meeting or make comments to you from there um so that's why we call it hybrid

1:42:00

I think if we move to having the Commissioners and our staff in person um

1:42:07

it would still be hybrid we would still um be broadcasting via YouTube and

1:42:12

people could come make public comment either in person at the community center

1:42:18

in front of the folks that are in person or online and I think like wise Commissioners would have the ability to

1:42:25

join online um so Commissioners obviously there's some logistical difficulties if we've got Commissioners

1:42:32

both in person and online just in making sure we're recognizing raised hands and comments and all those kind of things

1:42:38

but it is possible we did that um for a little while before city hall

1:42:43

closed and I think we maybe had I can't quite remember three or four

1:42:49

meetings that were hybrid and it worked fine I mean it wasn't perfect but it was fine I would say commissioner

1:42:59

yes yeah somebody who works and does have children at home uh and given the

1:43:08

uh at well documented um women do more of the child care I won't get into that

1:43:16

um I I think that it is important to be in front of the public and while I appreciated um and and want to show do

1:43:25

difference to um The Honorable Wellman um

1:43:32

the I think I think it's important for us to occasionally be all in like we were at

1:43:40

the open house and I think opportunities like that or maybe having a sometimes

1:43:47

like the King County Council will have a special meeting and they'll go out to the district and they'll have a meeting

1:43:52

in in in front of a group at Redmont town hall or something um just to just

1:43:59

to get out and press the flesh a little more and meet people and get that sense of personal connection that folks are

1:44:05

looking for um I'd be really really opposed to part in part out um my

1:44:11

experience with those meetings was that it was extremely difficult for the chair to um track raised hands online and in

1:44:20

person uh to get order of who raised their hands it was a bit of a mess so I

1:44:25

would prefer that if we do want to do um some connect if we want to have provide

1:44:31

better public service and and by being more connected to the public if that's a goal and I I don't think it's a bad goal

1:44:39

um that it it be sometimes um a some like a dessert you know it's a sometimes

1:44:45

treat as opposed to an all thetime treat um especially given the weekly nature of

1:44:51

these meetings while we're updating the comp plan I think it would be really untenable for a lot of working parents

1:44:57

to make a weekly meeting um and uh deal with baseball and Girl Scouts and dance

1:45:04

and all of those wonderful things the kids on the island

1:45:09

do commissioner Reed I I wasn't intending for us to make a

1:45:15

recommendation on what we think we should do I was just kind of saying hey let let's PT this up to council and see

1:45:21

if they have any guidance or recommendations they would

1:45:26

like that that's all that's the only reason I was bringing that up I I person yeah it's definitely easier um

1:45:35

virtual Vice chair Murphy yeah I I would be reluctant to

1:45:42

follow Adam's suggestion of punting this to council uh how we manage our meetings

1:45:48

is our business not theirs um and any more than how they do theirs is our

1:45:54

business uh so I'd be reluctant to to ask them for guidance um for me

1:46:02

personally uh given my disabilities online is

1:46:07

extremely um beneficial uh it allows me access given my computer setup to access

1:46:15

documents very quickly and to be much more effective and useful as a

1:46:22

commissioner uh so I prefer the online format um I've watched a lot of Council

1:46:29

meetings where one or one or more council members um is out of town and

1:46:34

it's a truly hybrid meeting with for whatever commission or council members

1:46:40

present and and one two or three not and online and that seems to function fairly

1:46:48

well uh but I I do think the idea of once in a while like the idea of

1:46:54

dessert of having uh us all together um for for some special type of proceeding

1:47:01

is probably not a bad idea either so but I would I would allow for the default of

1:47:07

having a true hybrid meeting where people can participate either um in

1:47:14

person or remotely um one final

1:47:19

comment following on on uh I think commissioner Q's statement um one of the

1:47:27

main reasons why we have kept this online um was for the very reason that

1:47:32

the workload was so heavy and the number of meetings was so heavy that was a conscious decision uh and that was a

1:47:40

major driving force um for that

1:47:46

decision have having heard from most of the Commissioners on the issue uh

1:47:53

can I just get a thumbs up thumbs down about asking staff to Circle back with

1:47:59

Commissioners maybe in August and take individual temperature offline as to

1:48:05

what Commissioners would prefer as we head into the fall season that is deferring this issue

1:48:14

to thank you so Allison if you want to loop back with all of us individually

1:48:19

and take our temperature later this year yeah happy to do that I set up some calls before we pick up our fall

1:48:25

meetings and make a recommendation on how to accommodate what people prefer

1:48:31

okay

1:48:37

um commissioner access uh I believe I tabled one of the

1:48:43

Motions last time do we need to untable that for

1:48:50

discussion because I think staff's responded to it in this new

1:48:57

table um in order to take that motion off the table we need to vote to remove

1:49:03

it from the table and insert it for discussion are you proposing we do

1:49:10

that I I guess it's a process question and maybe the city clerk can answer if we put something on the

1:49:17

table and we are about to declare here are our findings here are the

1:49:23

recommendations the council does that then um mean that thing stays on the

1:49:28

table forever and it doesn't get Revisited again um because I want to be

1:49:34

fair to the person who proposed the motion um and untable it if this is the last shot

1:49:42

at discussion discussing it um commissioner RAB um I believe the staff

1:49:49

response pointed Us in the direction and I spoke with a you know professional in this area and they said that that's the

1:49:56

that's the convention um that we've pointed to where a reference is so I'm

1:50:03

at peace with it staying at the table or just disappearing I feel no need to

1:50:09

bring it up um because because of staff's response commissioner Q commissioner

1:50:16

ragab does not feel the need to revive his motion on the table did you want to do anything with it I'm happy to leave

1:50:23

it on the table then okay

1:50:32

um if there are no further motions around

1:50:40

findings uh Allison and Adam Zach I think we're in a place where we want to make a motion to refer the draft

1:50:46

comprehensive plan I'll frame that motion in just a second is there something that you need to do or

1:50:53

recommend doing about kind of summarizing or presenting something to

1:50:59

us uh no oh I think in the last two years of working on this project I have

1:51:04

summarized many things and I think we're ready for a motion yeah okay uh in that

1:51:11

case I'd like to make a motion to refer the draft comprehensive plan as amended by Planning Commission this evening to

1:51:18

city council for its review

1:51:25

second moved in second discussion Vice chair Murphy should we

1:51:32

be recommending approval uh or that they adopt the updated comp

1:51:42

plan Adam Zach is nodding his head the the staff recommended motion

1:51:49

included the word it was a motion to recommend a option

1:51:55

um so that that was the staff recommended version

1:52:07

okay do we want to actually put the staff recommended version of the motion

1:52:12

up so that I can point to it and say let's do that I'm gonna let's do that

1:52:18

one I think chair Vice chair Murphy is trying to recommend

1:52:26

that yes I thought that's what we

1:52:31

were doing I didn't use the word adoption in my statement so let me clarify for

1:52:37

Deputy city clerk the motion on the table is to recommend adoption of the updated

1:52:44

comprehensive plan as amended to the city council

1:52:54

it was seconded by commissioner accuse if no further

1:53:04

discussion Deputy city clerk can you call the role please thank

1:53:09

you chair bazu hi commissioner accuse

1:53:17

I chair Vice chair Murphy I and commission riab

1:53:26

abstain motion passes

1:53:35

301 commissioner ragab I wish the I wish to State the reason for my dissenting

1:53:42

vote did you dissent or abstain uh abstaining vote

1:53:48

apologies um there are factual errors in this document but I respect the commission's vote on

1:53:55

it thank you Adam Zach you had your hand up thank

1:54:01

you yeah I just wanted to say that uh this is this is a pretty big milestone

1:54:07

for this project and we've been working on this uh with you've been working on

1:54:13

this for uh two years now and it's a it's a pretty cool thing that we got to

1:54:19

this point um I just was you were voting on the motion reflecting on the

1:54:26

thousands of pages of Planning Commission bills and studies that have gone forward and I think it's it's a

1:54:34

really um it's you you should be really proud of the work that you've done here

1:54:41

um on this plan and I think you you arrived at a really great document to bring forward to the council um and it's

1:54:48

been it's been my pleasure working with you through this process and um I I think it's We've Ended up with a

1:54:55

really good plan coming out of it um so I just wanted to give a tip of the Hat

1:55:01

um for the work thank you commissioner

1:55:07

ges um I wanted to support uh kind of a mutual admiration

1:55:14

Society feeling here this was a lot of work it was a lot of work and I feel like the city staff um I wish there were

1:55:21

more of you um I I think we kept you up very late a number of times and I think

1:55:26

part of that was us kind of trying to figure out our process and so I want to thank staff um I also want to thank our

1:55:34

new chair bazo I think you've um in this first meeting where you're

1:55:40

fully chairing I think you've uh done an exemplary job I really appreciate the way you ran this meeting um and I'm

1:55:47

excited to see more of that in the future and I hope it will be more effective for um

1:55:52

for staff and the commission so thank you everyone and I'd also like to thank my fellow Commissioners we had a lot of

1:55:59

tough discussions and I uh I appreciate the candor I appreciate the um respect

1:56:06

shown to each

1:56:13

other I think that wraps that final item of special business and we move on to

1:56:19

other business uh do we have a utility director's report yeah just brief one um I did want

1:56:27

to say thank you to Adam for all his hard work on everything related to the comp plan for the last two and a half

1:56:32

years I mean a very high percentage of those thousands of pages of Planning Commission bills and draft elements were

1:56:39

authored by him and he's put in a TR tremendous amount of really good work on this so many thanks Adam great

1:56:47

job um and then um just shifting to thinking looking forward um I think I

1:56:55

mentioned at the last meeting we're reconvening the housing work group here very shortly the first meeting scheduled

1:57:01

for June 20th um commissioner acuse and chair bazo will be joining that group

1:57:07

we're going to be meeting um I think every week or two throughout second half

1:57:13

of June and month of July um trying to get four or six meetings in and create a

1:57:19

draft of the code Amendment we need to make to add capacity um for the higher density units

1:57:26

to meet our affordability targets so I think that'll be another big piece of

1:57:32

important work and staff and the work group will be quite busy during that

1:57:37

time period preparing those drafts and reviewing them and for that reason we're

1:57:42

going to propose canceling the Planning Commission meetings in June and July um

1:57:48

so the June 26th and July 24th Planning Commission meetings will be cancelled

1:57:53

since you all made a decision tonight we won't need the June meeting and we're we're going to cancel the July one as

1:57:59

well that means our next meeting will be in September just GNA look at the date really

1:58:06

quick September 25th yeah um so like we

1:58:11

said earlier I'll be in touch with all of you individually um sometime in August early September about the desired

1:58:19

meeting format for the fall and kind of the upcoming work plan and those sorts of things um so I guess just watch for

1:58:26

an email here in a couple months to touch base and then we'll be back in the

1:58:33

fall all right um oh one other thing I wanted to

1:58:39

say sorry um so tonight's recommendation is going to be prepared a draft will be

1:58:46

prepared by staff a written recommendation based on everything that was discussed tonight the chair will

1:58:52

sign that and along with the drafts and the findings all of that package will go

1:58:58

to city council we're planning to um bring the recommendation forward to City Council on July 16th um chair bazo you

1:59:06

will be invited to join staff at that meeting to present the recommendation to council um we can talk more about that

1:59:13

offline if you got questions um just want to make sure that was on all of your radar in case you want to

1:59:20

tune in to watch the meeting and from there that'll really just be the the city council's introduction to this

1:59:26

recommendation they're not going to be making any decisions at that time they'll pick it back up in September um

1:59:32

for two or three more meetings to make amendments and review their final

1:59:39

changes um yeah any questions about the rest of that

1:59:44

process um are we am I or is the commission able to review the letter in

1:59:51

the the yeah typically the way we do that is Staff drafts something the chair reviews it and then the chair signs it does

1:59:58

anybody else on the commission request review or you guys trust that I'll look at it

2:00:04

thoroughly all right I got some thumbs up Mike's just nodding yeah I he's like

2:00:10

I'm off the hook I don't to read it uh Deputy city clerk you have your hand

2:00:16

out yes thank you Adam chair um our bylaw has changed and I it

2:00:23

now requires a motion to cancel meetings and so if I could get a motion to cancel

2:00:28

the June and July regular meetings that would be wonderful so

2:00:33

moved a motion on the table to cancel the June and July meetings is it seconded second great do we have to vote

2:00:41

on it or yeah I guess we do huh right unless there's any discussion Deputy

2:00:47

city clerk can you call the role on the motion thank you commissioner accuse

2:00:53

hi chair bazo hi Vice chair Murphy hi and commissioner

2:01:00

r hi thank you thanks that's all I

2:01:06

have H awesome um I just had a couple of

2:01:11

final things to say tonight as we close out um I want to acknowledge our city

2:01:17

staff partners for all the darn hard work that they've had to do with us us

2:01:22

um I want to acknowledge Commissioners for all of the this is a hard work this

2:01:28

is a lot of hard work so the fact that we had the number of public commenters who are also trying to keep up with this

2:01:34

like I just acknowledge everyone who has participated in this process and who's been staying up late looking up

2:01:41

definitions chasing down legislation uh to be thorough and

2:01:47

accurate and mindful about the policies um I also do want to take the moment to acknowledge Vice chair Murphy um because

2:01:54

he predominantly led a lot of the bulk of this and I we didn't get an opportunity to our last meeting to

2:02:00

address that so I wanted to just acknowledge you for your effort as chair of the past year um this body's just

2:02:07

taken a lot of work and debated policies and your leadership has for the most

2:02:13

part gotten us here I get to take no credit because this is my first meeting so thank you for getting us here also

2:02:19

yeah it's great for you you get to roll in and take the glory so it's the best

2:02:24

kind isn't it thanks for doing all the hard work so timing is everything uhuh somehow it doesn't quite feel that

2:02:31

way but anyway I do want to make sure we acknowledge you publicly for your work and your support uh and everybody here

2:02:39

so thank you thank you um okay with that uh if there is no

2:02:47

further business um I do want to just remind folks commissioners if you have any planned absences if you could just

2:02:53

reach out to us offline um and let staff and myself know planned absences for the

2:02:59

fall because our next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday September 25th

2:03:04

at 6 PM there being no other business to come before the Planning Commission the

2:03:09

time is now 8:03 p.m. and the meeting is adjourned as a reminder to Commissioners

2:03:14

please stay seated or at least on screen until staff has terminated the broadcast thanks everybody and good evening