



PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

MEETING SUMMARY

Regular Bi-monthly Meeting
Thursday, May 18, 2017, 6:30pm
City of Sammamish Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Eric Brooks, Pos. 1
Shanna Collins, Pos. 3, Chair
Larry Crandall, Pos. 4, Vice-Chair
Roisin O'Farrell, Pos. 2
Matthew Petrich, Pos. 6
Nancy Anderson, Pos. 7

ABSENT

Jane Garrison, Pos. 5

STAFF PRESENT

Kellye Hilde, Planning Manager
Doug McIntyre, Senior Planner
David Goodman, Management Analyst
Kevin Johnson, Permit Technician

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Shanna Collins called the Sammamish Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

April 6th minutes - **Approved as distributed 6:0**

April 20th minutes - **Approved as amended 6:0**

Public Comment: Non-Agenda: (3 Min Individual / 5 Min Representative)

No Public Comment

Public Comment Closed

OLD BUSINESS 6:39 PM ([Bookmarked Video Link](#))

Title 24 Update – Work session

Staff commenced presentation:

Overview: Sammamish Municipal Code (SMC) Title 24 contains the processes, procedures, and requirements for updating and amending the Comprehensive Plan. This title was originally adopted in 1999 (Ord. O99-29), and was last updated in 2003 (Ord. O2003132). City staff will be drafting a new title – SMC Title 24A to replace Title 24 that will make the Comprehensive Plan amendment process easy to understand for citizens wishing to participate and for staff to administer.

SMC Title 24A includes the following new processes related to amending the Comprehensive Plan:

- A “biennial review” cycle that coincides with the City’s budget. The proposed code includes a two-year biennial review cycle that will replace the annual docket review currently used. Moving to a biennial review cycle will allow the City to better allocate resources to fully analyze amendment proposals.
- A two-step review process for amendment proposals. The proposed code delineates a two-step process for the review of amendment proposals: the docket review, which will serve as a preliminary review, and a legislative review for those proposals that the Planning Commission and City Council are interested in analyzing further.
- Clear guidelines and responsibilities for review. The proposed code better outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the acceptance and review of amendment proposals.
- Streamlined code. The proposed code is significantly shorter than SMC Title 24 and introduces the amendment process in a logical, linear manner.

Commission and Staff commenced discussion:

Commission asked why the proposed code states that the Comprehensive Plan should be amended no more than once a year while the code also introduces a biennial review cycle. Commission also pointed out a missing punctuation mark under the general procedures where it references amending the Comprehensive Plan between cycles.

Staff responded that it is a reference to the RCW that caps changes to once a year, and that a comma was missing from that section.

Commission asked where the list of items that may be changed in the biennial review came from.

Staff responded that the list is from the current Comprehensive Plan.

Commission asked if a Zoning Reclassification should be included in the list of definitions.

Staff responded that Zoning Reclassification is a separate administrative process from changing the designation of a property on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.

Commission pointed out that a period is missing in 24A.30.010 paragraph one subsection A. Commission asked about if under the same section there should be an “and” or an “or” when it lists the two requirements for an amendment to qualify for the docket.

Staff responded that the period is indeed missing and will be added, and that it should be one or the other requirement that must be met.

Commission asked if under section 24A.30.030 paragraph one subsection B where it states that “the biennial review may not occur during years where a periodic update is scheduled” and clarifying that the ‘may not’ is a must not or could not?

Staff responded that the intent is that it could but does not have to and the City could reserve the right not to. Also, when a jurisdiction goes through the periodic update, there is a lot of resources dedicated to completing an update and so this allows for focusing resources without spreading them too thin.

Commission asked if there was excess verbiage that could be eliminated in the paragraph relating to deadlines as the paragraph that follows it is basically duplicated. Commission also pointed out that the term proponent is suddenly used, and wonders if it should be applicant instead.

Staff responded that the duplicate reference can be taken out and that proponent will be changed to applicant.

Commission asked why there is a section that lays out criteria for an applicant to meet when proposing an amendment while there is also a section which states that Council can use any criteria they choose and deny amendments that meet the listed criteria.

Staff responded that the criteria outlined provides the applicant with guidance for preparing an amendment application, while still realizing that meeting the criteria does not guarantee that an amendment will even be considered. Staff reminded the Commission that Comprehensive Plan amendments are not a by right type of application and their approval is at the discretion of the Council.

Commission asked if there are instances where the applicant could help offset the burden on staff resources by allowing them to pay more or hire consultants.

Staff responded that it is in the community’s best interest for staff to review applications as they are more familiar and experienced with the City’s codes, regulations and history.

Commission asked if staff will be creating handouts or other informational guides that will break down the process and timeline of going through the amendment process.

Staff responded that they do plan on creating informational guides for the public.

Commission mentioned that they would like to see the title start with purpose and definitions, as most titles are organized that way and doing so reduces the need to search through the code for definitions.

Staff responded that they agree and will rework the section to have it match the formatting of other titles.

Commission asked staff if applicants can come in for pre-application meetings and when are they available.

Staff responded that any applicant has the ability to request a pre-application meeting and that staff realized during last year’s process that they did not offer pre-applications meetings early in the process. Moving forward, staff plan to begin accepting applications further in advance of the deadline to accommodate pre-application meetings.

Commission asked that staff develop a document or wording within the code that explains to the public what the next steps and timeline are once they apply for an amendment, as it does not seem transparent.

Staff responded that such a document would be better developed outside of the municipal code and that this information is shared with applicants during the application process.

Public Comment: Agenda: (7 Min) 8:00 PM

Michael Seals - 2880 244TH AVE NE
Topic: Title 24 Update

Starke Shelby - 2856 244TH AVE NE
Topic: Title 24 Update

Jolie Imperatori - 745 2ND AVE NW ISSAQUAH
Topic: Title 24 Update

Mary Wictor - 408 208TH AVE NE
Topic: Title 24 Update

Chair Collins motioned to extend the meeting until 8:40 PM, **Approved 6:0**

Paul Stickney - 504 228TH AVE SE
Topic: Title 24 Update

Public Comment Closed

Motion to Adjourn: Vice-Chair Crandall motioned to adjourn; seconded. **Approved 6:0**
Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Chair: Shanna Collins

PC Coordinator: Kevin Johnson

[Video Audio Record 5/18/17](#)

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