



## MINUTES

PLANNING POLICY COMMISSION  
6:30 p.m. – Thursday, June 20, 2024

---

### 1. Call to Order

The hybrid meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by CHAIR VOISS.

Commissioners Present: Chair Voiss, Vice-Chair Bader, Commissioners Kennedy, Milligan (Virtual), Patterson, and Zakharoff (Alt)

Absent: Commissioners Krass, Altimore and Esemuede (Excused)

Staff Present: Minnie Dhaliwal, Community Planning & Development (CPD) Director  
Amanda Jackson, Meeting & Records Assistant  
Stephen Padua, Long Range Planning Manager

### 2. Approval of Minutes

a) Minutes of March 28, 2024

There were no comments or corrections and the Minutes were approved.

b) Minutes of April 11, 2024

There were no comments or corrections and the Minutes were approved.

### 3. Public Comments (General)

There were no requests to speak.

### 3. Regular Business (00:03)

a) Chair and Vice-Chair Elections (A)

CHAIR VOISS presented the Election Process.

VICE-CHAIR BADER nominated Jason Voiss for Chair. COMMISSIONER PATTERSON seconded the nomination. There were no further nominations. CHAIR VOISS accepted the position.

## 6-20-24 Planning Policy Commission Meeting Minutes

COMMISSIONER PATTERSON nominated Sara Bader for Vice-Chair. CHAIR VOISS seconded the nomination. There were no further nominations. VICE-CHAIR BADER accepted the position.

b) **Rules and Regulations Review (A) (00:05)**

CHAIR VOISS presented the Review Process.

There were no amendments and the 2023 Rules and Regulations will continue.

c) **Annual Updates to Title 18 Land Use Code - Phase 1 (D) (00:06)**

*Presented by:*

*Stephen Padua, Long Range Planning Manager*

CHAIR VOISS stated that strengthening language and understanding is occurring at this meeting, and continued deliberations would occur following the Public Hearing at the next meeting.

Padua began the presentation.

VICE-CHAIR BADER asked if a timeline starts pre-application, and Padua replied that the timeline starts with the submittal of the application. VICE-CHAIR BADER asked how a community meeting held pre-application would impact a timeline for compliance. Dhaliwal replied that the recently passed House Bill mandates timelines as well as mandating money refunded if the timeline is not met. An option is that pre-application be optional. The process was described. VICE-CHAIR BADER asked if there is still a space for community feedback and Dhaliwal replied that applicants have expressed that early community feedback is desired to inform design. VICE-CHAIR BADER asked if community meetings have historically been well attended, particularly at level four, and Dhaliwal replied yes, depending on the project and neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if permission to not refund if the time permitting process is not compliant is being asked for, a reason there may not be a community pre-application conference. Dhaliwal replied that this is one of the reasons but that there are more.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked how eliminating a community pre-application conference would be better for developers. Dhaliwal replied that feedback will still be received early in the design process, and that community meetings take 30 days to arrange, in example, mailing notices, and some projects will have to count those 30 days in the overall 60-day time period, half of the review time. Under the House Bill, the city is not being given the option to extend the timelines.

VICE-CHAIR BADER asked for clarification regarding the alternative to make the community pre-application meeting optional and making the post-application meeting required or optional. Padua replied to make the post-application meeting a requirement.

## 6-20-24 Planning Policy Commission Meeting Minutes

Padua continued the presentation with the Technical Document Requirement. (00:22)

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked for clarification regarding interdependencies within an application. Padua replied that for Technical Document review, the applicant could conduct a technical review process prior to submitting a full application, a more formal process including staff. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if all reports such as Critical Areas, Land Slide Hazard or Geotechnical will be conducted at the same time and still be considered together. Dhaliwal replied that the choice to obtain any or all reports early is up to the applicant to inform site design. CHAIR VOISS asked for clarification that the developer is given more flexibility and feasibility, and Dhaliwal replied correct, if early guidance is desired.

Padua continued the presentation. (00:30)

COMMISSIONER ZAKHAROFF asked for clarification regarding noise from HVAC units. Padua replied that the state regulates noise and the Department of Ecology requires 90-day notice for changes to the regulation.

VICE-CHAIR BADER asked for clarification regarding placement of noise making units. Dhaliwal replied that Homeowner Associations (HOA) are involved, and that language can be added that developers make the best effort to avoid installing noise making units where these may disturb other property owners. The Department of Ecology adopted noise level is 55 decibels (db) during the day and 45 db at night.

CHAIR VOISS stated that presenting different scenarios will be helpful to illustrate situations at the next meeting and that screening options for aesthetics could be included. Dhaliwal replied that heat pumps require air drawn in, and that heat pump screening may be complicated as a result. Side and back yard opportunities must be exhausted before considering front yard placement.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if the purpose of a setback is for safety requirements, if allowing placement of a heat pump in a setback defeats the purpose of a setback, and what other cooling devices could be installed internally. Dhaliwal replied that a setback is generally for fire separation from fire code, and that the Fire Department has expressed that a heat pump in a setback is not of concern. The last question will be addressed at the next meeting.

Dhaliwal asked Commissioners to summarize what staff should bring back. CHAIR VOISS stated front yard aesthetics, safety, and options. Padua reiterated the question of VICE-CHAIR BADER regarding inclusion of language around minimizing impacts on neighbors.

Padua continued the presentation with Lighting Code. (00:47)

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked for clarification regarding complying with Dark Sky standards and lighting playfields. Padua replied that with added language requiring a lighting study, impacts and mitigations are addressed. Dhaliwal replied that a standard is hardwired that the market does not deliver, but lighting levels can be met with alternatives already in

## 6-20-24 Planning Policy Commission Meeting Minutes

code. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if the Dark Sky standard will still be needed if stadium lighting is allowed to exceed minimum Color Rendering Index (CRI) and Dhaliwal replied yes but can confirm at the next meeting.

VICE-CHAIR BADER asked if language can be added to strengthen Dark Sky standards, and if there is a maximum allowed unit of measurement. Padua replied that an answer can be brought to the next meeting.

CHAIR VOISS asked if manufacturers are examining bringing units down. Padua replied no, that for stadium lighting, manufacturing lower stadium lighting does not meet the purpose of stadium lighting.

Padua continued the presentation with Monument Signage requirements. (00:53)

VICE-CHAIR BADER asked for the definition of a Monument Sign. Dhaliwal replied that the definition can be looked up, but essentially a free-standing sign not attached to a building.

Padua continued the presentation with Landmark Signage requirements. (00:56)

CHAIR VOISS asked if there is a plan for the Triple XXX Root Beer Drive-In sign, and Padua replied that Burgermaster hopes to keep the sign, but criteria requires that the sign not be changed. Allowing for more flexibility over time while keeping some criteria is the goal of staff.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if another Commission would be asked for feedback regarding the Landmark code update such as Arts. Padua replied that there are separate criteria to establish the designation, historical and importance to the community. Changes are proposed to how to maintain the established designation over time, the purview of the Planning Policy Commission. Dhaliwal replied that the provision is not heavily used and community feedback can be solicited. A criteria is that a Landmark sign will exist for 40 years but the life span of most signage is less. Value to the community is considered.

COMMISSIONER PATTERSON asked if the change to Landmark code is overly relaxed, no guidance to aesthetic, and suggested a middle ground beyond size and shape.

Padua continued the presentation with tree removal tracking on public property. (01:03)

COMMISSIONER PATTERSON asked if there is a requirement for Parks and Public Works to track. Padua replied not currently a requirement. Dhaliwal replied that Parks and Public Works coordinate with an Urban Forester on staff.

COMMISSIONER ZAKHAROFF asked if an agreement could be reached between the Planning Commission and Parks to ensure a tracking requirement is in code. Padua replied that tracking by Parks will not stop due to the importance.

## 6-20-24 Planning Policy Commission Meeting Minutes

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if either department regulates tree removal, aside from tracking, and how to manage a community concern regarding limiting tree removal. Padua replied that tree regulations in Title 18 provide limits on tree removal. Dhaliwal replied that there is only a reporting requirement and exemptions for trees in public Right-of-Way. Removing trees costs money, and are only removed if diseased, dying, or for a capital project. Community discussions are associated with capital projects. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN stated understanding the process for now.

Padua continued the presentation with language within Traffic Impact Fees. (01:11)

VICE-CHAIR BADER stated the theory is good but language still leaves room for interpretation and asked if language can be better defined. Padua replied yes.

COMMISSIONER PATTERSON asked if an example of a change of use scenario could be provided, and Padua replied with how a vacated commercial property which becomes a residential property would be handled in the proposed change, eliminating an exemption.

Padua concluded the presentation with Park Impact Fees. (01:14)

CHAIR VOISS stated that the Public Hearing and further discussion would be held next week and asked the Commissioners for any questions and concerns at this time.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY asked if there is another option for electronic communication, 18.204.070, Application Completeness, Padua asked if the question was if the property owners can choose, and COMMISSIONER KENNEDY replied the applicant to choose and asked how homeowners will know communication has been sent and by which mode. Padua replied that some notification systems have communication preferences of the people requesting to be a part of the process, and otherwise communication is set up by the city for the project. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY asked what other electronic communication methods could be utilized and Padua replied that communication methods in the future are not known and email and social media are the electronic options at this time. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY stated liking the flexibility but wanting to be sure the process is clear to the public. Padua replied that because of changing technology, the term *electronic communication* is used rather than specific methods.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN stated that with a completeness requirement, to not be specific could result in a challenge on what is deemed effective electronic communication and asked for further research.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked if 18.404.050, Determining Average Grade, will interfere with control of building height. Dhaliwal asked if the question was if methodology could be manipulated to create a taller building, and COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN replied yes. Dhaliwal replied that average grade point would need to be calculated all along the perimeter of the building so that manipulation of average grade is more difficult, looking at all sides of the building. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked for clarification regarding the term *proposed*

## 6-20-24 Planning Policy Commission Meeting Minutes

*topography*. Dhaliwal replied that existing grade and not finished grade is used, and that the term will be examined.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked for clarification regarding amenities and the property line, 18.508.030. Padua asked if the question was specific to heat pumps or decks.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN replied that code language removed line four. Dhaliwal replied that heat pumps are amenities and not structure. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked what besides heat pumps are considered amenities that now would not need to be five feet from a property line. Dhaliwal replied that the section earlier defines, and Padua replied that accessory structures are defined earlier in 030. COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN asked where amenities are defined and stated that the question could be researched and answered at the next meeting. Dhaliwal replied that in 508.030.82, permanent amenities are mechanical equipment including but not limited to A/C units, air compressors and heat pumps. Decks, porches, patios and ramps are not amenities.

CHAIR VOISS asked if Commissioners had questions or concerns regarding minor amendments. Padua stated having feedback needed.

## 5. Reports

### a) Council Update (01:27)

Dhaliwal stated that on June 10, 2024, 12 Permit Process Improvement recommendations from a consultant were shared with Council. Upcoming meetings will include a transfer of development rights, and the Comprehensive Plan with missing middle.

## 6. Other Business/Announcements

### a) Upcoming Schedule

Padua stated that the Commission Calendar has been updated.

COMMISSIONER MILLIGAN thanked the Commission and staff for allowing hybrid participation.

## 7. Adjournment

CHAIR VOISS adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Garza, LLC  
Recording Secretary