

City of Selah  
Planning Commission Minutes  
of  
July 21, 2015

Selah Council Chambers  
115 W. Naches Ave.  
Selah, Washington 98942

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Quinnell at 5:30 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners: Miller, Quinnell, Torkelson, Smith, and Pendleton.  
Staff Present: Tom Durant consultant, Caprise Groo, Secretary  
Guests: Don Wayman, City Administrator

C. Agenda Changes : None

D. Communications

1. Oral- Chairman Quinnell invited the public to speak of matters that were not on the agenda.

Mr. James Hanna approached the podium. He stated that he was a resident at 181 Lancaster Rd, Selah WA. He stated he understood this was the first reading of 10.24

Chairman Quinnell stated that was on the agenda and they would get to it shortly.

2. Written - None

E. Approval of Minutes

1. March 17, 2015 Minutes

Chairman Quinnell asked for a motion to approve/disapprove the minutes.

Commissioner Torkelson motioned to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

Chairman Quinnell asked for a voice vote. The minutes were approved with a voice vote of 5-0.

F. Public Hearings

1. Old Business - None
2. New Business - None

G. General Business

H.

1. Old Business – None
2. New Business- Revised SMC 10.24 Planned Development Zoning District  
First Draft Study Session

Chairman Quinnell stated that this was the first draft of SMC 10.24 and that it did not involve any current projects. He explained that anyone who wanted to speak would have the opportunity and if you have questions after that, please write them down. (First draft of SMC10.24 attached)

Mr. Wayman stated that written questions would help the process.

Chairman Quinnell opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. James Hanna- 181 Lancaster Rd. He declared that he had read the ordinance and realized a lot of time had gone into it. He stated that it still had vague language that allowed flexibility. He recommended defining major and minor changes, as well as defined height limits.

Commissioner Miller declared that this ordinance would allow for different configurations of housing and that the density was the underlining code.

Mr. Wayman explained that a Planned Development Overlay should not mean rentals. It could be a variety of configurations with high quality neighborhoods.. It would free up open space and allow for different roads. He stated the height would not change

Mr. Durant replied that the height could change.

Mr. Wayman explained that the code permitted 35 feet high and that the impact to the neighbors was considered. He stated that the builder should still be able to be creative in their design.

Commissioner Miller asked if there were parameters.

Mr. Wayman stated that he had considered the quality of life of the neighbors.

Commissioner Miller asked about the 22 foot setback and pedestrian access if the home owner had company. He stated than pedestrians needed to be enabled.

Mr. Durant stated that he had seen 18feet for setbacks.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Durant discusses the set back to the garage.

Mr. Wayman declared that the set back to the garage had to be twenty-two feet.

Commissioner Miller, Smith and Mr. Wayman discussed ADA accessible in community areas.

Commissioner Miller stated that a certain percentage should be ADA.

Chairman Quinnell asked if anyone else wanted to speak.

Mr. Richard Weller-50 Herlou Place. He stated that a side by side comparison would be better to show changes. He asked what a Planned Development Overlay was.

Commissioner Miller explained that the code doesn't always work for every piece of ground. This PDO allows a builder to bring forth ideas and have a guide to lead the way.

Mr. Well asked if the property would need rezone to do this.

Mr. Durant explained that the underlining zone would still apply. A Planned Development relaxed some of the standards and allowed mixed dwellings.

Mr. Wayman explained that a PDO will allow less interpretation and give builders guidance.

Mr. Weller asked if the new rules made it clearer what can and can't be done. He asked if this was a much more prescriptive process. He asked who would determine what was a minor or major change.

Mr. Wayman stated that he didn't anticipate an issue. If it was a minor it would be like a classed II review. If it was a major change the process would have to start over.

Mr. Durant explained that there were criteria for what was a minor modification and it went to the City Administrator for approval/disapproval. A major modification goes to the Hearing Examiner for a recommendation.

Mr. Weller Stated that the criteria was not clear to him.

Commissioner Miller stated this was a first draft

Mr. Weller stated that the blue ink on the document helped and he just skipped to those sections.

Chairman Quinnell asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak.

Ms. Diane Underwood - 402 N 9<sup>th</sup> St, Selah, WA 98942. Stated that she had several concerns, one being 10.24.010b. She stated that it was very vague. She declared that she would make her notes and then turn them into Mr. Durant or Mr. Wayman

Mrs. Shirley Johnson-Hoy asked what kind of protection the public had if they did not like what the developer was doing.

Commissioner Miller stated that there was a hearing process and several steps where the public could state their opinion.

Mrs. Johnson-Hoy stated that it is not in this document.

Commissioner Miller explained that it may not be in this document but it is a multi-step process

Chairman Quinnell thanked Mrs. Johnson-Hoy.

Ms. Underwood - On cherry there was a project and how do we make sure we get notice.

Chairman Quinnell explained that there was a process.

Ms. Underwood stated that she was with in the 600 feet.

Mr. Durant asked about the county treasurer address. He stated he would look to see why she didn't get the notice. He explained the process to Ms. Underwood

-----  
The computer was stuck on printing Q's across the page. Restarted the computer.  
-----

Ms. Underwood stated that planting strips should be trees and grass no rocks.

Ms. Katy Fountaine explained that she was not sure the public could participate. Will there be an opportunity to make comments on the changes. Will there be a minimum size?

Commissioner Smith asked if Ms. Fountaine would write down her questions for the next meeting.

Ms. Fountain agreed.

Dick Graf approached the podium. He asked if it was correct that the density of zone stayed the same. He stated that the South Selah Acre Tracks have islands that have not been developed in the last thirty years. He suggested higher density with specific requirements for compatibility.

Mr. Durant stated that that sounded like a bigger issue than what was being dealt with at this time. He stated that he thought that would be a Comprehensive Plan issue.

Mr. Wayman declared that he might consider special zoning districts that could be recognized by the council to give the builder leeway to build higher quality homes.

Mr. Graf stated that his company dealt with family residential and the people have gone to multi-family residential. He stated that it would be good for the city to have multi-family homes.

Chairman Quinnell asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Unknown Man asked if a study had been done on the impact of increase population on the schools, housing and such. He stated that he had been drawn here by the quality of life and that he would not like it if the quality of life changed for quantity.

Chairman Quinnell asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Commissioner Miller wanted to know if there were any parameters to affordable housing. He stated he did not know the criteria for affordable housing but thought it could help.

Chairman Quinnell asked what was compatible. He stated that there should be criteria for compatibility. He also addressed the percentage for the LDSF.

Mr. Durant asked how to define and 2-family home verses multi-homes.

Mr. Graf asked if he could address the two family housing. He stated that two family was two family dwelling units, and buildings of four or more families was multi-family.

Discussion: 3 or more multi-family.

Commissioner Miller stated that there must be many examples that could be looked at for reference.

Commissioner Smith stated that she agreed that the demographics were changing and more families were living together. More people were taking care of aging parents and a town house or duplex seem to be needed. The need for affordable quality home and multi-family homes also is needed.

Mr. Bill Teaford stated that if they were talking about seniors or ADA the homes needed to be single level.

Ms. Underwood stated that the new thing was mini houses and she would like to see some of them if possible.

Mr. Wayman declared that he and Mr. Durant needed solid guidance to get a clean document for the public and the commission.

Chairman Quinnell suggested they go page by page. He stated that they needed the definition of compatible.

Commissioner Miller requested the definition of Multi-family dwelling.

Mr. Durant asked what duplexes would be.

Mr. Wayman asked what the commission considered compatibility.

Chairman Quinnell stated that it had to look pleasing

Mr. Wayman asked about roof lines and siding.

Commissioner Miller stated that there were many things to look at such as fascias, architecture and setbacks

Chairman Quinnell stated that it would seem like it needed to be a case by case decision.

Mr. Durant asked what they could do to insure compatibility. He stated that it should be defined first. ,

Discussion: zoning.

Conclusion: Side by side zoning differences cannot dictate what a builder can build. R-2 Build to R-2 density. R-1 builds to r-1 density. (example: An existing set of properties in an R-1 zone is directly next to, or bordered by, an R-2 zone where a new PDO might be built)

Discussion: Building heights and setbacks.

Conclusion: to add another paragraph and be more restrictive.

Discussion of 10.24.040 and the percentages of total number of dwelling units in a PDO allowed as buildings designed for two or more dwelling units. (How many units of the total may be built as 'attached.')

Conclusion: 25% for the percentage and a homeowners association will take care of open space.

Mr. Durant stated that where the percentage is it should say 2 or multiple family dwellings.

Mr. Wayman started to discuss page 10.24.050 Planned Development Overlay criteria.

Mr. Durant asked to change 'coherence' to 'compatible' to allow the hearing examiner more leeway.

Mr. Wayman proceeded to 10.24.060 Application Procedure. He stated that 'B' was new to the procedures. He stated that Mr. Graf had suggested that a Q & A and a study session with the council.

Discussion ensued

Conclusion: Question Bob Noe on public hearings and study sessions.

Mr. Durant stated that some of the stuff needs to defer to title 21 for notice requirements.

Mr. Durant addressed 10.24.070 and establishing during the pre-application process what documents need to be provided.

Mr. Torkelson stated that the planned development is pretty detailed on what is to be built

Mr. Wayman suggested a check list for 10.24.070.

Mr. Durant stated that the check list be determined at the pre-application meeting.

Discussion: what does a project need?

Conclusion: each is different and not all the paper work is needed for every Planned Development.

Mr. Wayman directed everyone to page 7. He stated that every developer needed a project description and detailed information concerning the items listed below. Then he proceeded to 10.24.080 Hearing Examiner Recommendations.

Mr. Durant stated that the wording should be no later than 10 business and parties of record

Mr. Wayman proceeded to page 8 Development Standards.

Mr. Durant asked for clarification of sidewalks and curbs.

Mr. Wayman stated that all developments would have sidewalks.

Discussion ensued over planting strips, gutters and sidewalks.

Conclusion: do not include planting strips and add to setbacks.

Mr. Wayman proceeded to page 9. He explained that he is currently dealing with the sentence "Planned development densities shall not be used as criteria to judge compatibility with adjacent uses and properties."

Discussion on fences ensued.

Conclusion: not to require fences.

Mr. Wayman asked if everyone was good with the diagrams of open space. He explained about the words he left in bold lettering. He asked if 15 percent was a good number.

Discussion: What is a good number for open space?

Conclusion: 200 square feet per living unit.

Mr. Durant stated that they may need to define open space.

Discussion: what is considered open space?

Conclusion: read and strike out what Commissioners don't want.

Mr. Wayman proceeded to 10.24.120 roads and parking. He stated that one of the biggest issues is parking

Discussion: Not enough Parking at this time.

Conclusion: High standards for planned developments.

Mr. Wayman directed everyone to the pictures of the street designs on pages 16 and 17.

Discussion: how far back should the setback be?

Conclusion: minimum setback 22 feet from home side of sidewalk to garage?

Mr. Miller requested no 20 foot streets.

Discussion: street width.

Conclusion: Various sizes various street sizes.

Mr. Wayman referred to Part C. on Page 15. He stated he did not refer to hammer heads and cul de sacs.

Discussion: Should these be excluded or not.

Conclusion: Think about it and discuss at next meeting

Mr. Wayman asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Durant stated that he had scheduled a public hearing for the 4 of August.

Mr. Wayman stated that at the end of the next meeting he hoped that this could be complete.

Discussion: hearing and public opinion.

Conclusion: need another study session.

Mr. Dick Weller highly recommended clear definitions that are separate from this document.

Mr. Durant stated that the minutes from the last meeting and the findings were attached.

Ms. Underwood suggested graduating the zoning.

H. Reports/Announcements

1. Chairman
2. Commissioners
3. Staff

I. Adjournment

Commissioner Miller motioned to adjourn the meeting, Commissioner Torkelson seconded the motion. Chairman Quinnell adjourned the meeting at 7:47 pm with a voice vote of 5-0.



---

Chairman