

**LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 19, 2012**

Members Present: Councilmembers Stephen Langer, Chair; Jeannine Roe, and Julie Hankins

Staff Present: City Manager Steve Hall, Assistant City Manager Jay Burney, City Attorney Tom Morrell, Community Planning and Development Director Keith Stahley, Downtown Liaison Ruth Snyder, Community Services Manager Steve Friddle, Planning Services Manager Todd Stamm, Senior Planner Cari Hornbein, Rich Hoey Public Works Director

Guests: Amy Tousley, Mike Reid, Jerry Parker, Carol Richmond, Steven Segal, Bob Jacobs

The April 19, 2012 meeting of the Land Use and Environment Committee was called to order by Councilmember Langer at 5:32.

I. Approval of March 29, 2012 LUE Summary

The March 29, 2012 summary minutes were approved as presented.

Councilmember Langer asked to amend the agenda to move Placemaking RFP to the first item.

II. Consideration of the Results of the Placemaking RFQ

Councilmember Langer asked Ruth Snyder to provide an overview of the Placemaking RFP process. Ms. Snyder reviewed a PowerPoint presentation detailed seven locations where Placemaking projects could be proposed. Finding areas to offset parking loss. Cheaper, lighter and quicker. Ms. Snyder presented PowerPoint slides with images of the following locations:

1. Bus stop by Old Town Bikes
2. 5th Ave landscape area
3. 5th Ave in front of sandwich shop
4. 4th Ave in front of Courtyard Antiques
5. Chestnut Street in front of Courtyard Antiques
6. Corner of 5th and Capital Aqua Via landscape island
7. Bulb-out corner of 4th Avenue and Jefferson Street in front of Finders Keepers
8. 4th Avenue and Adams in front of the Bike Stand

Ms. Snyder then reviewed next steps that include sending out RFP to artists and holding another information meeting.

Councilmember Langer asked what the timing was and how the request is being distributed.

Councilmember Roe asked what Council role will be. Ms. Snyder that the PBIA will act as review committee and make recommendations to City Council. Councilmember Roe said she would feel more comfortable if council were involved in the process. Ms. Snyder responded that the PBIA

recommendations would be brought to council for final approval and that she would work with Councilmember Roe to include her in earlier stages of the review process if she were interested.

III. Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update

Ms. Hornbein provided an overview of the process to date. She noted that May 1st is our first meeting on the Council's SMP process and reviewed Attachment 1 the City Council SMP Process.

Councilmember Langer asked whether a public hearing was required? Ms. Hornbein responded that Council may not be required to hold another public hearing.

Councilmember Hankins asked why there will be a staff and a Planning Commission proposal. Ms. Hornbein explained the two versions. Councilmember Hankins asked if it was possible to remand the unresolved questions back to the Planning Commission. Planning Commission Chair Tousley responded that it was possible, however, it would have significant impacts on the Planning Commission's work plan and that composition of the Planning Commission has changed with three new members who have not had the benefit of over two years of exposure to the SMP process.

Councilmember Roe asked will the former Planning Commission members be involved in the May 1st meeting.

Councilmember Roe said she was interested in areas where there was not agreement among the Planning Commission. She said that she was interested in who was present for each item and what their vote was. Councilmember Roe noted that the votes varied from meeting to meeting. Ms. Hornbein responded that the minutes are very clear regarding votes and include who voted for what. Ms. Tousley noted that the matrix would be complex as there were few distinct or consistent voting patterns. She also noted that while there were areas of disagreement there was much that the Planning Commission agreed to.

Councilmember Langer asked staff and the Planning Commission if there were issues that were not dealt with. Ms. Tousley noted that there were split decisions. Ms. Hornbein added that the commission worked hard to find consensus on most issues. There are a few issues that the Planning Commission ran out of time including view protection. It was not voted on, however, it was addressed and discussed by the committee and there is a record for City Council to work with.

Councilmember Roe responded that views will be one of the most crucial decisions to be made.

City Manager Hall added that we will bring Council all of the arguments to weigh what's best for the community.

Ms. Tousley noted that there are very items that you won't some recommendation form of a recommendation although in some cases there may only be a one vote majority.

City Manage Hall added that we recommend that Council hold a public hearing and then follow up with a workshop or workshops to explore the issues that emerge at the public hearing. He felt that the workshop approach would allow the community to move away from simple for and against arguments.

City Attorney Morrill added that there's not a requirement for a public hearing, however, there's been such a long period since the Planning Commission held its public hearing that one is needed. There also have also been a number of changes in the TRPC draft that would need to be addressed. City Attorney Morrill recommended that a workshop might be a way to take some input on the proposal.

Councilmember Langer said that the public should have an opportunity to comment on a single document. Having a workshop might be a way to move towards a common understanding and identify areas of agreement as well as contention. He would like to see some kind of workshop format to present information and integrate different ideas into a single document.

Councilmember Roe asked if anyone from the public would like to weigh in? Carol Richmond likes the idea of both. First do a workshop and then move to public hearing. What is our philosophy? Following that hold a public hearing.

Susan Ahlschwede said that she thought that the workshop would be beneficial. Gus Guethlein recommended using the two forums of a public hearing and a work shop in that it would allow for a variety of input. Rob Ahlschwede noted that there's been a year without public input and that council needs to do more public outreach and take additional public input.

Bob Jacobs noted that council is not equipped to deal with a less than complete project and recommendation. You're going to have a wide range of input. Council is going to get lost if they try and workshop the SMP. He would not even consider this process to finish the plan. He advised the committee to send it back to the Planning Commission.

Mike Reid Port of Olympia recommended doing the workshop and using the Department of Ecology to help to set a baseline of education. He agreed that a public hearing is also needed.

Carol Richmond asked if we will also be taking written comments.

Councilmember Langer summarized: we need both a workshop and public hearing. Concern has been raised about not having one document to respond to. There are issues that the Planning Commission has no recommendation. How can we get to something that is manageable?

Tom Morrill responded that staff is working to pull together the draft and identify the areas of disagreement. There will likely be one document with an addendum and issues noted. He advised that it might not be appropriate to remand the entire SMP to the new Planning Commission.

Councilmember Roe clarified that her intent would be to send only the parts that are not finished back to the Planning Commission. City Attorney Morrill responded that approach would require Planning Commission to start with a public hearing, take testimony and study the issues.

Councilmember Roe said that council doesn't have the time to give it the attention necessary to resolve the issues.

Councilmember Hankins said that there are some areas that need more input. City Attorney Morrill responded that we could try and figure out a way for the new Planning Commission to take those issues up.

Ms. Tousley responded it would be her recommendation to not go back to the Planning Commission. Let's hold the meeting on May 1st and see what's being proposed. She noted that she had concerns about impacts to current work program and the Comp Plan.

Steven Segel asked to comment. Councilmember Langer allowed. Mr. Segel said that he thought it would be appropriate for the new Planning Commission to weigh in. It could be done expeditiously. You want a product that will lead to an intelligent conversation and one that can be approved.

Ms. Tousley requested that should Council decide to remand issues to the Planning Commission that the scope be very narrow and a deadline be established.

Councilmember Langer asked the committee to listen to the Planning Commission on May 1st and perhaps then a better understanding of how to move forward might emerge. He added that we should defer a decision until after the committee has a clearer idea of what the issues are.

III. Community Renewal Area (CRA) Status Report

Mr. Friddle provided the committee with a brief overview of the CRA. He explained that the CRA is another tool for dealing with blight and areas subject to blighting influences in our downtown. He reminded the committee of the process that is required to establish a CRA and that we must identify an area and create a plan. He noted that we must define what are the outcomes that the City would like to see.

He reviewed the RFQ process from 2011 and the council's last experience. At that time, City Council determined that we need an outside consultant to assist us in developing a CRA, creating the plan and assisting in a public participation process. Three consultants were interviewed in 2011 including EconW, NDC and Urbanist. Each would develop a CRA for council's consideration.

Councilmember Langer asked how do we integrate the different pieces? He said that moving forward and selecting the consultant make sense.

Councilmember Roe recommended that the issue be presented to the full council.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50.

Next meeting is scheduled for May 24, 2012 and includes: EDDS Update, Pedestrian Interference Ordinance, Urban Agriculture and if the Committee agrees we could present the final draft of the Downtown Data.