

# Spokane Plan Commission

June 13, 2018

## Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Commissioner Dellwo

### Attendance:

- Commission Members Present: Commissioner Dellwo -President; Commissioner Dietzman, Commissioner Baker; Commissioner Francis; Commissioner St. Clair St. Clair St. Clair; Commissioner Batten; Commissioner Kienholz; Commissioner Shook.
- Commission Members Absent: Commissioner Diana Painter; Councilmember Lori Kinnear - City Council Liaison; Community Assembly Liaison (TBD).
- Quorum met.
- Staff Members Present: Heather Trautman - Planning Director; Jacqui Halvorson - Clerk.

### Public Comment Period:

- **Katheryn Alexander from the Bemiss Neighborhood.** Asked why the public can't comment on topics that are on the agenda? We then cannot impact your thinking while you are making a decision, which makes it very non-participatory. She also noted Commissioners are hard to contact.
  - Commissioner Dellwo noted that anyone can send their thoughts by writing and email.
  - Heather noted that you can send comments to support staff or the PC secretary. We welcome any comments from the public. We will provide that contact information in the PC packets when it is available. Public Hearings are noticed in the Spokesman and Gazette and are set-up for public comment. Commissioner Dietzman suggested calling 311, which is very easy to use.

### Commission Briefing Session:

#### 1. Approve May 23, 2018 meeting minutes.

Commissioner Dietzman entertained a motion to approve the May 9 minutes.

Commissioner Baker made a motion to approve the May 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes; Commissioner St. Clair seconded. Minutes approved 6/1 abstention.

#### 2. City Council Liaison Report: Councilmember Kinnear (absent).

No Report.

#### 3. Community Assembly Liaison Report: Commissioner Francis gave a status report. (*CA Liaison position is currently vacant and in the recruiting process.*)

- a. Commissioner Francis noted that Nathan Gwinn gave a presentation on infill housing. The conversation focused on wall heights going from the 30-35 foot and potentially raising the roof height above that; there were concerns were about the space above 35-feet as being usable space; will that drive-up roof heights over time?
- b. Next week the Land Use Committee is meeting and will have a continued discussion about the DTC-100 Building Heights amendment.

#### 4. President Report:

No report.

#### 5. Transportation Sub-Committee Report: Commissioner Dietzman

- a. Commissioner Dietzman noted that the next PCTS meeting has been deferred to July 10<sup>th</sup>, to accommodate the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday schedule.

#### 6. Secretary Report: Heather Trautman.

- a. Heather talked about the Infill package, and that based on the last workshop presented by Nathan Gwinn, there were some slight edits, including suggestions by Commissioner Francis to touch base with the public and committee about consideration of a “true third floor”, as well as allowance for additional roof height to allow for pitch to be one of the options on the roof form, and how to deal with that space. That pushed out the Infill ordinance from a workshop today, and will be looking at a proposed ordinance on June 27<sup>th</sup>. That would allow for a public hearing on lot-size and width, roof form, and parking considerations to go forth for a July 11<sup>th</sup> hearing. Heather indicated that Nathan would have to notice the same day the Commission is considering the Infill draft; and asked if the Plan Commission was comfortable with this. Commissioner Francis said he feels the Commission has spent enough time on this topic that they are comfortable with this schedule, and the other Commissioners agreed.

## **7. Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment - Shauna Harshman**

Shauna presented a PowerPoint, along with handouts, on text amendments for Comprehensive Plan Chapter 2, (the new chapter). She noted that:

- One applicant has withdrawn one of the text amendments.
- We amend the Comprehensive Plan once a year.
- The amendment review process and procedures are outlined in RCW36.70A and SMC 17G.
- No comments to date.
- Amendments are procedural in nature so exempt from SEPA review.
  - Commissioner Dietzman asked if the Strategic Plan is part of the Comprehensive Plan now. Shauna told the commissioner she would follow-up with an answer to his question, but noted we may follow the same path as other documents and simply reference the Strategic Plan in the Comp Plan.
  - He asked if we received any public comments on any of the other Comprehensive Plan text amendments. Only one comment about the lack of housing in the City of Spokane.
  - Public comment on the text amendments is open through July 27<sup>th</sup>.

## **Workshops:**

### **1. Continued Discussion of the DTC-100 Building Height Motion - Kevin Freibott**

Commissioner Dellwo indicated that, Heather Trautman, Kevin Freibott and himself had met to determine how to handle this topic expeditiously. Commissioner Beyreuther is in Pullman meeting with the Governor so was unable to be here today, although Commissioner Dellwo provided options of what the Commission can consider for today’s motion based on that discussion.

Kevin reviewed the options through a PowerPoint presentation:

Column A: Is the motion as it now stands.

Column B: Is the motion that the Commission approved May 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Column C: Represents the concept the performance-based option that Commissioner Beyreuther presented.

Commissioner Dellwo provided more detail on the performance-based option that Commissioner Beyreuther had provided, which means that if you want to do something different with your property - taller, wider, etc., then you might be able to do that under certain criteria, e.g. provide low-income housing, or aesthetics that are more desirable. This would be defined through workshops the Commission committee would engage in this year, simultaneous with the Design Review process.

He noted that his concern is that we don’t need to do this design deviation process (Option C), just for a few properties along Spokane Falls Blvd, but that we could do this for the entire city, which would be an option available to the downtown area, so that if there is someone who wants to vary from the existing code, they could make a proposal and it could be considered under certain criteria.

Commissioner Beyreuther did provide some material that would explain what he has in mind for Option C. What we have now is more prescriptive criterion. The approach he is suggesting is more progressive; where you consider the various options that a developer can perform and then provide a means to make that change. His approach can be handled by a *deviation* process.

Kevin provided some explanation of this process, where the Design Review Board makes an evaluated decision on a project based on certain criteria. He noted that what currently exists in the code is different than what Commissioner Beyreuther is envisioning.

Commissioner Dellwo reviewed what the Commission could vote on today:

- A. Reconsider the vote that we have taken already and make some changes, then proceed with a recommendation to the City Council.
- B. Recommend as-is to the City Council, what we passed on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, with a commitment that we are going to go through this process of design departures.
- C. Commissioner Dellwo sends a letter to the City Council letting them know that certain changes could be made to this proposal that wouldn't have a detrimental effect on the motion. We can all provide our own letters to the City Council letting them know how we feel about the original motion, etc.

Commissioner Dellwo opened the meeting for Commission discussion:

**Commissioner St. Clair:** Our recommendation is that they consider this motion for those two lots; we have received so many comments that the public does not want this. This is an important location to the City's future, across from the park.

**Commissioner Francis:** I have a concern making a motion today; we need everyone present. This will impact the City for many years ahead.

**Heather:** If you go ahead with the May 23<sup>rd</sup> recommendation approving findings at the next meeting - or, to discuss the parameters of the resolution of what the Plan Commission wants to do as far as commitment to investigating and creating a design deviation process as part of the design guidelines and the Downtown Development Code update (that will be done late this year and into 2019); at the next meeting you could scope out what this process will be based on Option C.

**Commissioner Dellwo:** Suggested that the Commission push this forward two weeks so the entire Commission can make a decision of what approach we should take.

**Commissioner St. Clair:** If we go with Option B, we should attach Commissioner Beyreuther's comments. People don't want a monolith across from the park; Option B would allow a huge monolith. People want to see the park.

**Heather:** Individuals can send letters with their comments to City Council.

**Kevin:** Revisit Option B or review Commissioner Beyreuther's Option C.

**Commissioner Shook:** through the community and letters we've received, people like the ordinance the way it is and don't want a change. I was influenced by the business group comments at the May 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting; I am glad we have a chance to reconsider our vote. We must think about what we are allowing in this City in the future. How do we preserve the beauty of the City and what the public wants?

**Commissioner Baker:** The reason we recommended Option B to the Commission was because A was not economically viable; and B is. The option must work out financially.

**Commissioner Batten:** If we don't move forward with B then we must default to A. B was well-thought-out by the Committee. We opted for 'boots on the ground' and no more parking lots - which is what the people want. We need to move the conversation forward to when Commissioner Beyreuther is here so he can explain what he is suggesting, so that all of us are comfortable with what we are voting on. To do what Commissioner Beyreuther is suggesting will work but will take some time. Council kicked this back to us due to lack of clarity.

**Commissioner Dietzman** agrees with Commissioner Batten. Go ahead and approve conclusions we approved earlier with the 18,750 sf floor plate, 50-foot separation, no height limit, and would be economically viable, and send this on to the City Council; then Commissioners can send individual letters, and we can also forward Commissioner Beyreuther recommendations. This is a highly prescriptive approach and is highly restrictive. Commissioner Beyreuther's option relieves some of those restrictions to design options. Option B doesn't have too many restrictions. I'm not sure if the design deviation option C is going to be that much different.

**Commissioner Francis** agrees with Commissioners Batten and Dietzman: I don't want to spin our wheels. There has been no progress in the last month on this. I have concerns about what we voted on and approved on May 23rd.

**Commissioner Kienholz** wants to wait for Commissioner Beyreuther and noted that it's our job to make a decision - that is what we, as Commissioners should be doing - not to write a bunch of letters with our opinions.

**Commissioner Batten** noted that the material that Commissioner Beyreuther has submitted to date is not enough to make a decision.

**Call the question: Motion: To table the DTC-100 topic until the Plan Commission meeting on June 27th.**

**Moved:** Commissioner Kienholz. **Second:** Commissioner Baker. **Roll Call: Motion Passed 5 yea/2 nay/1 abstention.**

Commissioner Beyreuther will provide a clear idea of what he wants us to consider. It will not include the details that will need to be researched over several meetings this summer.

**Commissioner Batten** wanted to confirm that what we will come out of at the next meeting is that we will proceed with the recommendation that we already gave in Option B, with the idea that we will follow up at a later date with the societal, environmental, and economic development provisions, and take the time to define and clarify those items, and tag that on down the road?

- Commissioner Dellwo said, yes - but this approach doesn't solve Commissioner St. Clair's concerns, but it is what Commissioner Beyreuther is suggesting.
- then said, to your point then we should not expect any in-depth dive prior to the next meeting, but to further develop that process.
- Commissioner Dellwo said Commissioner Beyreuther will come back with more details of what we are looking for, and then we could go with the way Commissioner Batten is seeing this, or reconsider for small changes to Option B, or just send our own messages.

#### **1) Member Items of Interest/Requests for Future Agenda**

- **Commissioner Francis:** Getting back to Katheryn Alexander's concern as mentioned at the beginning of this meeting, is it possible, on the Plan Commission web page, to have a submission form or email address for the public to make a comment that is then forwarded to the Planning office and then distributed to the Commission?
  - Heather noted that she has already acted on this, and will find a way to get the information out to the public.
- **Commissioner Kienholz** indicated that she attended the Affordable Housing and Real Estate Portfolio Committee Meeting yesterday and there was comment about a miscommunication between City staff and City Council; it concerned her because there seemed to be a consensus that there should be more communication between the AHREP Committee and City Council, specifically the staff experts that are in CHHS. We need to be thinking more about this citywide, and what we are doing about affordable housing and needs related to housing.
  - Heather noted that the City is currently n creating a landing web page for all housing information that will be located on a single page. CHHS and Nate Gwinn are working on this project.

Adjourned: 3:12