



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Virtual Zoom Meeting

June 7, 2021 6:30pm

Zoom Link not yet created

Telephonically: 253-215-8782 Meeting ID: Passcode: 98328

PLEASE MAKE NOTE OF MEETING START TIME CHANGE.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ATTENDANCE

a. COMMISSION MEMBERS

Position	Commissioner	Present	Absent
#1	Jodi Rivera		
#2	Kyle Litzenberger		
#3	Judy Justice		
#4	David Baublits		
#5	Daniel Adams		
EX-OFFICIO	Mike Schaub (Mayor)		

b. TOWN STAFF

c. ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL REQUESTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION

☐ Town Administrator

☐ Town Planner

☐ Town Attorney

☐ Secretary

☐ Other(s): _____

3. PLEDGE OF ALLIGIANCE

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. May 17, 2021

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS-SUBMITTED IN WRITING

7. NEW BUSINESS-NONE

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS-NONE

- a. EMC Chapter 18.04-District Regulations review
- b. EMC Chapter 18.08-Accessory Dwelling Unit review

9. STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

10. ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT

Eatonville Planning Commission

Bi-weekly Report to the Town Council



5/17/2021

To: Town Council

From: Daniel Adams, Chairman

General

The meeting went efficiently. We got through our agenda items.

Current Tasks

1. EMC Chapter 18.04-District Regulations review

We are researching as a group other municipalities how structures and site coverage are defined and applied regarding district regulations and zoning. Some clarification is needed to make it easier for applicants and the general citizenry to understand and how it can apply to them as well.

2. EMC Chapter 18.08-Accessory Dwelling Unit review

We discussed this topic at length. Staff is coming back to us with new language in the code to reflect the need for more affordable housing in Eatonville which is mainly what the conversation revolved around.

I request the same items for our next possible meeting since Monday, May 31st is a holiday. Please see below for my letter I promised to you for your council pack for our Chapter 19 to you.

Thank you and I will be at the meeting this next week if you have any questions for me.

Humbly,

Daniel Adams

Chairman Eatonville Planning Commission

Dear Council,

Eatonville should remove Chapter 19 from the code because the current code is too restrictive, subjective and historically not easy to work with. In many ways it's harder and more expensive for applicants to get a project finished.

Many of the problems surrounding citizens' abilities to get their permits currently revolves around Chapter 19. This chapter increases review costs, unnecessary staff attention and the time needed to fix proposals, only to have them reviewed again by staff, which takes more time and more money out of the pockets of the citizens and leaves even less time for staff to work on other projects. During our work on Chapter 19 over the last few years, we realized the draft changes such as removing some of the most restrictive made us realize that we would still be keeping many pieces of the chapter that would continue to make projects difficult for commercial or residential in the future because nearly all of it is too prescriptive.

After discussing where we stood on our work with the design standards, we decided to look into what other towns our size are doing right now for their design standards and were tasked to come back next time with ideas and text we could compare to and possibly use for Eatonville. At the next meeting everyone had brought back something to share from multiple municipalities with populations near the size of Eatonville. In short, we found that many of these similar towns had much different design standards than Eatonville currently has. That is to say, next to nothing and if they did, they related to health and safety, road, and sewer construction standards (building codes such as the IBC).

Only a couple towns have more than that but they are still much leaner than ours and they talk about commercial development in a situation unique to that municipality, namely Buckley. That town has a very homogeneous and historical downtown. All of this led to discussions about whether or not we even needed to continue to pair down our own Design Standards or to do what many towns our size have done; not have them at all.

We voted to remove the chapter to make the lives of the citizens and staff easier. These standards weren't even fully written from scratch for the town and its needs. They were pulled from another municipality altogether and barely edited for Eatonville. Adopting them was a knee-jerk reaction. This chapter was created to deal with a single potential development that never even materialized. It was so situational that it hurts more than it helps projects after it's adoption. So, in the intervening years, this code that doesn't even fit the town's needs was left largely the way it was without any meaningful changes for over eight years.

Hence why staff finally brought it to us in 2018. They saw changes needing to happen as well and were frustrated along with applicants.

It is no wonder why the commission took so long hemming and hawing over the design standards review during the first two years of work on it. We could find no commonalities with the unique circumstances in Eatonville to the code we are mandated to follow and meetings were filled with silence, awkwardness, and it became a matter of the blind leading the blind because nothing really fits with our town's needs. Please see below for what we found from other municipalities:

No Design Guidelines	Engineering/IBC Only	Actual Design Guidelines	Notes about column to the left
Goldendale	Algona	Black Diamond	Trimmed down versus Eatonville, very light on requirements with only multi-use and residential being talked about
Friday Harbor	Zillah	Medina	Only site coverage and height restrictions
Elma	-	Raymond	Limited, only Planned Unit Developments
Benton City	-	Warden	Street focused, curbs, sewer, engineering; basic
Kalama	-	Buckley	Buckley has a historical and uniform downtown district with character in its core. Also has multi family but has no SFR at all in its code.

As you can see, and you can research for yourself, many municipalities with a size near Eatonville have very limited subjective design standards and for good reason. They want growth and development, and based on what we have read, they are trying to make it easy for applicants to get projects permitted and finished. This same philosophy should be how Eatonville sees its growth in the future, not restrictive or subjective. The council should act on our recommendation as soon as possible. Town staff jobs would be made easier and applicants will see results in a more efficient manner. As seen in the table above, many other towns make it work, why not us?

Signed, Daniel Adams, Chair Eatonville Planning Commission