

nearby land. Stated he is pursuing ownership of the property to the south, and the owner of a multi-family residential development to the east has expressed interest in a rezone of his land from C3 to residential. Adding these properties to the subject parcel in a larger residential rezone would result in a finger of residential zoning adjacent to a commercial district rather than an island of residential zoning. Provided a map showing the adjacent properties about which he spoke.

DICKINSON

Entered into the record a location and zoning map of subject property with adjacent properties marked, submitted by Jon Booker, as Exhibit No. 2.

Scott Finch
150 NW Harold
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that he is a proponent. Questioned how much of the Zone Change Application would have to be re-submitted to include the land that is now for sale. Has owned his property for 5 to 6 years. The house was moved from WSU in 1963. Stated that he has buffer zones with the surrounding businesses and provided photos. The commercial properties around his property have been no problem. He did not realize the property was zoned C3 until after it was purchased and he tried to get financing from a bank.

DICKINSON

Entered into the record photos of subject area, submitted by Scott Finch as Exhibit Nos. 3a, 3b, and 3c.

Willo Street
105 NW Old Wawawai Road
Pullman, WA 99163

Provided a map of Felsted Storage Short Plat No. 2 and Frank Street Short Plat. Stated that she is concerned with the amount of commercially zoned property adjacent to Sunnyside Park. Feels that this proposal would provide a better buffer to the surrounding properties. She has lived in the house since 1963.

DICKINSON

Entered into the record the map of Felsted Storage Short Plat No. 2 and Frank Street Short Plat, submitted by Willo Street, as Exhibit No. 4.

George Kunkel
315 NW Dillon
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that he is speaking on behalf of Pullman Mini Storage. He handed out photos of the subject property area. He is concerned about the proposed zone change as a commercial property owner. He has received complaints from residential property owners about noise in the past. Stated that Harold and Effie Drives are not wide enough to accommodate commercial truck traffic when there are vehicles parked on the streets by residents in the area. Recommends the C3 zoning be retained to prevent future conflict.

DICKINSON

Entered into the record photos of subject property area, submitted by George Kunkel, as Exhibit Nos. 5a – 5i.

GARL

Called for neutral parties; no response.

Called for proponents.

Scott Finch
150 NW Harold
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that truck traffic is light and the noise issue has not been a problem for him. He is the only house on Harold and Effie Drive. His driveway will hold six cars, so street parking is not an issue for his residence.

Jon Booker
105 NW Old Wawawai Road
Pullman, WA 99163

In response to a Planning Commission question, he stated that an R2 zone change has been suggested instead of an R1 zone change because the property to the south of the subject property is already R2.

GARL

Called for opponents; no response.

Closed public input.

DISCUSSION

Gibney stated that the property was pre-zoned by the city in 1987 to C3 prior to annexation.

Shannon stated that he is resistant to re-zoning the subject property to R2.

Anderson stated that this is a difficult decision, but the subject property should stay C3.

Alred stated that she is disinclined to reduce the size of the existing C3 zone.

Wendle stated that even though there is no conflict now between the property owners of the houses and the commercial developments, it does not mean that it will always stay that way.

Garl stated that he feels it should stay C3. If the Zone Change Application was to come back with the additional land added, there would be no pre-judgment.

MOTION

Anderson moved to accept Findings of Facts Nos. 1-16 for Resolution No. PC-2010-7 as prepared by staff. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

MOTION

Anderson moved to add as Finding of Fact No. 13 language from the applicants' proposed findings related to nonconforming regulations and their inability to obtain financing for residential improvements, and adjust other Finding of Fact numbers accordingly. Seconded by Shannon and passed unanimously.

MOTION Anderson moved to add as Finding of Fact No. 18 language from the applicants' findings regarding the suitability of the subject property for residential uses. Seconded by Shannon and passed unanimously.

ANDERSON Suggested that draft conclusion No. 7 should state "prezone" rather than "zoning."

MOTION Shannon moved to accept staff's draft Conclusion Nos. 1-9 for Resolution No. PC-2010-7 as amended by Anderson. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

MOTION Wendle moved that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map designation amendment be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation for denial. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

MOTION Gibney moved to accept Finding of Fact Nos. 1-18 for Resolution No. PC-2010-8 as prepared by staff and revised by the Commission, for resolution No. PC-2010-7. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

MOTION Shannon moved to accept Conclusion Nos. 1-9 for Resolution No. PC-2010-8 as prepared by staff, with the amendment to No. 7 suggested by Anderson. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

MOTION Wendle moved that the proposed zoning classification revision be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation for denial. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

REGULAR BUSINESS
Conduct a discussion regarding the formulation of draft design standards for the College Hill Core neighborhood.
Dickinson stated that at the meeting of July 28, 2010, the Commission conducted a public discussion about potential objectives for the design review standards proposed for the College Hill Core. From that meeting staff has generated a series of questions to assist the Commission in providing direction regarding the formulation of the design standards.

DISCUSSION Question No. 1: What problems are we trying to solve?
Gibney – Design standards will not properly address property maintenance or vandalism. The design standards should also be for city owned buildings.

Anderson – Design standards cannot regulate what is attractive or unattractive on a structure.

Question No. 2: What purposes will design standards serve?
Gibney and Anderson – Design standards should enhance land use compatibility.

Alred, Shannon and Crow – Design standards should preserve the historic integrity of the neighborhood; improve the appearance of the area; and enhance the land use compatibility.

Question No. 3: What aspects of the built environment should be addressed?

Shannon – Stated that he feels it is too early in the process to address this now.

Gibney – Stated if the word “should” was changed to “could,” then it would be appropriate to address all aspects.

Question No. 4: To What types of development should design standards apply?

The Commission agreed that design standards should apply to single family homes, duplexes, multi-family residences, Greek houses, churches, and businesses.

Question No. 5: What property owner actions should trigger design review?

The Commission agreed that this question should be left to staff.

Question No. 6: Should different parts of College Hill have different standards?

Garl – Maybe be left as an open question until the process of creating the draft standards takes shape.

Crow – Maybe have the Certified Local Government (CLG) ad hoc committee help because they could see the whole picture.

Question No. 7: Which entity should administer the standards?

Garl, Anderson, and Crow – All agreed that a committee should administer the design standards.

Gibney – Some simple issues could be handled just by staff.

Question No. 8: How should design standards be coordinated with CLG Standards?

Garl – Possible subset meeting with CLG ad hoc committee and the Planning Commission.

GARL

Opened the discussion up to the public.

Alex Hammond
1110 NE Indiana
Pullman, WA 99163

Pointed out a few points in the Ellensburg Design Standards that would work in Pullman and were worded well, including Page 1, No. 3 and Page 2, No. 6.

Allison Munch-Rotolo
635 NE Illinois
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that the Certified Local Government program will likely not be an effective tool for preservation of the Historic District of the College Hill Core because it may be difficult to obtain the required property owner consent to participate in the program. Promoted the use of the Ellensburg Design Standards in the city's research because they did a good job of identifying separate standards for historic and non-historic properties.

Anita Hornback
405 NW North
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that she is on the CLG ad hoc committee and does not feel design standards are an appropriate task for the group.

Eileen Macoll

Stated that inclusion of single family homes in design standards is rare. Also, design standards can improve safety.

GARL

Closed the public comment portion.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

October 6, 2010:
Gibney will not be available. No other Commissioners in attendance expressed any concerns.

October 27, 2010:
No Commissioners in attendance expressed any concerns.

November 17, 2010:
No Commissioners in attendance expressed any concerns.

ADJOURNMENT

Crow moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Shannon and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 pm.

ATTEST:

Chair

Planning Director

Secretary