

**January 26, 2012**  
**Ellensburg City Planning Commission – Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**City Council Chambers**

Members Present: Chair Bruce Simpson, Vice Chair Sarah Bedsaul, Bill Beattie, Beverly Heckart, Fred Padjen, Gretchen Thatcher  
Members Absent: Bob Hood  
Others Present: Planning Supervisor Lance Bailey, Alex Eyre, Doug Stalder, Meg Ludlum, several members of a CWU Geography class

Beverly Heckart opened the meeting at 5:00p.m.

**Minutes**

January 26, 2012 Regular Meeting

15.30.050(C)(4)(a) – Minutes should be amended to show that the Planning Commission recommended removing “tourist commercial”

Motion was made and passed to approve the minutes as corrected.

**Public Meeting**

**1) Continue discussion of the Draft Land Development Code**

Alex Eyre presented a proposal from the Arts Commission.

The Ellensburg Arts Commission would like to propose additions to sec 15.33.030 (Floor area ratio (FAR) bonus system) for the R-M, R-H, R-O and I-L zones similar to those in sec 15.33.020 providing a density bonus system for owners/developers willing to participate in a ‘Percent For Art’ program.

Owners/Developers of property with planned private building development costs in excess of \$300,000 in R-M, R-H, R-O and I-L zones would be eligible for density bonuses of 15-25% in return for their voluntary contribution of no less than 1% and no more than 1.5% of the total project budget for the acquisition and installation of publicly accessible art on the development site. In lieu of on-site public artworks, a developer may make an equivalent contribution to the Ellensburg Public Art Fund.

Planning Commission asked that the Arts Commission possibly provide some ideas on what kind of incentives could be developed for commercial development. There also needs to be more discussion on who would decide what constituted art to the point of meeting the code requirements, and some criteria for making those decisions.

Doug Stalder addressed the Commission. He stated that residential density is usually constrained mostly by parking. He supports the idea of providing density bonuses or other incentives for participating in public art projects.

**LDCU Article 3**

15.30.050(C)(4)(a)

***A motion was made and passed to eliminate “corridor neighborhood commercial” and “tourist commercial”***

The Planning Commission discussed the list of uses allowed as conditional uses in the P-R zone. There was a diversity of ideas about how to deal with properties in the P-R zone that transition out of public ownership/use.

Meg Ludlum addressed the Commission and asked who would decide if a P-R property is “surplused”

Doug Stalder addressed the Commission. He stated that the vast majority of properties currently located in the P-R zone are functioning as intended. There was a discussion on the process the city uses to rezone a property.

15.31.040

It was suggested to make restaurants, bars and brewpubs be a conditional use (not a permitted use). And a development condition be included that states:

“Provided that the restaurants, bars and brewpubs are subordinate to a permitted use”

It was discussed that the term “subordinate” needs to be defined in this context. How do you define a use that is subordinate? Does it have to be one the same property? The term subordinate is used in Section 15.31.030 in regards to accessory uses.

***Motion:***

***Remove restaurants, bars and brewpubs as well as coffee house, espresso bar as permitted uses in the I-L zone. Make the use C, with development condition C13 making those uses accessory uses.***

***The motion did not pass (3-3)***

***Motion:***

***Make restaurants, bars and brewpubs as well as coffee house, espresso bar a permitted use in the I-L zone, with development condition P13 making those uses accessory uses as defined in 15.31.030.***

***The motion passed (4-2)***

Pros and cons of allowing office uses in the C-T zone

- There can be aesthetic issues trying to make office uses compatible with typical C-T uses (con)
- Provide services for residents, particularly in the north part of town (pro)
- It is not important for the functionality of office uses to be located close to the interstate

***Motion:***

***Remove all office uses from the C-T zone***

***The motion passed (6-0)***

Conference centers should be allowed in the C-T and C-H zones, as well as the downtown commercial areas. It is more likely that a large use such as a convention center will locate

***Motion:***

***Allow conference center as a permitted use in the C-H and C-T zones***

***The motion passed (5-1)***

15.31.040 Special Uses

***Motion:***

***Remove “Art, performing arts, and recording studios” and “museums” as permitted uses in the C-T zone. Make parks and playgrounds accessory uses within the C-T zone***

***Motion passed (4-2)***

***Motion:***

***Remove interim recycling facility, police facility, public agency or utility yard as permitted uses in the C-T zone.***

***Motion passed (6-0)***

***Motion:***

***Include Public transportation passenger terminals as a permitted use in the C-T, C-H, CC and CCII zones***

***Motion passed (6-0)***

***Motion:***

***Allow SWES only in the following zones - P-R, I-L, I-H, C-T, C-H***

***Motion did not pass (3-3)***

***Motion:***

***For 15.30.040 Residential zones and map designations***

***Include the following for sections A(7) and B(6):***

***“i. VISIBLE/Universal Design Housing”***

***And in sections C and D, include as #3: “Providing standards and guidelines that encourage affordable and VISIBLE/Universal Design Housing “***

***Motion passed (6-0)***

The next meeting was scheduled for February 9<sup>th</sup>

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm

Respectfully submitted

Lance Bailey, Planning Supervisor