

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
March 15, 2011
Minutes

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: Kelly Sorensen, Chairman,** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present were Mike Chambers, Norman Stenberg, Greg Becker. Absent was Delores Finchum. Staff Members attending were; Susan Driver, City Planner; and Carol McLester, Deputy Clerk-Treasurer.

GUESTS PRESENT: Ellen Warren, City Council Member

Kelly Sorensen, Chair, welcomed newly appointed City Council Member, Ellen Warren.

Kelly Sorensen, Chair, noted that a quorum was present.

- 2. READING & APPROVAL OF MINUTES: - February 22, 2011**
Motion #1: Norm Stenberg moved and Greg Becker seconded to accept the minutes for the February 22, 2011, meeting.
All Yeas, Motion Passed

- 3. FINISH SMP CHAPTER 3 AND DISCUSS NEW TIMEFRAME:**
Susan reported the cities and counties have now split. Susan stated that there will be a meeting on March 18, 2011, which will include the City Planning Directors, the County Planning Director, the County Natural Resource's Director, and Ecology will be on the phone. Susan explained that they are trying to figure out a way to complete the SMP since there is not enough money left to have the consultants complete it. They are going to try to figure out what is left of the budget and how best to use it.

Motion #2: Norm Stenberg moved and Mike Chambers seconded to table #3 due to the discussion that Susan Driver has brought forth.
All Yeas, Motion Passed

- 4. REVIEW FORM-BASED-CODE IN WATERFRONT MASTER PLAN (NOT ADOPTED) AND WATERFRONT SUBAREA PLAN (ADOPTED):**
Susan handed out the Form-Based-Code for the Waterfront Master Plan. Susan asked everyone to read it so they could discuss at next Planning Commission Meeting.
- 5. DISCUSS NECESSARY REVISIONS TO F-B-C AND TO EMC WB SECTION:**
Susan gave a brief explanation of the differences between the Subarea Plan and the Waterfront Master Plan. She also noted that as the Subarea Plan has been adopted, the EMC zoning code language for the Waterfront Business District needs to be revised to match.

6. DISCUSS HOP REGULATIONS AND USE CHART – WE DID NOT GET THIS ADOPTED LAST YEAR:

Susan reported the Proposed Parameters for Home Occupation Permits in the City of Entiat that they had been discussed last year were never submitted to City Council for adoption. Susan stated that the City Council is now reviewing Business Licenses and the Business License Code and suggested this would be a good time to take the HOP to Council as a recommendation.

Motion #4: Norm Stenberg moved and Mike Chambers seconded to recommend the Proposed Parameters for Home Occupation Permits to the City Council.

All Yeas, Motion Passed

7. NEW BUSINESS:

a. Discuss Giusti proposal to purchase land

Susan reported that Mr. Giusti came into City Hall and met with the Mayor and the Public Works Director and requested to purchase 40 feet of the top portion of the property (No Parcel #) south of his property (Parcel #25-21-04-130-460). He would like an easier turning access into his driveway because he has given his neighbor an easement that has constrained him.

Susan created a list with the approval of the City's Attorney Steve Smith. Susan explained that there are seven items that have to be followed for anyone who would be interested in acquiring any portion of any City land. The first thing Mr. Giusti would have to do is to make a formal request to City Council. The second thing is the property needs to be appraised and he would have to pay for the appraisal. The City would pick the Appraiser and the appraisal would belong to the City. He would have to go through the Public Hearing process after we get the appraisal. It has to become a public process so the community can decide if they want to sell this piece of property or not. There would then be a Council Hearing. Mr. Giusti would have to pay the appraised market value. He will have to do a boundary line adjustment and pay for the survey. Before Mr. Giusti gets to the point of buying the property he will be out \$5,000.00 to \$ 7,000.00.

Commissioner Mike Chambers commented as to why did we even open the door of negotiation with someone on a piece of property that the City just received, which we have been fighting for years to get and now we are going to parcel it up and sell a portion of it off at appraised value? What benefit to the City is there if we are already getting the appraised value at the time we sell the whole lot, rather than a portion of the lot and have to go through some discussion with a property owner who happens to have gotten himself in a bind by doing something improperly on his own property. The property owner's argument is he wants the property line to be perpendicular to the street?

Susan reported that the property line is not crooked, the street is crooked.

Mike stated that it is not a City Street, it is a private road and the City is not responsible for that.

Mike Chambers suggested dividing lots 1 and 2 so that they are equal which would push the boundary line 20 feet to the north. If we cut about 40 feet off the top of the entry point of that lot, the marketability will be dramatically reduced. The whole goal of this is absolutely essential that the City acquires the dollar figure we need to buy the 12 acres from the P.U.D. by the end 2012, or we go without and that land goes back to the P.U.D. If we sell off a portion of the lot at market value (example \$4.00 square foot) that lot is not just going to be market value but sale potential on the quality of the lot. If we don't sell that lot we don't have the money to buy the 12 acres. If we don't buy the 12 acres, this whole thing is going to end up in a black hole. The public in this town deserves to be treated better. Not only does the City benefit nothing from selling a portion of that lot but all the population in town benefits nothing from it. If the property owner wants it he can buy the whole lot.

Greg Becker asked Susan what does that do to the Mayors and your credibility if that's already been open before we even get started?

Susan stated that it has been explained to the property owner on how it works. He has made a request to Council but has not followed the other steps. Susan reported that the Mayor told Mr. Giusti that he doesn't think that the City will sell.

Mike reported that there is a trade that he would consider that would benefit the City. Mr. Giusti could trade the one acre lot (Parcel #25-21-04-554-300) across from his property for the use as a park-n-ride for future development for the waterfront. If the City is going to do anything, it has to be to the benefit of the citizens of the City.

Motion #3: Greg Becker moved and Norm Stenberg seconded that because we are concerned about the Waterfront Development, the Planning Commission recommends that no sales discussion on the three waterfront lots be entered into until the Planning Commission has an opportunity to review those three lots and the potential impact to the waterfront project.

All Yeas, Motion Passed

b. Rainier Skyline Excavators

Susan reported that the latest news is Rainier Skyline Excavators were supposed to close on the property today, March 15, 2011. Susan stated that she had not heard if they had because we didn't allow them to bring in a 1988 single wide mobile home and that could be a deal breaker.

c. Tucker Property

Susan reported that there is a potential buyer for the old warehouse that sits on the corner of Stoneridge Street and Hwy 97A. The potential buyer wants to sell mattresses, carpet, and second hand treasures. He has already heard from the Department of Transportation that he can't have access off the highway because he has access from Stoneridge Street.

d. Winery & Others

Susan reported that Swakane Winery is located south of town. They have tasting rooms in Wenatchee and Leavenworth, and would really like to have a tasting room in Entiat. They want to move everything into the City Limits. They have talked to Greg Kemp about buying one of his warehouses. On Susan's recommendation they have looked at the Reidel property so they could grow grapes in the orchard area and have a tasting room in the commercial area. Susan stated that their children go to the Entiat School District and they love Entiat and want to be here, they are just trying to figure out how to make the money work. Susan suggested that if anyone has an opportunity, stop and talk with Mike and Donna and encourage them to come to Entiat.

- e.** Susan reported that the developer of Saska Hills has already put in 3.5 million dollars into the development of that property and residential lots are not selling. They put in a water tower, pump station for the sewer, they extended the P.U.D. facilities, and everything is there. They are looking at changing this to a Mixed Use Planned Development and since the Planned Development Code has a binding site plan they have to start over and submit a new application and go through the whole process again. They would like to put in a wine tasting room, plant grapes on the hillsides, and maybe bring in a restaurant. They are also reapplying for the 40 acres UGA expansion this year. Susan suggested that everyone read Chapter 18.38, Planned Development for discussion at next meeting.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

9. ADJOURN:

Kelly Sorensen, Chairman, adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Carol McLester, Deputy Clerk-Treasurer

