

CITY OF FIFE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING

Fife City Hall

May 19, 2011
7:00 pm

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:15 pm by Acting Chair Brown.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Acting Chair Jeff Brown, Commissioners Doug Fagundes, Tamra Lemoncelli,
Excused: Commissioner Spence Braden
Absent: Chair Jim Call, Commissioners Shannon Thornhill, Lamarr Bond Sr
Staff: Associate Planner Chris Pasinetti and Senior Administrative Assistant Katie Bolam
Public: Councilman Pat Hulcey; Michelle Bunker, 5905 4th St E; Rhea Nagel, 5801 4th St E; Mr. & Mrs. Mike Solvie, 6457 40th St E; Cassandra Moore, Grette Associates; Kim Van Zwalenburg, Dept of Ecology

3. INTRODUCTION – SMP

Planner Pasinetti introduced the overall plan, and guests Ms. Moore and Ms. Van Zwalenburg. He presented the history and purpose of the SMA, explaining that the local program carries out the policies and must be consistent with WAC guidelines. The schedule is defined by the SMA (2012 for Fife). We are now in Phase 3 of 6. Ms. Moore said that the overall goal is no net loss of ecological function, based on inventory and characterization reports in Phase 2. Ms. Van Zwalenburg said that, in addition to the public outreach done in local jurisdictions, Ecology will hold public meetings on entire program with plans from all jurisdictions. Planner Pasinetti then showed on a map where each of the 5 shoreline designations specific to Fife are located, and explained how each of the items 4a-4d (below) are incorporated into Fife's SMP.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Shoreline Environment Designations
- b. Bulk and Dimensional Regulations
- c. Land Use Policies and Regulations
- d. Incorporation of the Critical Areas Ordinance

Above.

e. Other Comments

Resident Michelle Bunker asked how this regulation will affect residents, particularly as applicable to rebuilding in the case of damage. Ms. Moore said that any new development in a shoreline will be subject to SMP review; existing development (page 70 in draft plan), if it's non-

conforming, is generally allowed to remain and be rebuilt within the existing footprint and within 3 years of the damage. Ms. Bunker asked for explanation of the RCW/WAC items mentioned. Ms. Van Zwalenburg explained that the RCW contains the SMA law, while the WAC contains the guidelines for the law. She also answered that it's not yet certain what will occur if a particular jurisdiction and the state rules cannot meet agreement – current case occurring in Burien now.

Resident Rhea Nagel asked what, if any, changes this will bring to the existing wetlands (referring to property known as Milgard). Planner Pasinetti explained the proposed zone change to open space in that area, and that the only changes would be enhancements, such as removal of noxious/invasive plants. Ms. Nagel referenced some recent tree cutting and clearing she had observed by City crews – Planner Pasinetti will look into that.

Ms. Baker asked for a definition of "Open Space"; Planner Pasinetti said the land is designated for conservation.

Mike Solvie said his property (in Saddle Creek) backs up to the wetland; there are some trees that have died and he wonders if there's room for vegetation management in the Plan in general, and specifically if these trees can be chopped down/removed. Planner Pasinetti said that its covered in the Critical Areas ordinance, and yes there's room for the management of hazardous vegetation. Mr. Solvie also mentioned the ugliness of the orange silt fences remaining in the area.

Commissioners Comments:

Commissioner Brown said the Plan is excellent reading/very thorough. He asked if the plan is just a template, or if it's specific to Fife. Ms. Van Zwalenburg said that the intent is that it's specific to Fife, although there's certainly similarities. Ms. Moore assured that the definite goal of Grette is to be specific, and especially the levee designation is very specific. Commissioner Brown also asked how "structure" is defined, if it includes a retaining wall, for example. Planner Pasinetti said yes, citing page 83.

Commissioner Lemoncell agreed that it's a very good document, only cautioning for a proof stage to make sure things aren't missing, such as the afore-mentioned hazardous vegetation issue. Some discussion regarding aquifers.

Commissioner Fagundes also said the plan is well put-together. He asked about the dollar amount referenced in the building exemption section, wondering how it is decided on, and if there's a timeline (i.e. \$50k over 10 year span?). Ms. Van Zwalenburg said that wouldn't work, and she explained that the figure comes from the SMA, and it is calculated by the OFM based on economic factors. She further pointed out that some things are not considered substantial development, such as a single-family residence, so that would not need a shoreline permit, but it still must meet guidelines (vegetation, pervious surface, etc). Commissioner Fagundes also asked about administration responsibility. Ms. Van Zwalenburg said that it is the City's job to manage the plan, as it has been managing the Critical Areas for many years. All permit fees are local; any appeal process will go to the state.

Ms. Bunker asked when the City will start determining what's going to be done in shoreline? Ms. Moore answered that the cumulative impact and restoration phase will stipulate general boundaries for how restoration should occur.

