WOODLAND PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Planning Commission Regular Meeting - 7:00 PM

Thursday, March 21, 2013

Woodland Community Center
782 Park Street, Woodland, Washington

CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• February 21 Meeting Minutes

WORKSHOP

1) Shoreline Master Program Update
   • Consultant Presentation

2) Pre-Existing Uses and Structures – Code Amendment
   • Staff Report
   • Review Draft Ordinance
   • Optional – Motion to Move Draft Ordinance through SEPA Process

3) 2012 Comprehensive Plan Updates
   • Review Comp Plan Amendment Requests (Staff Report & Request Letters)
   • Planning Commission to determine if a proposal should receive further consideration as part of the comprehensive plan amendment process (WAC 365-196-640(6)(d))

ADJOURN

cc: Post (City Hall Annex, Library, Post Office, City Hall)
    City of Woodland website
    Planning Commission (5)
    City Council (7)
    Those that have expressed interest in a meeting topic
    Mayor
    Department Head
WOODLAND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Planning Commission Regular Meeting - 7:30 PM
Thursday, February 21, 2013

Woodland Community Center
782 Park Street, Woodland, Washington

Present:  
Chair David Simpson  
Commissioner Sharon Watt  
Commissioner Nancy Trevena  
Commissioner Murali Amirineni  
Commissioner Deborah Deans

Absent:  
None

Also Present:  
Secretary JoAnn Heinrichs  
Community Development Planner Carolyn Johnson  
Public Works Director Bart Stepp  
Mayor Grover Laseke

CALL TO ORDER 7:29:58 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Watt moved to approve the January 17, 2013 minutes as written, Commissioner Trevena seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARING 7:30:49 PM

1) Amending Central Business District (C-1) Uses. Land Use Permit 212-910.

- Staff report given by Carolyn Johnson. Johnson summarized changes made at the January Planning Commission meeting:
  - Added definition for Drug Treatment facilities that addresses group homes and AA/NA meeting spaces,
  - Drive through facilities were listed as conditional uses,
  - Gas stations remained conditional uses, and
  - Wholesale and most manufacturing remained prohibited uses.

Spot zoning concerns: A concern over spot zoning was brought up in the public comments. Staff discussed these concerns with MRSC legal council. The ordinance does not create a special zoning category for Dave’s Garage and DZ Machine Works. MRSC concurred that no spot zoning is created by the draft ordinance.

Non-conforming, pre-existing uses: The code identifies pre-existing properties and uses. MRSC and staff are recommending more generic language presented in staff report
rather than language that includes specific addresses.

Summary: Two comment letters were received at the start of the meeting and were not in the packets. These letters were from Marilee McCall and Scott Perry.

Based on a comment letter received, the Planning Commission asked that “motels” be added to #22 and incorporated with “hotels and hostels”.

- Public Testimony

Open public testimony:7:39:05 PM

➢ Jeff Leuthold: Leuthold expressed a concern with excluding manufacturing. We used to have Lamiglas downtown. What if we had manufacturing along with retail in the same building? Manufacturing can be located in small facilities today. As long as they have a retail component, it seems like it would be appropriate downtown.
  - Commissioners responded that some manufacturing is specifically allowed by the draft ordinance, namely #1 “artisanal and craft shops and shops for custom work or repair”. Adding additional manufacturing uses was considered by the Commission during recent workshops on the C-1, however, the Comprehensive Plan says that manufacturing is not to occur in the C-1.

➢ What would happen to the existing bank drive throughs?
  - Existing drive throughs are pre-existing and the code would not impact them. Any new drive throughs would be approved through a conditional use permitting process. Conditional use permits are reviewed annually for compliance with the permit.

➢ Scott Perry: I am part of the Woodland Economic Development group. We have discussed that a niche we could serve is recreation. It is important that if someone wants to build or sell kayaks or canoes or something similar, that they can in the C-1. I have a concern about not including drive through facilities. Most lots wouldn’t allow drive throughs because of their small size. If they don’t have enough space for a drive through, then this should come out during the site plan review process. I don’t believe drive throughs would result in heavy traffic.

Close public testimony:7:47:08 PM

- Planning Commission Deliberation

➢ Commissioner Trevena: Trevena said that the group had discussed manufacturing in past workshops and that sells of boats would fit under permitted use #27. Trevena then asked staff about the rebuilding of homes in the C-1 following destruction.
  - Carolyn Johnson: There is a different section of the code that addressed rebuilding after destruction. It says that homes can
be rebuilt provided LDR-6 standards are maintained.

➢ Commissioner Trevena: Are there any lots in the downtown that wouldn’t be able to be rebuilt following destruction because they were unable to meet setbacks?
  • Carolyn Johnson: A property in this situation would be a good candidate for a variance to those setback standards.

➢ Chair Simpson: The comprehensive plan prohibits drive throughs and manufacturing in C-1. We would have to go in and change the comprehensive plan in order to make drive through facilities a permitted use. The current draft ordinance is pushing consistency with the comprehensive plan as far as we can without need for a comprehensive plan amendment.

➢ Commissioner Trevena: Most of the issues brought up in the comments were things previously discussed.

• Commissioner Trevena made a motion made to send the proposed code to City Council with the amendments to #14 and #15 recommended in the staff report and the use “motels” being added to #22. Commissioner Watt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 7:57:01 PM

WORKSHOP

Shoreline Master Program Update 7:58:36 PM

• Derek Chisholm, a planner with Parametrix, gave a presentation on the Shoreline Master Program update. His presentation covered:
  ➢ Maintenance and Enhancement of Ecological Processes
  ➢ Mitigation of Cumulative Impacts
  ➢ Shoreline Geographic Designations

• The following discussion and questions and answers occurred during and after the presentation:
  ➢ Bart Stepp: There is not a lot of public access now and there aren’t a lot of opportunities. What if we are never able to get public access? At some point in time is Ecology going to tell us we are in violation of our plan?
    • Derek Chisholm: I’m never seen this happen. It is assumed the City would budget for access needs.
  ➢ What about buying credits for public access?
    • TJ Keiran suggested a “fee in lieu” program for shoreline public access.
  ➢ Jeff Leuthold: Leuthold expressed a concern over the concept of “no net loss”.
    • Derek Chisholm: Not all areas can be restored. If industrial has been established, it is industrial and “no net loss” may not be able to be accomplished. Example: Shorelines setbacks are 10”, Ecology would not let you at this point. Client may have to do mitigation.
  ➢ The group began looking at the different shoreline environmental designations on the map and discussed possible changes to the map.
Carolyn Johnson: Will we be able to build roads if we designate an area as recreation?

- Derek Chisholm: That shouldn’t be a problem, but Ecology has a problem with roads being built parallel to the shoreline.

Derek Chisholm: Gave an explanation of the program update chart.

“Commercial” designation is also identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Portion #11 has a road crossing through it. Portions of #12 a road and the sea wall, which splits the ecological function, will have to be identified separately, the rules will be different, but they are in the shorelines. Would need a different designation on one side of the wall from the other side of the seawall. Areas 12 & 14: have both commercial & industrial property there.

Currently if any piece of your property is in the 200’ you have to apply for a shorelines permit.

A lot of this stretch along the river is not very accessible to the public. Need to figure out some logical places to public access. Jeff Leuthold: It will be a maintenance nightmare and cost a lot more.

- Derek Chisholm: Public access would not be required if it is not reasonable.

Bart Stepp: Diking District doesn’t seem to want anything going on top of the dikes. One of the comments from the Army Corp of Engineers is that they want all the trees removed along the sea wall.

The Corp of Engineers will be involved with our meetings.

- Channel migration, the widened area is the channel migration zone. Carolyn Johnson: the bottom portion of #13 is in the floodway, and there is absolutely no development.

Most of River Mist is in the 100 year flood plain, but only a small portion is within the floodway.

With an already established development, there is nothing to trigger shoreline access. However, new churches and multi-family development, for example, would be asked to build public access. Especially if they are a non-water dependent uses. There are constitutional issues that are being looked at in the courts now. Developments of 4 or more single family dwellings and multifamily apartment buildings would have to provide access.

The museum and DZ Machine Works are not water dependent businesses.

Woodland has a lot of river frontage, but very few ways to get to the river.

The Shorelines Act gives preference to single family dwellings but not multi-family buildings.

Derek Chisholm explained environmental designation for the Horseshoe Lake area.

Visit website: http://www.co.cowlitz.wa.us/buildplan/planning/shorelines.html

Derek Chisholm: Will start next conversation where we left off with this conversation. I will take the suggestions and notes back and will meet again in March.
Joint meeting with Planning Commission and City Council was cancelled.

1. Planning Commission said the March 18th would work as a date for the joint session meeting. Meeting likely to begin at 6:30p.m.

ADJOURN 9:30:03 PM

Commissioner Trevena moved to adjourn to our next regularly scheduled meeting on March 21, 2013. Commissioner Amirineni seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

JoAnn Heinrichs, Planning Commission Secretary Date

These minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings. A recording is available in the office of the Clerk-Treasurer
To: Planning Commission
From: Carolyn Johnson, Community Development Planner
Date: March 13, 2013
Re: Land Use No.: 211-913, Nonconforming Uses and Structures, Zoning Text Change

Summary
Two recent land use disputes (208 Buckeye / Foglia House and 1773 Goerig St / Schurman Machine Shop) involving non-conforming uses resulted in hearing examiner decisions that shed light on the City’s pre-existing, non-conforming code. In amending the code, the City has the benefit of the hearing examiner’s legal analysis in these two cases. This staff report includes key portions of these decisions documents as they relate to a code amendment.

Change of Use
Under Washington law, a nonconforming use is limited to the specific use occurring when the use became nonconforming. A nonconforming use cannot change from one type of use to another, even though the uses, and their associated impacts, are very similar

Discontinuance / Abandonment
Woodland Municipal Code section 17.60.030, Discontinuance, states “If a pre-existing use is nonconforming and not actively used for a period of six months, it shall be deemed discontinued.” The courts have repeatedly held that “discontinuance” is synonymous with abandonment. “A discontinuance results from the concurrence of an intent to abandon and some overt act or failure to act which carries the implication of abandonment.”

1 Coleman v. City of Walla Walla, 44 Wn.2d 296, 300-301, 266 P.2d 1034 (1954) (nonconforming rooming house cannot be changed to fraternity house). See, also, Open Door Baptist Church v. Clark County, 14 Wn.2d 143, 150-151, 995 P.2d 33 (2000), (legal nonconforming use as church could not be resumed after intervening years as art school); Shields v. Spokane School Dist. No. 81, 31 Wn.2d 247, 255, 196 P.2d 352 (1948), (nonconforming elementary school cannot change to trade school)

2 Andrew v. King County, 21 Wn.App. 566, 572, 586 P.2d 509 (1978)
"vacate" for a specified period. In addition, the Courts have held that where a use that is "discontinued" for a period specified in the local code it creates a presumption that the use has been abandoned³. A proponent can still overcome the presumption of abandonment by showing they did not intend to abandon the use. However where a use has been vacant, intent appears to be irrelevant.

Once a property owner meets the burden of proof that a nonconforming use was established, the burden of proof shifts to the City to prove that the use was discontinued or abandoned⁴. In order to prove discontinuance or abandonment, the City must establish “(1) intent [to abandon] and (2) an overt act, or failure to act, which carries with it the implication that the owner does not claim or retain any interest in the right to the nonconforming use.” Id. at 648.

\[
The \text{ intent [to abandon] cannot be inferred from or established by a period of nonuse alone, but must be shown by the owner or occupier's overt acts or failure to act, such as written or oral statements evincing an intent to abandon the use, structural alterations to the building inconsistent with the continuance of the nonconforming use, or failure to take some step such as license renewal necessary to the continuance of the use. Id. at 653.}
\]

In the Foglia case, the property owner did not alter the physical structure of the building to convert the building into a single-family residence. The Foglias neither expressed any intent to convert the structure to a single-family residence nor to abandon the multi-family use. They took no material steps to either convert the structure to a single-family residence or to abandon the multi-family use.

CMJ

³ Andrew v. King County, 21 Wash.App. 566, 572, 586 P.2d 509 (1978) (the cessation of a use for the period prescribed by the zoning code is prima facie evidence of an intent to abandon the nonconforming use)

⁴ Van Sant v. City of Everett, 69 Wn.App. 641, 647-648, 849 P.2d 1276 (1993). “Nonconforming uses are vested property rights which are protected. Protected property rights cannot be lost or voided easily.” Id. 69 Wn.App. at 649 (internal citations omitted).
The text highlighted and italicized are proposed amendments to the current code. Text struck through is proposed to be eliminated from the current code.

Chapter 17.60 - PRE-EXISTING USES AND STRUCTURES

Sections:

17.60.010 – Purpose.

17.60.020 – Nonconforming uses, structures and lots.

17.60.030 – Abatement of Illegal Use, Structure or Development

17.60.040 – Continuation.

17.60.050 – Modification.

17.60.060 – Discontinuance.

17.60.070 – Change of use.

17.60.080 – Destruction.

17.60.090 – Completion of structure.

17.60.100 – Single-family dwellings.

17.60.110 – Manufactured home on an individual lot.

17.60.120 – Preexisting lots of record.

17.60.010 - Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide for those circumstances, uses and lots that are inconsistent with regulations of this title but which enjoy rights based on their previous legal existence. The intent of this chapter is to permit legal nonconforming developments, lots, structures, and uses to continue until they are removed but not to encourage their perpetuation.

17.60.020 - Nonconforming uses, structure and lots.
A nonconforming use is a use of property that was allowed at the time the use was established but which, because of changes in zoning regulation, is no longer permitted. A nonconforming structure is a structure that complied with zoning and development regulations at the time it was built but which, because of subsequent changes to the zoning and/or development regulations, no longer fully complies with those regulations. A nonconforming lot is one that, at the time of its establishment, met the minimum lot size requirements for the zone in which it is located but which, because of subsequent changes to the minimum lot size applicable to that zone, no longer complies with requirements.

17.60.030 - Abatement of Illegal Use, Structure or Development.

Any use, structure, lot or other site improvement not established in compliance with use, lot size, and development standards in effect at the time of establishment shall be deemed illegal and shall be discontinued or terminated and subject to removal.

17.60.040 - Continuation.

A pre-existing use or structure which is nonconforming may be continued and maintained in reasonable repair and safe condition; provided that the use or structure is not enlarged, increased, made more nonconforming, or extended to occupy a greater area than was occupied on the date of adoption of the ordinance codified in this title or applicable amendments thereto. The extension of said pre-existing use to a portion of a structure which was built for the pre-existing use at the time of the passage of the ordinance codified in this title is not considered an extension of a nonconforming pre-existing use. A nonconforming, pre-existing use or structure may not be moved in whole or in part to any other portion of the lot or zoning district in which it is located. If moved, it must be to a district in which the use is permitted. Any nonconformance that is brought into conformance for any period of time shall forfeit status as nonconformance. For single-family dwelling exception, see Section 17.60.090.

17.60.050 - Modification.

A. A pre-existing structure nonconforming with respect to height, yard requirements, lot coverage, or density may be utilized by a use which is permitted in the district in which the structure is located. In order to accommodate a permitted use, the structure may be repaired, modified, or altered, internally and externally; provided such repairs and modifications do not increase the nonconformance of the structure and that they meet the International Building Code standards.

B. In addition, a pre-existing structure which is non-conforming according to the description contained in subsection (A) of this section may be modified or altered in such a manner that it conforms to the standards of the district, this title, and the International Building Code.

C. The owner of a pre-existing use which is non-conforming, may be able to expand with special permission of the hearing examiner through a conditional use permit.

17.60.060 - Discontinuance.
A pre-existing, nonconforming use that lies vacant for a period of six months or that is abandoned by the property owner, shall be deemed discontinued. Abandonment is evidenced by an overt act, or failure to act, which carries the implication that the owner does not claim or retain any interest in the right to the nonconforming use. A period of nonuse alone does not prove intent to abandon a nonconforming use. Instead, the intent to abandon must be shown by the owner or occupier’s overt acts, or failure to act, such as written or oral statements showing an intent to abandon the use, structural alterations to the building inconsistent with the continuance of the nonconforming use, or the listing of the property or structure for sale or lease in a manner inconsistent with the continuance of the nonconforming use. If a pre-existing use is nonconforming and not actively used for a period of six months, it shall be deemed discontinued. A discontinued pre-existing use which is nonconforming cannot be revived and any further uses of the property must conform to the provisions of this title as provided for above.

17.60.070 - Change of use.

If a pre-existing use which is nonconforming is changed, it shall be changed to a use conforming to the regulations of the zoning district in which it is located, and after change, it cannot be changed back again.

17.60.080 - Destruction.

If a pre-existing use or structure which is nonconforming is destroyed by any cause to an extent exceeding fifty percent of the cost of replacement of the structure, using new materials, a future structure or use of the property shall conform to the provisions of this title. For single-family dwelling exception, see Section 17.60.090.

17.60.090 - Completion of structure.

Nothing contained in this title shall require any change in the plans, construction, alternation, or designated use of a structure for which a building permit has been legally issued and construction commenced prior to the adoption of the ordinance codified in this title and subsequent amendments thereto.

17.60.100 - Single-family dwellings.

A. Single-family dwellings existing in the C-1, C-2, C-3, I-1, and I-2 districts at the time of passage of the ordinance codified in this title shall be allowed to remain, and any addition or improvements thereto shall meet the standards of the LDR-6 district.

B. If said single-family dwelling existing at the time of passage of the ordinance codified in this title are destroyed by any cause to an extent exceeding fifty percent of the cost of the structure, such dwellings are permitted to be improved or reconstructed; provided the standards of the LDR-6 district are maintained.

B. In any zone, a single-family dwelling destroyed by any cause to any extent, shall be allowed to be improved or reconstructed, provided the setback standards of the LDR-6 district are maintained.
17.60.110 - Manufactured home on an individual lot.

A manufactured home legally sited on an individual lot outside of a manufactured home park or subdivision, may be replaced by another manufactured home, provided the replacing manufactured home meets the standards set forth in Section 17.16.080(L) of this code.

17.60.120 – Nonconforming lots.

Any permitted use may be established on an undersized lot that cannot satisfy lot size or width requirements of this Title; provided that:

1. All other applicable zoning development standards, such as building setback requirements and lot coverage requirements, are met or a variance has been granted;

2. The lot was legally created and satisfied the lot size and width requirements applicable at the time of creation;

3. No unsafe condition is created by permitting development on the nonconforming lot; and

4. The lot was not created as a “special tract” to protect critical area, provide open space, or as a public or private access tract.
To: Planning Commission  
From: Carolyn Johnson, Community Development Planner  
RE: Comprehensive Plan Map Changes  
Prepared: March 14, 2013 for the Commission’s March 21, 2013 Meeting  

The City has received two requests for Comprehensive Plan Map changes and rezones. The Planning Commission’s task for their March 21st meeting is to determine if the proposals listed below should receive further consideration in 2013. As per WAC 365-196-640(6)(d), “Once a proposed amendment is received, the county or city may determine if a proposal should receive further consideration as part of the comprehensive plan amendment process.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Acres (approx.)</th>
<th>Existing Comprehensive Plan Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Comprehensive Plan Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janice Schurman</td>
<td></td>
<td>East portion of a 1.23 acre lot that is divided by Lewis River Road. The property owners are interested in rezoning that portion of the property that is east of LRR.</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 Lewis River Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Kasziewicz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portion of the 2.2 acre lot that contains historic retail building.</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Light Industrial (I-1)</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695 Lewis River Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Property divided by LRR. Interest would be in rezoning the portion east of LRR. Lot segregation required.  
2 Property primarily used for industrial purposes but the corner market store has had commercial uses for years. The owners are interested in creating a lot that includes the corner store and rezoning just that portion of the property.

Once the Planning Commission decides which proposed amendments should receive further consideration, parties will be notified and the application process will begin. Ultimately, all amendment proposals must be considered concurrently in a package so that their cumulative effects can be understood. The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation to the Council on the Comprehensive Plan amendment package after holding a public hearing.
Background Information on the Anthony Kasziewicz (Lynn’s Market Building) Request

1. Are the existing use and existing zoning designation consistent?
   a. The property has a long history of housing both industrial and commercial uses. The building pictured below has a long history of commercial uses and all recent uses of this building have been of a retail nature that is consistent with a commercial designation. Other buildings on site have a history of industrial use which the property owner wishes to continue.

Figure 1. The structure pictured above has a long history of commercial use.
2. Surrounding zoning:

Background Information on the Anthony Kasziewicz (Lynn’s Market Building) Request

1. Are the existing use and existing zoning designation consistent?
   a. The subject parcel is 1.23 acres with a High Density Residential zoning designation. The lot is divided by Lewis River Road. The portion west of LRR has a single family house on it. The applicant is not interested in rezoning this portion of the property. The portion east of LRR has a small structure (pictured below) with a history of commercial use inconsistent with its current zoning. The property owners would like to rezone just this portion of the property.
2. Surrounding zoning:
5 March 2013

To Woodland Planning Commission:

Thank you for the notice of opportunity to request rezoning properties. Schurman Trial Run Trust owns the property located at 1654 Lewis River Road. The property is for sale. Please consider this letter as a formal request for rezoning.

The property at consideration is one parcel separated by Lewis River Road.

The property on the East side (1654) of Lewis River Road is zoned High density residential. This is a small narrow lot running along the Lewis River. Historically the property has been used commercially. There is a small "shack" like structure on the property. It sits empty at this time. The Trust would like the zoning on this property changed to a commercial zone to reflect its highest and best usage.

We hope to sell the property and have had a lot of interest in it for small scale retail use such as a bait and fishing tackle shop, a pet grooming business, another barber shop, a specialty sandwich, barbeque catering business. As one of the last open Lewis River water fronts, Fish First has also expressed interest.

The small lot on the west side of the property is currently a rental occupied by elderly tenants. We have no interest in rezoning this part of the property at this time.

We look forward to working with the city about this property. Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 503-452-7437.

Janice Schurman

Janice Schurman, Managing Trustee for Schurman Trial Run Trust.
Thanks Carolyn!

We would definitely look into the division and consider creating a separate lot. I think by doing it would keep everything easier for future accountability and marketability.

Thank you again and look forward to hearing back from you!

~Anthony

On Feb 13, 2013, at 3:42 PM, Carolyn Johnson <JohnsonC@ci.woodland.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Anthony,

Thank you for stopping in today and for sending the email below. I plan to take your request and all like requests to the Planning Commission in March where they will decide if they are willing to consider specific request or not. If they are willing to consider your request then you will have the opportunity to apply.

My concern continues to be land division. While it doesn’t appear to be against state law to have a single property with multiple zoning designations, I don’t think the planning commission or city council would feel comfortable approving it. As you can imagine, it would also be an administrative challenge.

One solution would be to make the approval of the rezone contingent on you creating a separate lot for the portion of the property that is going to be zoned commercial. This way you wouldn’t go through the expense or trouble of land division without assurance that you’d get the desired zoning designation. If the Council approves the rezone, you could then move forward with the division.

At a minimum we would want to see a legal description of the land to be rezoned at the time of application.

Carolyn

Carolyn Johnson MCP
Community Development Planner
City of Woodland
(360) 225-1048 Office
(360) 225-7336 Fax
Thank you for discussing the future of the property with me this morning. We are very interested in converting a section of the property from current Industrial zoning to Commercial use.

The specific building has a long history of being used for retail through a special exception through the city. Generally the items sold were manufactured in the back of the building and sold in the front. We would like to maintain Industrial zoning for the 1695 Lewis River Road as we will always be using it specifically for manufacturing. Because of its prime location on the roadway, a lot of interest has come from future tenants wanting to use the space for retail.

Please consider our request and we would love to hear back from you regarding the City's thoughts on the re-zoning.

Sincerely

Anthony Kasziewicz
## ESTIMATED TIMELINE
### 2013 Annual Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 19</td>
<td>City asks for formal request letters from those who have expressed interest in comprehensive plan amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19 and 26, 2012</td>
<td>Public participation program with procedures and schedules published (<em>The Reflector</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2013 (Deadline)</td>
<td>Deadline for formal request letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8, 2013 (Deadline Extended)</td>
<td>Extended deadline for formal request letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2013</td>
<td>Planning Commission determines if a proposal should receive further consideration as part of the comprehensive plan amendment process (WAC 365-196-640(6)(d)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2013 (Deadline)</td>
<td>Applications submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any applications not received by the deadline will be considered in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 2013</td>
<td>NOA published in <em>The Reflector</em> and 60-day DOC notice issued as Per RCW 36.70A.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 2013 at 5 PM</td>
<td>Public comment period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2013 at 5 PM</td>
<td>SEPA appeal period ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2013</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5, 2013</td>
<td>1st readings of the ordinance by City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19, 2013</td>
<td>Final reading of the ordinance by City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>