



# Planning & Economic Development Committee Minutes

Thursday, March 7, 2019

5:30 PM

SeaTac City Hall – City Council Chambers

Members:	Present:	Commence: 5:36 P.M.
		Adjourn: 7:17 P.M.

Joel Wachtel, Chair	
Peter Kwon	<b>X</b>
Stanley Tombs	<b>X</b>

Other Councilmembers: Mayor Erin Sitterley; Rick Forschler

Staff Present: Steve Pilcher, CED Director; Gary Schenk, Building Services Manager; Jennifer Kester, Planning Manager; Kate Kaehny, Senior Planner; Sr. Asst. City Attorney Mark Johnsen; Economic Development Strategist, Aleksandr Yeremeyev

1. Public Comment	None.
2. Minutes of 02/07/19 meeting	Approved by consensus.
3. 2019 Comp Plan amendment cycle	<p><u><b>X</b></u> Briefing and direction</p> <p>Sr. Planner Kate Kaehny reviewed the 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment process, including a briefing on the State Growth Management Act and regional planning policies (PSRC &amp; King County). She also reviewed SeaTac’s Comp Plan, its history and basic framework.</p> <p>Ms. Kaehny reviewed both preliminary and final docket criteria and discussed how City-initiated amendments might be considered. She then reviewed some topics that staff is suggesting should be considered.</p> <p>CM Forschler advocated increasing the density of areas such as north and south Military Road. He also suggested that the Maywood area should be considered for up zoning. He questioned why these</p>

	<p>weren't already on the list. Discussion ensued on how to get this matter under consideration.</p> <p>The Committee agreed these issues should be placed on the Preliminary Docket.</p>
<p>4. Foreclosed Homes - ProChamps Services</p>	<p><u><b>X</b></u> Briefing and direction</p> <p>CM Peter Kwon summarized the previous discussions on this topic. Building Services Manager Gary Schenk introduced Noah Reando with Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell Public Affairs. A representative (Kevin) from ProChamps was on the phone.</p> <p>ProChamps focuses on issues of blight. The data they receive is from King County records. Their service is to identify the owner or /responsible parties for foreclosed or abandoned properties. The City would need to adopt an ordinance and the City would then enter into a contract with ProChamps for administration of the registration process. Kevin reviewed a map that demonstrates the properties they identify and how they function. He also provided an example of the work they currently do for the City of Spokane.</p> <p>A question came up regarding indemnification and how that is covered by ProChamps. Sr. Asst. City Attorney Mark Johnsen suggested this discussion occur in the future should the City decide to pursue this option.</p> <p>Mr. Johnsen clarified that the City's Code Compliance program still has responsibilities. He also noted that the mapping information can be imported into the City's GIS system, which would be helpful to Police and Fire. He noted that the City of Spokane attempts to visit registered properties on a monthly basis, which demands staffing resources. He discussed some potential issues of fee vs. tax and how the City would administer a program.</p> <p>It was agreed to discuss this topic again at the next meeting.</p>
<p>5. Challenge Seattle initiative</p>	<p><u><b>X</b></u> Briefing and direction</p> <p>CED Director Steve Pilcher introduced this issue, noting that staff is looking for direction of whether to develop potentially responsive code amendments.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concern with "signing on" to a program that includes "low income" housing while advocating "middle income" housing since SeaTac is already more affordable than other King County cities. It also agreed that SeaTac is already doing many things that encourage more affordable housing. The Committee did not direct staff to propose any specific code amendments.</p>
<p>6. Expansion of Multifamily Housing Tax Exemption</p>	<p><u><b>X</b></u> Briefing and direction</p>

eligible areas	<p>CED Director Pilcher introduced the topic, noting that staff has been hearing from developers who would like to have this tool available in areas of the city outside the S. 154th St. Station Area, the only currently eligible area.</p> <p>The Committee discussed both pros and cons of this type of program. There is some support for expanding eligible areas, with conditions (such as only being for middle income housing).</p> <p>Staff will develop some options for the Committee to consider.</p>
7. Future Topics	Potential future topics for discussion were reviewed
8. Adjourn	The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.