CONVENE: 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair Elizabeth Robbins and Commissioners Grace Edwards, Terry Kirkpatrick, Brian Schumacher, Meghan Sullivan, Michael Tobias, and Anthony Varela.

Excused: Commissioner Nathan Peters.

Staff: Community Development Director Michael Matlock and Planning Manager Brad Medrud.

CHANGES TO There were no changes to the agenda.

AGENDA:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: TUMWATER PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING **MINUTES JUNE** 14, 2022:

AMENDMENTS:

Commissioner Kirkpatrick moved, seconded by Commissioner Tobias, **MOTION:** to approve the June 14, 2022 minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMISSIONER There were no reports. **REPORTS:**

MANAGER'S Manager Medrud reported the consultant is under contract to assist staff in **REPORT:** updating the tree preservation ordinance. The initial meeting is scheduled on July 21, 2022 with future meetings scheduled in August.

> Staff is in the process of reviewing a consultant contract for the update of the street tree ordinance.

PUBLIC There were no public comments. **COMMENT:**

ORDINANCE NO. Manager Medrud reviewed the Final Docket of 2022 Annual Housekeeping Amendments. **O2022-013, FINAL DOCKET FOR** 2022 ANNUAL During 2020 and 2021, staff gathered information on proposed minor Tumwater Municipal Code (TMC) housekeeping amendments to be HOUSEKEEPING considered collectively in 2022. The proposed amendments are intended as

minor corrections to the City's development regulations.

TMC 18.60.025(A) establishes a process for development code housekeeping amendments that is similar to the one the City follows for annual Comprehensive Plan amendments.

On June 21, 2022, the City Council approved all items on the preliminary docket of proposed amendments to move forward a part of the final docket. Other housekeeping amendments that do not fall under the same TMC 18.60.025(A) process will be considered as part of Ordinance O2022-015 at the same time as Ordinance No. O2022-013. The staff report includes a summary of each amendment, applicable code sections to be amended and proposed amendment language.

Manager Medrud reviewed the Final Docket of Amendments:

A. Accessory Dwelling Unit Entrances - Accessory Dwelling Entrances Amendment to TMC 18.42.010(D)(3) would change a requirement to an option:

[...]

D. An accessory dwelling unit shall be designed to maintain the appearance of the main building of the single-family residence.

[...]

3. The primary entrance to an accessory dwelling unit shall should not be visible from the yard on the same side of the lot on which the primary entrance to the primary single-family dwelling unit is located.

- B. Adult Family Homes/Residential Care Facilities Amendments would address consistency of adult family home and residential care facilities as permitted and conditional uses with:
 - RCW 70.128.140 Compliance with local codes and state and local fire safety regulations
 - TMC Title 18 Zoning in individual zone districts
 - TMC 18.53 Housing for the Functionally Disabled

Amends TMC 18.53.020 as follows:

<u>18.53.020 Adult family home</u>. An adult family home shall be a permitted use in the following zoning districts: <u>GB, OS</u>, RSR, SFL, SFM, MFM, MFH, <u>MHP, CBC, BD</u>, NC, MU, GC, LI, CS, HC, <u>and TC and ARI</u>.

Amends TMC 18.53.030 as follows:

18.53.030 Residential care facility.

A residential care facility shall be a permitted use in the following zoning districts: <u>GB, OS</u>, RSR, SFL, SFM, MFM, MFH, <u>MHP, CBC</u>, <u>BD</u>, NC, MU, GC, CS, HC, <u>and TC</u> LI and ARI. It shall be a

conditional use in the following zone district: HI.

- C. Bicycle Storage Clarifies bicycle storage requirements. 18.50.120 Required bicycle facilities.
 - [...]
 - C. Long-term (class 1) bicycle facilities shall protect bicycles and their components from theft, unauthorized access, and weather. Examples include a lockable bike cage or class 1 bicycle lockers.
 - [...]

3. Each residential unit shall have access to $\frac{1}{2}$ the required long-term bicycle space facilities.

4. Long term bicycle facilities shall be provided as specified in Figure 18.50.120(A).

 D. Capitol Boulevard Community – Multifamily Parking Requirements
 - Removes the 1.0 parking space per dwelling unit limit for multifamily dwellings to relieve off-street parking impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

18.21.060 Development standards.

Development standards in the Capitol Boulevard Community zone district are intended to achieve a human-scale, pedestrian- and transit-oriented environment:

[...]

N. TMC 18.50.070 notwithstanding, the number of required parking spaces for multifamily dwellings shall not be more than one off street space per dwelling.

E. Car Washes - Adds "carwash" as an amendment to the Title 17 Zoning definitions, instead of a specifically listed use.

18.04.010 A definitions

[...] "Automobile service station" means any area of land, including the structures thereon, that is used for the sale of gasoline or other motor fuels, oils, lubricants, and auto accessories, <u>including but not</u> <u>limited to transmission, lube and tire stores, and car washes as a</u> <u>primary use</u>; and which may or may not include washing, lubricating, and other minor servicing <u>as accessory uses</u> with the exception of automobile body work.

[...]

Commissioner Kirkpatrick inquired as to how an electric vehicle (EV) charging station fits within the definition. Manager Medrud offered that it could be added. EV charging stations are a permitted use throughout the City's commercial and industrial zones as a standalone use rather than an accessory use. He agreed the recommendation would be appropriate to consider.

F. Duplexes - Amends the permitted uses in the RSR and SFL: "Duplexes" are allowed in the residential/sensitive resource (RSR)

and singlefamily low density residential (SFL) <u>zone districts on</u> <u>individual lots legally established before or on April 15, 2021</u>. Such <u>uses Duplexes</u> shall not occupy more than twenty percent of the total lots in a new short plat or subdivision, which was legally established after April 15, 2021. In such cases, the community development director shall have the discretion to alter the percentage in order to allow the new short plat or subdivision to meet minimum required densities due to topography or other special conditions related to the site, such as critical areas.

Commissioner Kirkpatrick asked for clarification on whether a duplex could include a two-story duplex as well as a side-by-side one-story duplex. Manager Medrud affirmed that a duplex is considered two housing units on one parcel that is designed in any type of configuration.

Chair Robbins asked whether allowing additional residential and associated activities would pose more problems for Residential Sensitive Resource zone districts. Manager Medrud noted that Residential Sensitive Resource density is capped at no more than four dwelling units per acre, which would drive the type of development.

Amends the permitted uses in the SFM:

"Duplexes" are allowed in the single-family medium density residential (SFM) zone <u>district on individual lots legally established</u> <u>before or on April 15, 2021.</u> <u>Such uses Duplexes</u> shall not occupy more than thirty percent of the total lots in a new short plat or subdivision, which was legally established after April 15, 2021. In such cases, the community development director shall have the discretion to alter the percentage in order to allow the new short plat or subdivision to meet minimum required densities due to topography or other special conditions related to the site, such as critical areas.

- G. Impound Yards Adds "impound yards" use, which is not currently permitted in any zone districts in the City:
 - Creates a new definition in TMC 18.04.090
 - Adds as a conditional use to the LI, HI, and ARI zone districts
 - Adds minimal conditions through the conditional use process in TMC 18.56.180

Chair Robbins asked whether the City is experiencing a demand for the use within the City. Director Matlock advised that the department has received one request for development of an impound yard.

Councilmember Tobias inquired about the status of the auction yard near the BPA power lines. Manager Medrud advised that the auction

yard no longer exists on the site. An impound yard would not be an allowed use on that specific site because it is located in the General Commercial zone district.

H. Mixed Use Overlay (MUO) - Clarifies that MUO requires commercial uses along primary roadways rather than 20% of every building.

18.33.060 Development standards.

Buildings entirely or partially located more than two hundred feet from the Tyee Drive/Israel Road intersection right of way and that contain a commercial and/or residential use shall meet the density standards below and the applicable development standards in TMC 18.20.060(B) through (H) of the underlying mixed use zone district. See Diagram 18.33.060. All other uses shall meet the applicable development standards of TMC 18.20.060(A) through (H).

A. Each parcel in the mixed use overlay shall contain residential and commercial uses. The entire gross floor area of the first floor of building(s) facing existing or new public right-of-way frontage shall be dedicated to commercial uses.—A minimum of twenty percent of each building shall be commercial and a minimum of twenty percent shall be residential.; provided, that n No less than ten thousand square feet of gross floor area of a building and no more than fifty thousand square feet of gross floor area of a building shall be dedicated to commercial uses. The percentage shall be calculated by determining the percent of square feet devoted to each type of use.

[Delete Diagram 18.33.060]

Manager Medrud explained that when the MUO was adopted, developers were required to build both residential and commercial uses on the same parcel. Each of the buildings within the development must be comprised of 20% at a minimum of either commercial or residential. The only parcel with a MUO in the City is not conducive to include commercial uses because of the parcel's configuration. The proposal would enable commercial uses along the primary roadway with residential located behind the commercial use(s).

I. Nonconforming Signs - Addresses a conflict in the nonconforming signs requirements in TMC 18.44 Signs
 18.44.090 Existing signs.

Any existing sign may continue to be in operation and be maintained after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter and shall be a legal nonconforming sign provided:

[...]

B. A nonconforming sign may not be structurally altered or

^[...]

relocated. However, if such alteration or relocation is required as a result of government action, then said action is exempt.

Addresses a conflict in the nonconforming signs requirements in TMC 18.44 Signs

18.44.090 Existing signs.

[...]

C. A nonconforming sign will cease to be a legal nonconforming sign if a structural alteration or relocation increases its nonconforming status. An increase in nonconforming status will be construed to be a violation of this chapter and such sign will be subject to removal as provided in this chapter and TMC Chapter 18.54. Changes in the sign face wording of a nonconforming sign shall not be deemed an alteration under this section.

- J. Optometry Clinics Addresses "optometry clinics", which do not fit in the existing "medical clinic" or "professional services" uses
 - Creates a new "optometry clinics" use with a new definition in TMC 18.04.150
 - Adds as a permitted use to the NC, CS, MU, CBC, GC, TC, LI, HC, BD, and ARI zone districts
- K. Personal and Professional Services For consistency and understanding, split "personal and professional services" into "personal services" and "professional services" and removes "personal and professional and services and sales" from the TMC 18.07.020 Table Commercial zone districts permitted and conditional uses – Summary Tables of Uses

18.04.160 P definitions.

[...]

"Personal service" means a business which is neither the practice of a profession, nor dealing primarily with the sale of products as stockin-trade on the premises. <u>Product sales shall not occupy more than</u> <u>twenty-five percent of the floor area of the business</u>. Such businesses include, but are not limited to, barber and beauty shops, tailoring, shoe repairing, photographic studios, tanning parlors, and pet grooming and obedience training.

[...]

- Changes "personal and professional services" to "personal services"
- Adds the use to NC zone district and amend the name of the use in the CS, MU, CBC, GC, HC, and TC zone districts
- Deletes the combined "personal and professional services or sales" from NC and TC zone districts
- Changes "personal and professional services" to "personal

services" in the LI and ARI zone districts

- Adds "professional services" as a standalone permitted use in all commercial zone districts
- Adds "professional services" as a standalone permitted use in the LI and ARI zone districts
- Adds "professional services" as a permitted use to all subdistricts except the Bluff subdistrict in the BD zone district
- L. Public Building Signs Adds exemptions for the size and number of signs for public buildings located in residential zone districts.

18.44.140 Residential zone districts.

The following regulations shall apply to all residential zone districts (RSR residential/sensitive resource, SFL single-family low density residential, SFM single-family medium density residential, MFM multifamily medium density residential, MFH multifamily high density residential, and MHP manufactured home park zone districts):

[...]

F. In all residential zone districts, the height of any freestanding sign shall not exceed six feet, <u>except public buildings and churches are allowed one freestanding sign up to fifteen feet in height. Any additional public building freestanding signs must not be more than six feet in height; and</u>

[...]

; and

H. Public buildings and churches located in residential zone districts are allowed up to fifty-five square feet of signage. Signs may be freestanding or wall mounted. The allowed square footage may be applied to more than one sign, but the overall amount may not exceed fifty-five square feet.

Chair Robbins asked whether illuminated signs are included within the amendments. Manager Medrud said the code addresses illuminated signs in another section. The proposal only addresses the height of freestanding signs and the size of the sign (square footage). All other requirements, such as lighting would remain unchanged.

Commissioner Schumacher questioned the inclusion of churches, as they are not considered a public building. Manager Medrud said the churches were included because they function similar to schools and have similar requirements in terms of locating them and in the use of the facilities. Commissioner Schumacher commented that churches are exempt from property tax and should not be afforded benefits afforded to public buildings.

- M. Residential Mechanical Equipment in Setbacks Allows "residential mechanical equipment" in the RSR, SFL, and SFM zone districts rear setbacks.
- N. Residential Storage Sheds Gravel Access
 - Adds an exemption for residential storage sheds from driveway surface requirements
 - Currently, if a residential property owner wants to build a detached storage shed on a property having a gravel driveway, TMC 18.50.020(A)(1) requires compliance with the current parking regulations
 - In this case, TMC 18.50.030(B) requires residential property owner to convert the driveway to a hard surface, such as asphalt or concrete
- O. Subdivision Dedication Code Language Update Updates the subdivision dedication code language in TMC 17.24.030(D)(2) to change "men" to "persons"

Manager Medrud reported the Commission is scheduled to review the proposed development code changes at a worksession on July 26, 2022. He invited submittal of any questions or comments prior to the next meeting. The schedule includes a public hearing in August with the Commission's recommendation presented to the Council in September.

ORDINANCE NO.
O2022-015,
OTHER
HOUSEKEEPING
AMENDMENTS:
Manager Medrud reported Ordinance No. O2022-015 contains three proposed amendments to Title 2 Administration and Personnel, Title 12 Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places, and Title 15 Building and Construction that do not fall under the TMC 18.60.025(A) process but considered concurrently with the development code final docket in Ordinance No. O2022-013.

Manager Medrud reviewed the proposed amendments:

- A. Sidewalks Obstructions, Maintenance, and Repair the amendments address:
 - Short-term and long-term sidewalk maintenance
 - Clarify who is responsible for maintenance of sidewalks
 - Currently, neither the Tumwater Municipal Code nor the Tumwater Development Guide clearly addresses this issue

Proposed amendment language, new sections added:

12.08.035 Removal of sidewalk obstructions.

It shall be the duty of the owner of abutting property to remove or correct any condition which renders any sidewalk, curb, or driveway unsafe or unfit for use, including snow, ice, or obstruction of any kind, natural or artificial. [...]

12.12.070 Sidewalk maintenance and repair.

It shall be the duty of the owner of abutting property to keep the sidewalk, curb, and any driveway access in good repair at the owner's own expense. The owner shall maintain, or replace if necessary, the sidewalk, curb, driveway, or street tress to remove or correct any condition which renders any such sidewalk, curb, or driveway unsafe or unfit for use, including slopes (running and cross), lips or displacements, cracks, and algae and other slip hazards.

Commissioner Schumacher conveyed concerns about the proposal and cited a neighbor with a propensity for filing lawsuits and how the proposal increases the risk to homeowners subject to lawsuits for slip and fall accidents on sidewalks.

Commissioner Sullivan pointed how the proposal places additional burdens on senior citizens and disabled homeowners. Most property owners in the City are unaware that they are responsible for maintaining the sidewalk fronting their property.

Commissioner Kirkpatrick questioned whether the City has similar liability in terms of clearing streets. He questioned whether the provisions are dictating actions of property owners.

Director Matlock replied that in the case of liability risk, the City would be the responsible party.

Commissioner Tobias asked whether the proposal would include an inherent authorization for the property owner to use the sidewalk, such as a small business to place signage or other items. Manager Medrud explained that signage would be independent of the sidewalk proposal because it is possible to place a small business or "For Sale" signs of a specific size as allowed in the code.

Commissioner Tobias suggested an alternative of including "should" language rather than "shall" language, such as the example of the proposed changes to accessory dwelling units.

Chair Robbins pointed out other concerns such as obstructions not owned by the property owner, i.e., power pole or other utility structures. Manager Medrud said those instances are separate as those types of structures are permanent. Chair Robbins inquired about the circumstance of a temporary obstruction. Manager Medrud reported he would follow up with transportation staff.

Discussion ensued on the purpose of the proposed change if "should" was substituted and how the new requirements would be communicated to property owners. In response to comments on differentiating private versus public streets, Manager Medrud explained that private streets are designated by "blue" street signs and public streets are designated by "green" street signs.

Medrud advised that he would follow up on the questions with staff.

- B. Staff Reports for Hearing Examiner Schedule
 - Review when a staff report is needed for a hearing examiner hearing
 - The hearing examiner has asked that the date when staff reports have to be available be changed from the current five working days prior to the public hearing to seven days
 - Amend TMC 2.58.110 Distribution of information
- C. Traffic Study Requirements Updates the criteria for when a traffic impact analysis is required.

15.48.060 Traffic study.

Nonexempt building permit applications for the following types of developments must be accompanied by a traffic impact analysis study prepared by an engineer registered in the state of Washington with special training and experience in traffic engineering and who is a member of the Institute of Transportation Engineers and submitted by the applicant:

- A. Development that generates fifty or more vehicle trips in the peak direction of the peak hour on the adjacent streets and intersections; or
- B. Development that generates twenty-five percent or more of peak-hour traffic through a signalized intersection or the critical movement at an unsignalized intersection.

All developments that are estimated to generate ten or more vehicle trips, five or more truck trips, or one or more trips to any Interstate 5 interchange must provide trip distribution diagrams prepared by a qualified transportation professional even if a full traffic impact analysis is not required.

Chair Robbins asked how the City handles sequential development as it pertains to transportation studies and how each development impacts transportation. Manager Medrud responded that as a component when scoping a project, staff accounts of all known projects to include projects that have completed a feasibility review or are pending project review. Director Matlock added that each intersection has a rated level of service and transportation studies consider the cumulative impacts of developments.

Commissioner Schumacher commented on the substantial amount of traffic along 93^{rd} Avenue near Interstate 5. He asked about potential plans to improve 93^{rd} Avenue to handle the volume of traffic. Manager Medrud

advised that 93rd is a designated state highway and is subject to improvements by the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Manager Medrud reported the review and approval process timeframe follows the previous process. He plans to contact staff to address questions prior to the Commission's worksession.

Manager Medrud reported a review of the development review process was prompted by the Commission's request for additional details on the development project process. The intent of the training is to begin with the review of the broader development review process the City is required to follow with an actual development project proposal presented in September.

The City's project development review process is based on state laws, City plans, policies, codes, and regulations that have established the following:

- Determining how and where the City will grow and providing areas for new housing and jobs based on the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)
- Separating incompatible land uses
- Providing for essential public facilities
- Supporting affordable housing and other City goals
- Establishing timelines for review and vesting requirements

The City's Comprehensive Plan establishes goals, policies, and actions for land use, transportation, housing, parks, recreation, and the environment, as well as other factors. Those goals and policies in conjunction with City Council Strategic Priorities (updated annually) focus the direction of the Community Development Department's annual work program. Updating Comprehensive Plan goals and policies is limited to a yearly process with the state requiring a major update of the Comprehensive Plan every eight years. The major update of the City's Comprehensive Plan is scheduled to begin in fall 2022 and conclude by June 2025.

The Comprehensive Plan also includes subarea plans and other plans that support the Comprehensive Plan, such as the Brewery District Plan, Capitol Boulevard Corridor Plan, as well as other subsidiary plans, such as the Urban Forestry Management Plan, and the Climate Mitigation Plan.

Regulations codify and implement the policies for application to all types of projects, large and small. Additionally, the City utilizes a set of guidelines, such as the Tumwater Development Guide containing all construction regulations for building roads and utilities, as well as the Citywide Design Review Guidelines that oversee design requirements and guidelines of projects, and the Building Code.

A series of state laws codified within the Growth Management Act

PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING PROGRAM – DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DISCUSSION:

determine how and where the City will grow. The state provides a forecast on the population the City must plan for in both housing and jobs. The Comprehensive Plan identifies locations to support housing and jobs with regulations ensuring those goals are compatible, as well as essential public facilities. The City has also adopted goals to support affordable housing and protection of the environment (Urban Forestry Management Plan). The state has defined vesting and timelines for project review.

In addition to the development review process, protecting the environment is another goal within the GMA. The City's Climate Mitigation Plan, open spaces, and the Urban Forestry Management Plan all support those requirements. Another requirement is the efficient movement of people and good through the transportation system.

Manager Medrud reviewed a typical process a project undertakes and how public input is factored and influences the development review process. Citizen influence is greatest at the legislative level when the Council establishes policies, goals, codes, regulations, and guidelines for development. Citizen influence begins to lessen during the City's prescriptive processes, which outlines public processes and how decisions can be altered. At the permitting process level, the ability for the public to influence the outcome is limited within the confines of codes and regulations.

Manager Medrud shared information on the public's negative response the City of Lacey experienced after approving a gas station as a conditional use.

The City of Tumwater established a Development Review Committee comprised of the City's Building Permit Manager, Associate Permit Planner, Community Development Director, Building Official, and development engineering staff serving as the fundamental group to review and process project applications submitted to the City for all types of development projects. The committee is responsible for ensuring development applications meet the intent and the letter of all codes.

The City also has implemented a Consolidated Development Application and Review process to afford a developer an opportunity to submit other types of development permits, such as a conditional use permit or a planned unit development application concurrently with the development application for one joint review and decision rather than separate reviews.

The code includes some exempt actions depending upon the size of the project and the type of exemption. Typical exemptions include the State Environmental Policy Act review process. Local jurisdictions have the ability to include exemption levels within codes. For example, a short plat (9 dwelling units or less) exempts the applicant from completing a SEPA review. Each project requires a Project Permit Application that is specific to

the type of project that requires a review by staff, such as application forms, site plans, proof of water or sewer service, fees, and specific types of plan sets.

The City's process for submittal of an application is a rigid process and outlined in Title 14 of the Tumwater Municipal Code. The first step is a feasibility review of a project idea to a well-developed set of plans. All preapplication reviews occur with the Development Review Committee with meetings scheduled weekly. The feasibility review serves as an informal discussion about a potential project with no commitments from the City or the applicant. Two formal meetings required as part of the project review process are the preliminary and formal reviews of projects by the Development Review Committee. In each case, specific requirements are reviewed from the applicant as part of the submittal package. The goal is to ensure project applications submitted to the City do not require additional documentation to complete a project review. All preapplication meetings are open to the public and notices of each meeting are published. A public comment period is not afforded during review meetings other than listening to the proceeding and submitting written comments to staff, which are included in the file and considered as part of the application package.

Manager Medrud reported the project review process is applicable to both small and large projects with different applications for the size and type of project. Applications can be submitted electronically to the City. Under state law, the City has 28 calendar days from the receipt of an application to determine whether the application package is complete. Following determination of a complete application, the City has 14 days to issue a public notice of application, which is typically applied to larger projects. The notice is posted at City Hall, mailed to adjacent property owners located within 300 feet of the boundary of the project site, and published in The Olympian newspaper. Following determination of a complete application, the City is required by state law to review all project materials and issue a decision within 120 days. The City has the ability to seek additional information for clarification, which stops the clock. The timeline is intended to ensure all applications are processed timely and moved forward. Prior to issuance of a final decision, the City pursues the SEPA environmental review process, if applicable.

MOTION:

Councilmember Tobias moved, seconded by Councilmember Varela, to extend the meeting to 9:15 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prior to the end of the 120 days, the City issues the SEPA determination, if applicable. Today, the City rarely encounters projects that have been issued a Determination of Significance because of effective state and City codes and regulations. A SEPA Checklist is submitted as part of an application package identifying impacts caused by the project in specific areas. Any resulting impacts require mitigation to offset the impacts.

SEPA decisions can be different dependent upon the type of the project. Smaller scale applications for a building permit typically receive an Administrative Decision with staff issuing the decision. If someone appeals the decision, the decision moves to an open record hearing before the Hearing Examiner. Larger projects, such as a subdivision, a conditional use permit, planned unit development, or appeals are referred to the Hearing Examiner for an open record hearing. The Hearing Examiner conducts a hearing and accepts written comments, exhibits. public and recommendations submitted by staff, public testimony, and testimony by the applicant. All the information is part of the official record and considered as part of the Examiner's decision. All appeals of the Examiner's decision are referred to Thurston County Superior Court.

Manager Medrud reviewed TMC 14.08.030 depicting a table listing different project types that are subject to a Hearing Examiner process or Administrative decision.

Manager Medrud advised that more information on development activity in the City is available on City's social media platforms (website, Facebook), through public meetings and public hearings, on signs at project sites, local media, and email communications. He cited some specific websites to visit to obtain information on materials that are included in a project application, notices of applications of SEPA determinations, Development Committee Review meetings and agendas, zoning maps, Tumwater Municipal Code, and contact information.

Manager Medrud referred to additional materials provided to the Commission to include a list of definitions from Title 14 of the TMC, several pages outlining the development review process, and codes covering specific development actions.

- **NEXT MEETING** The next meeting is on Tuesday, July 26, 2022 at 7 p.m. The agenda includes a worksession on the Final Docket for 2022 Annual Housekeeping Amendments & Other Amendments and a possible briefing on the 2022 Comprehensive Plan Amendments.
- ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Sullivan moved, seconded by Commissioner Varela, to adjourn the meeting at 9:06 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net