



**RIDGEFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA**

**Wednesday, December 7, 2022
RACC - Columbia Assembly Room
510 Pioneer Street, Ridgefield, WA 98642**

- I. GENERAL SESSION CALL TO ORDER - 6:30 PM**
 - 1. Flag Salute**
 - 2. Roll Call**
 - 3. Late changes to the agenda**
- II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Anyone requesting to speak to the Commission regarding all items not subject to a specific Public Hearing may come forward at this time. Please state your name and address. Comments are limited to three minutes. Written comments may be submitted to the Clerk prior to the meeting.
- III. CONSENT AGENDA**
 - 1. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, 11/2/22 Meeting**
- IV. BUSINESS**
- V. PUBLIC HEARING**
 - 1. Code Amendments Re: Fees - Claire Lust, Community Development Director**
- VI. STAFF REPORTS**
- VII. FROM THE COMMISSION**
- VIII. ADJOURN**

**Planning Commission Agenda Packet is available at the following link:
<http://ridgefieldwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/>**



CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, WASHINGTON
Planning Commission MEETING MINUTES
November 2, 2022

Regular Meeting - 6:30 PM

GENERAL SESSION CALL TO ORDER - 6:30 PM

Flag Salute - [6:30 PM](#)

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Stan Okinaka	Commissioner	Present	
Patrick Flynn	Chairman	Present	
Gary Rightenour	Commissioner	Present	
Amanda Swenson	Commissioner	Present	
Richard Amerman	Commissioner	Present	
Katie Favela	Commissioner	Present	
John Rose	Commissioner	Present	

Late changes to the agenda - [6:31 PM](#)

No late changes to the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT - [6:31 PM](#)

No public comments provided.

CONSENT AGENDA

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Stan Okinaka, Commissioner
SECONDER:	John Rose, Commissioner
AYES:	Okinaka, Flynn, Rightenour, Swenson, Amerman, Favela, Rose

1. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, 10/5/22 Meeting

Commissioner Okinaka moved to accept the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Commissioner Rose. Ayes all. Motion passed unanimously.

BUSINESS - [6:32 PM](#)

Claire Lust, Community Development Director gave a presentation on Comprehensive Plan amendments. Comprehensive Plan amendments are proposed on an annual basis as required by code and state statute. They are typically presented to the Planning Commission and City Council in the November/December. Any Comprehensive Plan amendments that are adopted by City Council are adopted in January of the following year.

This year there are three Comprehensive Plan Amendments on the docket.

1. Ridgefield School District 2022-2028 CFP
2. 6110 N 20th St. Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone
3. Ridgefield CFP amendments

A Capital Facilities Plan is a required element of the Comprehensive Plan. The CFP consists of inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, forecasted future needs for public facilities, proposed locations of expanded or new capital facilities and a six year financing plan. An important function of the CFP is to identify the location and functional classification of existing and future public streets in the city.

This year there are two proposals:

1. Add Union Ridge Parkway as a collector between Pioneer St and N 10th St
2. To remove S 6th Way, currently identified as a future commercial/industrial collector between S Royle Rd and future S 51st Ave.

Discussion occurred regarding whether or not the City has discussed the road on Union Ridge Parkway with Clark College.

Discussion occurred regarding the difference between a minor and principal arterial.

Discussion occurred regarding Hillhurst Rd. becoming a principal arterial all the way to Pioneer St.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. 6110 N 20th Street Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zone Change

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:38 PM

No public comments provided.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:39 PM

Commissioner Rose moved to recommend approval of the 6110 N 20th St Comprehensive Plan Amendment and rezone as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Okinaka. Ayes all. Motion passed unanimously.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	John Rose, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Stan Okinaka, Commissioner
AYES:	Okinaka, Flynn, Rightenour, Swenson, Amerman, Favela, Rose

2. Ridgefield CFP Amendments

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 6:50 PM

Sabra Sand, CFO for Clark College and interim Vice President of Operations for the College. Ms. Sand stated that the College's planning, fiscal investment and safety considerations have been radically adjusted due to the potential requirement of a standard collector road north of the Pioneer roundabout. This requirement would dissect the campus community and the Clark College property.

She questioned whether the design, construction and costs for the road would be the responsibility of the College.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:53 PM

Discussion occurred regarding waiting to vote on this matter until the City and Clark College have an opportunity to discuss this matter in more detail. Ms. Lust explained that because Comp Plan amendments must be done before the end of the year there wouldn't be enough time to bring this topic back to Planning Commission.

Discussion occurred regarding the cost of the road and who is responsible for those costs.

Discussion occurred regarding the Planning Commission's comments/recommendations being presented to the City Council.

Discussion occurred regarding how the placement of the road will affect the building the College is planning to construct.

Discussion occurred regarding the City's rationale for the road being a collector.

Discussion occurred regarding whether a round-a-bout is required to have four legs coming off of it.

Commissioner Rose moved to accept the removal of S 6th Way between S 51st Ave and Royle Rd. and to remove the addition of Union Ridge Parkway as a collector. Seconded by Commissioner Okinaka. 6 ayes, 1 nay. Motion passed.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	John Rose, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Stan Okinaka, Commissioner
AYES:	Okinaka, Rightenour, Swenson, Amerman, Favela, Rose
NAYS:	Flynn

STAFF REPORTS - [7:05 PM](#)

Ms. Lust stated that the school CFP will be going to City Council for a Public Hearing and first reading on November 17th. The planned second reading and vote of adoption will be December 15th.

December will be Commissioner Okinaka and Commissioner Rightenour's last meeting and requested that everyone be in attendance.

FROM THE COMMISSION - [7:07 PM](#)

Commissioner Rose discussed the Chamber of Commerce meeting that was held in October.

Commissioner Favela participated in a joint school and City event working in the concession stand at the Homecoming game.

Commissioner Okinaka stated that Octoberfest netted \$24,000 + and was the biggest year so far.

Commissioner Flynn stated that the Trunk or Treats that were held were great. He also thanked the members of the community in attendance and the City staff.

ADJOURN - [7:09 PM](#)

Trina Siebert

Patrick Flynn

**CITY OF RIDGEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING**

MEETING DATE: December 07, 2022

ITEM:

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Code Amendments Re: Fees

GOVERNING LEGISLATION:

RCW 36.70A – Growth Management

RCW 82.02 – Excise Taxes – General provisions

SUMMARY/BACKGROUND:

Each fall, staff reviews the City of Ridgefield Master Fee Schedule (fee schedule) and proposes updates to ensure cost recovery, comply with new legislation, implement current or best practice, and address issues that have come up during permitting processes. Some of these updates require concurrent code updates. This year, three topics would require concurrent updates to the Ridgefield Development Code (RDC).

1. Administrative Adjustment (RDC 18.350.020-030). An administrative adjustment is a modification of twenty percent or less to any numerical standard in the development code. Currently, staff reviews all applications for administrative adjustment using a Type II process, which includes a 21-day public comment period and takes around six weeks from submittal to approval. The current fee for a Type II administrative adjustment is \$350. Staff proposes an update that would result in a Type I administrative adjustment for modifications of ten percent or less to any numerical standard in the development code. The Type I fee would be \$150, and the Type II fee would be raised to \$450 based on standard Type I and Type II review fees. This amendment would allow staff to review adjustment requests with minimal impacts to surrounding properties in around two weeks with no public comment period. Council approved the update to the fee schedule on December 1.
2. School Impact Fee Code Reference (RDC 18.070.060). Finance staff has been working with other departments to remove fees from the code and replace them with references to the fee schedule. This eliminates the risk of the fee amount being updated in one document but not the other. Currently, School Impact Fees (SIF) are enumerated in RDC 18.070.060. The proposed is to replace the enumerated fees with a reference to the Ridgefield Master Fee Schedule.

3. School Impact Fee Formula (RDC 18.070.100). The SIF formula adopted in code includes an adjustment factor reducing the calculated impact fees for single-family and multi-family dwelling units by fifteen percent to determine the final fees charged to the developer. The fifteen percent reduction was included in the original SIF formula in the 1990s as an additional safety check to ensure that fees were proportionate to the impact of development, and as a concession to stakeholders who opposed the creation of any SIF. The fifteen percent reduction is not the only element in the formula ensuring that developments are only charged their share. The formula reduces the total amount of construction costs to that which ties to new growth (excluding costs to eliminate existing deficiencies), includes tax and state match credits to factor in public funding available for development projects, and uses a student generation rate.

During the Planning Commission and City Council meetings held on the Ridgefield School District 2022-2028 Capital Facilities Plan, including proposed 2023 SIF rates, reservations were expressed regarding the proposal to reduce the multifamily SIF rate by 21 percent from \$11,002.35 to \$8,699.00 per dwelling unit. Using the current formula, \$8,699.00 is the maximum multifamily SIF rate the City could charge over the next six years. If the fixed fifteen percent adjustment factor was revised to be a maximum fifteen percent adjustment factor, then Council would have the option of adopting a multifamily SIF rate of up to \$10,234.11, either effective on January 1 or to be reached through incremental annual increases from a lower rate over the next six years. Staff proposes this revision to RDC 18.070.100.

Timeline:

- 11/2/22: Planning Commission public hearing on Ridgefield School District 2022-2028 Capital Facilities Plan, including proposed 2023 SIF rates.
- 11/17: City Council public hearing on School CFP and SIF rates.
- 12/1: Council adoption of fee schedule updates, with a placeholder for SIF to be completed after Council's adoption of the School CFP and SIF rates.
- **12/7: Planning Commission public hearing on fee-related code amendments.**
- 12/15: Council adoption of School CFP and SIF rates.
- 12/15: Council public hearing and adoption of fee-related code amendments.
- 1/1/23: Fee schedule updates go into effect.
- 1/20 (approx.): Fee-related code amendments go into effect.

MOTION AND RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

To recommend approval of the code updates:

“I move to recommend approval of the amendments to Title 18 as presented.”

STAFF CONTACT: Claire Lust, Community Development Director

ATTACHMENTS: 18.350.020__Adjustments._November 2022 update (DOCX)
18.070.060__Imposition_of_fees_November 2022 update
(DOCX)
18.070.100__School_impact_fee_formula_2022 amendment
(DOCX)

18.350.020 Adjustments.

Adjustments are limited to modifications of twenty percent or less to any numerical standard in this title or the Ridgefield Engineering Standards, except in the downtown core where adjustments are limited to forty percent or less when necessary for the preservation or rehabilitation of existing structures. For the purposes of this section the downtown core is west of 5th Street, east of Lake River, north of S. Shobert St., and south of N. Depot St. The cumulative modification to any numerical standard shall be calculated to determine whether the request shall be reviewed as an adjustment or variance, including all previous modifications approved for the proposed project or previous development on the site. Adjustments cannot be used in lieu of a zone change or to modify explicit policy provisions of the RUACP.

- A. When not related to a Type III application:
 1. The planning director shall make decisions regarding adjustments to this title; and
 2. The city engineer shall make decisions regarding adjustments to Ridgefield Engineering Standards;
 3. Type I review procedures shall apply to the decision when the proposed adjustment is a modification of ten percent or less. Type II review procedures shall apply to the decision ~~in either case~~ for all other proposed adjustments up to twenty percent.
- B. The hearing examiner shall have the authority to approve adjustments they are proposed in conjunction with a Type III development application.
 1. For the planning director or city engineer to recommend consideration of an adjustment to the hearing examiner, each adjustment shall:
 - a. Solve a practical problem related to a documented topographical or development constraint without adversely affecting neighboring property owners or the environment; and
 - b. Be consistent with sound engineering and planning principles.
 2. If the planning director or city engineer does not support a proposed adjustment the hearing examiner shall not consider the adjustment. However, the applicant may apply for a separate variance under Type III procedures.
 3. The city shall notify the applicant at the earliest reasonable date if the staff does not support the adjustment:
 - a. If an adjustment is proposed in writing at the pre-application conference, the applicant shall be notified of staff opposition in the pre-application letter.
 - b. If an adjustment is proposed in conjunction with a Type III development application, the planning director shall notify the applicant of staff's professional opinion when the application is determined to be technically complete.
 - c. The planning director shall explain, in writing, the reasons why staff does not support the proposed adjustment, based on subsection (B)(1) of this section.
- C. An applicant shall initiate a request for an adjustment.
 1. A written application stating the reasons for the adjustment shall accompany each adjustment request.
 2. Scaled maps showing existing topography, structures, streets and vegetative cover shall accompany each request.

3. Each adjustment shall require payment of a separate fee.

(Ord. 802 § 10 (part), 2002: Ord. 676 § 1 (part), 1995).

(Ord. No. 1108, § 2, 7-26-2012; Ord. No. 1207, § 2(Exh. A), 5-26-2016; Ord. No. 1266, § 2(Exh. A), 9-13-2018)

18.350.030 Decision standards for adjustments.

Any decision approving an adjustment request shall be in writing and supported by findings of fact and conclusions demonstrating that all of the criteria below have been satisfied:

- A. There are topographic or built conditions, such as steep slopes, wetlands, water areas, structures, streets, utilities, lot patterns, street patterns or similar conditions which justify departure from strict adherence to the standard to be modified;
- B. No significant adverse impacts to neighboring properties or to the environment will result from the modification; the cumulative effects of more than one adjustment shall be considered in this regard;
- C. The adjustment is consistent with sound engineering principles, and will be safe, practical and efficient;
- D. The modification is not contrary to the purpose section of this chapter, or to any applicable policy or provision of the RUACP or CFP;
- E. There are no other remedies prescribed in this title or the city engineering standards to alleviate the practical problem identified in subsection (A) of this section;
- F. The proposed adjustment is the minimum necessary to resolve the identified problem;
- G. The proposed adjustment is no greater than twenty percent (Type II request) or ten percent (Type I request) of the relevant numeric standard; and
- H. The proposed adjustment shall demonstrate how the development provides, through the design of the building or development site, greater benefit to the community as a result of granting an adjustment to a code standard, or
- I. The adjustment is required to comply with other regulatory schemes, for example, state licensing, and subsections (B), (C), (D), (G), and (H) of this section are satisfied.

(Ord. 744 § 18, 1999: Ord. 676 § 1 (part), 1995).

(Ord. No. 1108, § 2, 7-26-2012; Ord. No. 1253, § 2(Exh. A), 12-7-2017; Ord. No. 1325, § 2(Exh. A), 9-24-2020)

18.070.060 Imposition of fees.

- A. No building permit shall be issued for a development in a designated service area as defined in Section 18.070.070 unless the impact fee is calculated and imposed pursuant to this chapter.
- B. For single-family residential subdivisions and short subdivisions hereinafter approved, the per lot impact fee shall be calculated at the time of preliminary plat or short plat approval, noted in the face of the final plat, and imposed on a per lot basis at the time of final inspection of the building for which the permit was issued. For new multifamily and nonresidential development hereafter approved, the impact fee shall be calculated at the time of site plan approval unless deferred to building permit application, because the nature of the development is then not sufficiently defined to permit such calculation, and the impact fee shall be imposed at the time of final inspection of the building for which the permit was issued. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the fee shall be recalculated for building permit applications filed more than three years following the date of the applicable preliminary plat, preliminary short plat, or site plan approval.
- C. For development not necessitating or having been previously granted preliminary plat, preliminary short plat or site plan approval, the impact fee shall be calculated and imposed at the time of final inspection of the building for which the permit was issued.
- D. For development not necessitating a building permit, the impact fee shall be calculated and imposed at the time of site plan approval.
- E. For mobile home parks, the impact fee shall be calculated and imposed at the time of site plan approval.
- F. The school impact fee shall be calculated upon application of the formula set out in Section 18.070.100 based on information contained in the Ridgefield School District No. 122 Capital Facilities Plan, unless otherwise established by the city council. Such fee is ~~established as follows:~~set forth in the Ridgefield Master Fee Schedule.

Year	Single Family and Multifamily
2019	\$8,883.75
2020	\$10,100.00
2021	2020 rate adjusted for inflation as set forth in Section 18.70.100

(Ord. 678 § 7, 1995).

(Ord. No. 1215, 8-11-2016; Ord. No. 1286, § 2, 1-24-2019; Ord. No. 1307, § 3, 12-19-2019)

18.070.100 School impact fee formula.

The school impact fee shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{SIF} = \text{C}(\text{SF}) - (\text{SM}) - (\text{TC}) - (\text{FC}) \times \text{A}$$

- A. "SIF" means the school component of the total development impact fee.
- B. "C" means the cost of the improvements for each type of facility listed in the Capital Facilities Plan of the Ridgefield School District No. 122 needed to accommodate growth divided by the capacity of the improvement. Type of facility means elementary school, middle school and high school.
- C. "SF" means student factor. The student factor is the number of students typically generated from one residential unit for each type of school facility. The student factor shall be determined by the school district based on local data or state-wide averages.
- D. "SM" means state match. State match is that amount received from the state of Washington towards school construction costs. The state match component of the formula is that amount representing the per student amount of the state matching funds. This is calculated for each type of facility as: student factor x Boeckh construction index (cost per square foot) x SPI square foot standard x state match percentage.
- E. "TC" means tax credit. This is calculated as:

$$\frac{(1 + i)^{10} - 1}{i} \times \text{average assessed value for the dwelling unit}$$

$$i \frac{(1 + i)^{10} - 1}{i} \times \text{current school district capital property tax levy rate}$$

where i = the current interest rate as stated in the Bond Buyer Twenty Bond General Obligation Bond index.

- F. "FC" means facilities credit. This is the value of any improvements listed in the Capital Facilities Plan of the Ridgefield School District No. 122 provided by the developer.
- G. "A" means an adjustment for the portion of anticipated additional tax revenues, resulting from a development that is proratable to system improvements contained in the capital facilities plan. The adjustment for school impacts is determined to be a minimum of eighty-five percent.

School impact fee rates shall be updated annually following adoption of a School Capital Facilities Plan using the following procedures:

1. The planning director shall calculate annual inflation adjustments in the impact fee rates. The impact fees shall not be adjusted for inflation should the index remain unchanged.
2. The annual inflation adjustment shall be equal to the Rider Levett Bucknall Construction Cost Index annual change calculated after the first half of the year.
3. The indexed impact fee rates shall be calculated January 1, or as soon thereafter as the latest index information is available, and shall become effective immediately thereafter. A copy of the indexed impact fee rates shall be provided to the city council but the indexed rates shall become effective without further council review, except for subsection (4).
4. The impact fee rates may only be increased three consecutive years without further council review. In the event that the indexed impact fee rates would rise for a fourth consecutive year if the index were applied, city council shall review the proposed increase during a public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to establish a new impact fee rate.

(Ord. 678 § 11, 1995).

(Ord. No. 1203, 2-25-2016)

Attachment: 18.070.100 School impact fee formula 2022 amendment (Code Amendments Re: Fees)

(Supp. No. 94)

Created: 2022-10-28 14:52:50 [EST]