

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
JULY 15, 2025**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Derek Salustro
Ken Crookston
Naser Matar

STAFF PRESENT:

Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Tim Sahr, Development Engineer

I. Call to Order

Mr. Matar called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call:

Derek Salustro, Naser Matar, and Ken Crookston were present. Earl Clausson and Amanda Edwards are not present.

MOTION: *Mr. Crookston moved to excuse Earl Clausson and Amanda Edwards from the July 15, 2025 meeting. Mr. Salustro seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

III. Reading of Preamble

Mr. Matar stated that the reading of the Preamble is not necessary as the only agenda item is for old business.

IV. Administration of Oath

Ms. Susel stated that the administration of the oath is also not applicable to tonight's meeting.

V. Correspondence

None

VI. New Business

None

VII. Old Business

A. PC25-010 CITY OF KENT

The applicant is seeking approval of text amendments to the City of Kent Zoning Code for the following:

**CHAPTER 1104: SUPPLEMENTAL ZONING DISTRICT STANDARDS AND
OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS**

Ms. Susel explained that the text amendment regarding Section 1104, which the Commission recommended to Council in March 2025, has had some changes due to comments provided by a member of the public, who is an architect. She stated that she has reviewed the comments provided specifically for Section 1104 and has incorporated comments in the draft for the Commissioners to review.

She stated that Item #2 requires a 1-foot minimum projection to differentiate two stories, however, the commenter felt that this projection would accumulate ice and snow and create issues with the building structure and that it may not be necessary. Ms. Susel stated that she researched other communities and found other design regulations and most refer to a projection or a recessed off-set, which still provides a distinction between the lower and upper floors. She stated that she added the words "projection or recessed offset" and changed the 1-foot requirement to "6-18 inches".

Ms. Susel stated that the term "design elements" found in various sections of the proposed amendments has been changed to "building features" and includes some examples to be clearer and more concise as to what constitutes a "building feature." She explained that the intent of this proposed requirement is to ensure that new construction is complementary to abutting properties in terms of including some of the same features. This issue was frequently raised by the former the Architectural Review Board so the staff wanted to include it.

She stated that subsection 5 regarding the step back of stories for new buildings that are more than 2 feet taller than existing abutting properties has been increased for stories above 35 feet. She explained that this requirement has come up in the past and other regulations from other communities she reviewed had it at 35 feet.

Ms. Susel stated that the commenting architect found the Street Level Windows and Entrances section to be too specific due to existing buildings that didn't comply with the new requirements. Ms. Susel stated that she simplified the language to say that the street level windows need be at a height to allow the public to see in and the reflective glass prohibited and tinting limited to no more than 20%. She stated that it was suggested to strike Item 2 under Subsection 3 Street Level Windows and Entrances as she couldn't find anything that necessitated keeping it as is and added Item 3 to require the front façade windows to be a minimum of 18 inches between grade and the sills of the windows.

She stated that Item 4 was clarified and added that the windows must comprise 50% of the first floor area facing a public street using multi-part windows. She explained that Item 5 was already restated in Item 1. She stated that Item 4 replaces the term design elements with the inclusion of a projected entranceway feature such as a canopy, portico, overhang, or cover as examples.

Mr. Crookston questioned Subsection 2, Item 2 that refers to the use of stucco and similar materials and if they are allowed above street level.

Ms. Susel stated confirmed that it is the case.

Mr. Crookston questioned if Subsection 2, Item 3 allows 6-18 inches to either project out above that or recessed in.

Ms. Susel stated that that is correct and it is used to differentiate where the design style will change. She stated that she used other communities that have design regulations for reference.

Mr. Crookston questioned the step back stories term used in the same section Item 5.

Ms. Susel stated that it is an architectural term that refers to the projection or recessed feature found in other regulation references, which did not specify a specific measurement.

Mr. Crookston stated that in other applications, 20% refers to the amount of light that is allowed to project into the space.

After discussion, Mr. Sahr suggested adding "(80% light passage)" to define what is meant by 20%.

Mr. Crookston agreed.

Mr. Matar questioned where the changes will apply.

Ms. Susel stated that this is for new construction or façade renovations in the Overlay District. Ms. Susel stated that she will further research the tinting and it may be advisable to list the prohibition of reflective glass as a separate regulation.

Mr. Salustro liked the idea of separating reflective glass and tinting.

It was decided that there would be two sentences: Reflective glass is prohibited. Tinted windows must have a minimum of 80% light passage.

Mr. Crookston questioned what the average window height from grade is currently in the Overlay District.

Ms. Susel explained that this is a minimum to ensure that the windows don't go all the way to the ground. She stated that they can place the windows higher than 18 inches.

Mr. Crookston asked for clarification of the language that is meant to require windows on 50% of the frontage.

Ms. Susel stated it can be changed to say "50% of the first floor area facing a public street must be comprised of windows".

Mr. Clausson stated that 1106.12 makes sense for the Industrial District. He stated that he would like to have language that addresses the site restoration when an abandoned light pole is removed in Section 1106.17.

MOTION: *In the case of PC25-004, City of Kent., Mr. Clausson moved that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that they hold a public hearing to review and discuss the proposed zoning code text amendments for Chapters 1103, 1104, and 1106 and adopt the proposed text amendments with emergency as presented.*

Mr. Salustro seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0.

VIII. Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. Clausson moved to approve the April 15, 2025 Meeting Minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salustro. The motion carried 3-0*

MOTION: *Mr. Clausson moved to approve the May 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salustro. The motion carried 3-0*

IX. Other Business

None

X. Adjournment

MOTION: *Mr. Clausson moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salustro. The motion carried 3-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.*