

City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Notes: November 15, 2017
17425 Ballinger Way NE—Forest Room

Planning Commissioners present: T.J. Fudge; Ray Holmdahl; Connie Holloway; Richard Saunders; Rachael Katz

City Representatives present: Semra Riddle, Council Liaison; Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Ande Flower, Principal Planner; Lauren Hoerr, Assistant Planner; Kim Adams Pratt, City Attorney

Public present: Mike Dee, resident; Kim Drews, resident; Nick Negulescu, resident; Jack Tonkin, resident; Max Beuter, resident; Don Fiene, resident; Ben Moore, resident; Sally Yamasaki, resident

Planning Commissioners absent: Chair Jon Lebo, Vice-Chair Joel Paisner

Call to order: 7:38 PM

With both the Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair absent, it was necessary to elect a Chair pro-tem. Cmr. Saunders nominated Cmr. Homdahl. There were no other nominations so nominations were closed. The vote was unanimous to have Cmr. Homdahl serve as Chair pro-tem.

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Cmr. Homdahl requested to add an update from Mr. Bennett on the Central Subarea Plan under Reports. Cmr. Holloway asked to amend the item under Old Business to say Chapter 17 rather than the specific sections listed. Cmr. Saunders moved to approve the meeting agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Cmr. Holloway and passed unanimously.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

October 3, 2017

Cmr. Saunders suggested adding Max Beuter's last name in the section stating who was present at the meeting and in the Public Comment Section. Cmr. Katz moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Cmr. Fudge and approved unanimously.

Next meeting:

December 12th did not work for three commissioners. The next meeting is scheduled for December 5th, 2017.

Public Comment

Mike Dee

Mr. Dee summarized his perspective on recent developments regarding the central subarea plan. He mentioned his concern that the public is unaware of the Conservation Cluster Housing (CCH) code and future potential projects, but appreciated that a question and answer session was held before this meeting to help answer public questions. Mr. Dee summarized the public comments given on CCH at the November 9th Council meeting. He stated that Council may ask the Planning Commission to write a letter to Council for their opinion on CCH.

Jack Tonkin

Mr. Tonkin presented seven concerns and reasons why he and other citizens will ask for a 90-day moratorium on any CCH projects. He stated that he presented similar arguments at the November 9th Council meeting.

Kim Drews

Ms. Drews stated that she was part of the neighborhood meeting that occurred for one of the potential CCH projects. She summarized what was presented at the meeting and stated her opinion regarding how the project does not meet the CCH code requirements.

1 Nick Negulescu

2 Mr. Negulescu summarized a project similar to CCH that occurred in Shoreline that he found concerning and
3 asked what code is there in Lake Forest Park to prevent a developer from buying a group of properties and
4 creating a CCH project. He stated that his largest concerns about the code requirements for CCH are that it
5 only requires 1 parking spot per unit and that these types of projects will accelerate property valuations.
6

7 **Old Business:**

8 Subdivision Regulation Update—Land Use Procedures

9 Mr. Bennett asked City Attorney Pratt to point out to the Commission as the discussion progressed which
10 parts of the update were bringing the regulations into compliance with state law.
11

12 Cmr. Saunders asked if an agenda item could be added to the next meeting to brief the Planning Commission
13 on CCH. Cmr. Katz asked for a handout summarizing the process and how many public meetings occurred
14 before the ordinance was approved. Ms. Flower stated that both requests could be addressed.
15

16 Cmr. Holmdahl asked Ms. Flower to provide an overview of the history of the subdivision code update for
17 the members of the public present. Ms. Flower provided a summary that included pointing out that the City
18 needs to update the subdivision chapter of our municipal code because it is out of compliance with RCW and
19 WAC standards for subdivision code.
20

21 Mr. Bennett asked Ms. Pratt to explain her firm's approach to the Planning Department's request to develop
22 a model for this code update. Ms. Pratt explained that her firm combed through cities that are nearby and
23 those that are similar to Lake Forest Park. She stated that as the chapter on subdivision code is currently
24 written, it is difficult for the city staff, the applicant, and the hearing examiner to work through the process.
25

26 Mr. Bennett asked Cmr. Katz to summarize her proposed changes to the Purpose section. Cmr. Katz
27 explained that there is one sheet with strikethroughs and one final version. Cmr. Katz read the section aloud.
28 Small changes to Cmr. Katz's draft were proposed by various Commissioners and agreed upon.
29

30 Cmr. Holmdahl asked the group if they would prefer staying until 9 or 9:30, and the consensus was until 9.
31

32 Cmr. Katz first discussed her concern with contiguous parcels. Ms. Pratt reviewed the Lynnwood code
33 stipulation that Cmr. Katz suggested and thought it would be prudent to add it but try to make it more
34 stringent in future updates. Mr. Bennett suggested a target location would be on page 13 in 17.20.130 "Further
35 Subdivision" but that it can highlight wherever it is put for the next review.
36

37 Mr. Bennett suggested prioritizing things that will need Ms. Pratt's input. Ms. Flower asked to first focus on
38 the index and explained the thought process on how it is organized. Ms. Flower suggested striking out the
39 Design Criteria section due to community concerns over CCH, and Cmr. Saunders agreed.
40

41 Ms. Flower started the review with General Provisions. On page 19, Subsection 14 was discussed. Ms. Pratt
42 suggested, instead of using the Southern Gateway language, consult with PACE to craft the language for what
43 would be required for the traffic study. Ms. Flower committed to providing updated language at the next
44 meeting.
45

46 Ms. Pratt was asked whether or not the current draft code would be in compliance with state regulations, and
47 Ms. Pratt said yes. Councilmember Riddle asked Ms. Pratt if there was anything she would strengthen, and
48 Ms. Pratt said she prioritized getting it in compliance and then strengthening it later. The Commissioners
49 thanked Ms. Pratt for her time.
50
51
52

1 **New Business:**

2 Council-proposed Amendment to Neighborhood Business zone permitted uses

3 Mr. Bennett discussed the memo from Councilmember Resha about changing the permitted uses for the
4 neighborhood business zone. The proposed change would allow stores in NB zone to include gathering
5 spaces that would allow food and alcohol to be served on the premises. Councilmember Riddle provided her
6 perspective on the proposal and Commissioners asked clarifying questions. Commissioners gathered around
7 the map to look at the zones and discussed among each other what was currently there. Ms. Pratt said that
8 the language just needs to be consistent with words used in other places in the code.

9
10 Cmr. Holloway summarized the pros and cons of the proposed code change. Councilmember Riddle wanted
11 to clarify any potential consequences from the wording of the ordinance and Commissioners discussed the
12 importance of providing definitions for key terms used. Cmr. Saunders agreed with Cmr. Holmdahl about
13 clarifying hours of operation and impact on the neighborhood nearby. Mr. Bennett said he would will relay
14 the concerns discussed to the Council.

15
16 **Reports/Communications/Announcements:**

17 Project Status—Central Subarea Plan

18 Councilmember Riddle provided an update that since the meeting on October 11th, the Council decided to
19 change consultants from Makers to Otak, the second highest ranking of the consultants that were originally
20 interviewed. A subconsultant, 3 Square Blocks, will also be joining the project. Council also revisited and
21 redeveloped the scope of the project. Half of the new budget is on communication and then the other focus
22 is developing an initial framework plan. Another budget and scope will have to be created for more detailed
23 planning later on. The Council may be asking for feedback from the Planning Commission. The goal for the
24 consultants is to develop a framework for regulations for the Central Subarea similar to what was done for
25 Southern Gateway. Cmr. Holloway asked about the timeline, Mr. Bennett clarified that the tight timeline
26 originally communicated by Sound Transit was less constrained now.

27
28 **Agenda for Next Meeting:**

29 Discuss the Conservation Cluster Housing under Reports. Continue revisions of Subdivision Code.

30
31 Cmr. Saunder moved to adjourn. Cmr. Fudge seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

32
33 **Adjournment:** 9:35 PM

34
35 APPROVED:

36
37 _____
38 Jon Lebo, Chair
39
40 .