

City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission
Special Meeting Minutes: February 19, 2020
17425 Ballinger Way NE—Council Chambers

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Joel Paisner , Vice Chair Maddy Larson, Richard Saunders, TJ Fudge (via telephone), Jon Lebo, Mark Withers, Ira Gross, Rachael Katz; Steve Morris, Mark Withers

Staff and others present: Tom French, Councilmember; Lori Bodi, Councilmember; Phillipa Kassover, Deputy Mayor; Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Nick Holland, Senior Planner; Christina Haworth, Otak,

Members of the Public: Mike Dee; Don Fiene, Sally Yamasaki, Hayley Nolan, Dan Benson, Connie Barnes, Randy Sibonga

Planning Commissioners absent: None

Call to order: 7:01 PM

Chair Paisner said that members of the community brought treats for the Planning Commissioners to recognize the Commission's hard work. Other Commissioners thanked them for the gesture.

Cmr. Saunders arrived at 7:03pm

Chair Paisner thanked Cmr. Larson for chairing the meetings he could not attend. Chair Paisner wanted to clarify that the City Council considered the motion from the Planning Commission regarding moving the proposed parking structure out of town center. He said that the Council did acknowledge the Commission's motion, but did not act on it. He also said that some of the Commissioners are not comfortable having a garage in town center, but there is an understanding that a code has to be in place for the possibility of potential garage structure.

Approval of Agenda:

Cmr. Gross moved to approve the agenda. Cmr. Lebo seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously. Cmr. Larson said that a discussion on a message from the Commission to the Council regarding the parking structure regulations should be added to the agenda. Chair Paisner said that while the regulations may not be completely finalized, he thinks that the group can provide staff with enough direction to make a recommendation to the Council tonight.

Public Comment:

Mike Dee:

He said that he appreciates having the agenda packet online and that the Commission has suggested to extend the moratorium. He said he is concerned that Merlone Geier's comments are not being recognized with the new draft regulations. He also appreciates the summary of the hearing comments being available.

Don Fiene:

He thanked the Planning Commission and said that tonight could be a good time to make some decisions. He said that it is helpful sometimes to take a deep breath and think about why one lives in LFP when considering and making decisions. He said that when decision makers are deciding on items or issues, people that do not come to public meetings should be considered. He went onto to talk about the responsibility of public representation. He said the community is made up of a lot of volunteers. He said that the tree ordinance is the result of volunteers working to improve the community and that those volunteers are very connected with the community.

Sally Yamasaki:

1 She thanked the Planning Commission for their work. She said that the Planning Commission made the
2 material understandable and that it helps with asking questions. She said she understands why the garage
3 regulations are being created, but would like to see regulations for other parts of the City in addition to the
4 town center.

5
6 Cmr. Saunders thanked Chair Paisner for finding the record of the City Council response to the Planning
7 Commission on the issue of the garage location.

8 9 **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

10 There were no meeting minutes to approve but it was noted that the summary of public comments from the
11 2-11-20 hearing were available for review.

12 13 **Next Meeting**

14 March 10, 2020 is the next regularly scheduled meeting (see discussion below regarding next meeting).
15

16 **Report from City Council Liaison**

17 Councilmember French said that at the Council's last meeting included discussion on extending the
18 moratorium for town center at a future meeting. He said that the Council had very positive comments
19 regarding the work the Planning Commission was doing. He thanked staff for providing the public
20 comments from the hearing and indicated that the comments were constructive. He also said that he hopes
21 the dialog with the public continues and mentioned that a bigger facility might be needed for future hearings.
22 He also mentioned that the Council is discussing the next steps with regard to further code revisions. He
23 offered to anyone with questions to email him.

24
25 Cmr. Saunders asked Councilmember French if there has been any updates from Sound Transit.
26 Councilmember French said that they are negotiating with property owners whose properties are impacted by
27 the ST3 project. He said that Sound Transit has had staffing changes, so the new people will need to come
28 up to speed with the project. He said that information regarding the ST3 project and the City's involvement
29 would most likely be communicated through the City Administrator's report.

30 31 **Old Business**

32 Implementation of Town Center Vision

33 **Parking structure regulations**

34 Chair Paisner suggested that the four topics listed on the agenda under old business and the Town
35 Center Vision be discussed. Cmr. Lebo said he was recusing himself from discussion of the parking
36 garage because he is an employee of Sound Transit. Cmr. Morris said that Sound Transit can put a
37 garage in town center through claiming eminent domain. He said he does not favor trying to stop
38 Sound Transit from putting a garage in town center and noted the advice of the City Attorney. He
39 also said that the Commission should recommend regulations for a garage that will provide a
40 community benefit. He went onto say that he does not favor a 60 foot height limit, and that a
41 commercial ground level should be mandated and useful. Cmr. Larson said that she attended a
42 Council work session and that it was stated that a 30-foot high garage with commercial space would
43 workable. She also said that some Councilmembers thought that parking for city vehicles is a public
44 benefit.

45
46 Cmr. Gross said that a 30-foot height limit could accommodate all uses being considered. Chair
47 Paisner asked for clarification regarding commercial uses and what the proposed requirements
48 currently were in the draft regulations being considered. Cmr. Larson asked for Director Bennett to

1 explain what Otak presented to the Council at the previous work session. Director Bennett said that
2 he thought the main point of the information presented to the Council was to demonstrate that with
3 more of the structure underground, the height could be reduced. He also noted that the residential
4 height limit in the City is 30 feet and asked whether it was realistic for commercial structures in the
5 town center to have the same height limit.

6 Cmr. Larson said that the draft design guidelines call for garage floors to be underground. Cmr. Katz
7 responded that her understanding about the design guidelines are that they are suggestions using
8 “should” and not mandates using “shall.” She added that she favors more public benefit elements
9 such as open space and architectural style rather than stiff height regulations. Cmr. Saunders said
10 that height is a difficult issue. Cmr. Withers said he does not find 25 acres of asphalt parking
11 meaningful, and that he favors height over expansive surface parking. He also said he would like to
12 see the developer of the garage provide City parking if those stalls are displaced by the project and
13 that a requirement for open space should be mandated. He emphasized that he doesn’t care about
14 how high the garage is. Cmr. Gross said that a garage that blends in with town center is desired, but
15 does not favor commercial uses being mandated. Cmr. Fudge said there is a difference between a
16 parking garage and a commuter parking garage, and also said that a garage equates to useful parking
17 for town center businesses. He said that the 300 stall conversation should not be the driver of what
18 the regulations will be adopted.

19 Chair Paisner said he wanted commercial space next to City Hall because it could end up being space
20 for the City to use. He said he is comfortable going to 35 feet in height but would like to preserve
21 the commercial space requirement of 60,000 square feet. Cmr. Morris said that commercial uses on
22 the south side of the garage would make the building more inviting. He said that commercial space
23 within the garage is a reasonable requirement. Cmr. Katz said she agreed with Cmr. Morris. She also
24 said that the commercial tenants could be more compatible with the farmer’s market. Cmr. Larson
25 said that she still believes that we should not be programming for 300 spaces and that this stall
26 number may not be accurate. She talked about previous direction from Council, and asked for those
27 to think about the future uses of the garage, when driving is less popular as a transit option. She
28 went on to talk about public benefit in the form of architectural treatment and commercial space.
29 She said she was worried about the costs of the City operating a commercial space within the garage.
30 She mentioned her doubts that the commercial space will serve in the way it is being conceived. She
31 said that she is worried about the height over shadowing City Hall. She suggested three
32 recommendations, to keep the height limited to 30 feet, eliminate the 30 foot protrusion, and add a
33 requirement for a community space or parking for City vehicles. Cmr. Saunders asked, if there is
34 space for community uses or commercial use, how realistic is it that a tenant that benefits the public
35 would use the space. Director Bennett said that the City needs a bigger space for public engagement,
36 which was the concept regarding the space on the ground floor of the garage. He said that a
37 conversation with Sound Transit should occur regarding the City using the ground floor of the
38 garage. Cmr. Gross said that office space doesn’t have much public benefit and that office use might
39 not be the direction of what the public wants. Director Bennett clarified his statement and
40 emphasized that the space could be adaptable and serve as a commons or meeting area.. Cmr. Gross
41 asked for clarification on the commercial space square footage minimum. It was noted that the
42 requirement would be 10,000 square feet, not 60,000 as previously mentioned by Chair Paisner.
43 Cmr. Larson said that the space under the garage should not be confused as a substitute for the
44 current commons space. Chair Paisner said in the interest of making forward progress he was going
45 to summarize some of the issues discussed. One issue is the base height of the garage, another the
46 amount of commercial space required which is proposed to be 10,000 square feet. He suggested a
47 vote on topics, provided all of the public comments and information the Commission received at the
48 hearing last week.

1 Chair Paisner led a vote on the base height as a final recommendation to the City Council. Cmr.
2 Morris moved to amend the draft regulations to incorporate a 35-foot base height limit for a
3 potential parking garage. Cmr. Katz seconded. Chair Paisner asked for discussion. Cmr. Saunders
4 asked if this is connected in any way to the requirement for commercial space in the garage. Chair
5 Paisner said that the issue of commercial space will be addressed later on as a separate vote. Cmr.
6 Saunders said that the height and commercial space issues are interconnected. After some
7 discussion, Cmr. Morris withdrew his motion on the height limit. Chair Paisner said that he was
8 looking for a motion in regard to the base commercial space requirement, but that as Chair he didn't
9 feel comfortable making the motion himself. Cmr. Katz moved that, as part of the base
10 requirements, the language regarding section 18.42.090 (K) of the draft regulations (mixed use
11 requirements) be retained as currently drafted. Cmr. Morris seconded. Chair Paisner asked for
12 discussion. Cmr. Larson asked about the height component and if the Commission would be voting
13 on the issue. Chair Paisner clarified that the mixed use provision and the height provisions will be
14 separate votes. Senior Planner Nick Holland recited the motion for all to consider. Cmr. Saunders
15 said that the discussions and feedback from the community indicated that important issues should be
16 requirements. Cmr. Fudge said that commercial space really isn't Sound Transit's specialty, and that
17 the Commission should consider using Sound Transit to build something they can do well, such as
18 building an overpass. He also expressed concern for how Sound Transit could function as a land
19 owner leasing tenants within the commercial space. Cmr. Gross said via the public comments
20 commercial space makes the garage larger and the public wants the smallest garage. The
21 Commission voted on the present motion and the motion passed 5-3 (Lebo recused).

22 Cmr. Morris moved to change the base height maximum in the draft regulations from 30 to 35 feet,
23 Cmr. Katz seconded. Chair Paisner asked for discussion. Chair Paisner indicated the code section to
24 be 18.42.090 (A) (4). Cmr. Larson said that bonus heights should be considered before a required
25 base height is suggested. Cmr. Katz agreed and said that discussions on bonus height and benefits
26 should occur. Cmr. Gross agreed with Cmr. Larson. Chair Paisner also agreed. Cmr. Withers
27 reminded everyone about the residential maximum height of 30 feet, and said that a 5 foot height
28 increase is minimal and insignificant when applied to this type of use and the general scale of town
29 center. Cmr. Morris said that 35 foot limit sound reasonable. Cmr. Larson asked if height
30 maximums would be a non-negotiable element, and asked what elements of a project could be
31 negotiated with a development agreement. She again asked if the base height requirement needed to
32 be expressed in the code as a non-negotiable element. Chair Paisner asked Director Bennett to
33 clarify the issue. Director Bennett said that the base height could not be amended as a part of a
34 development agreement. He pointed to exceptions (18.42.090 (A) (6)) in the draft code regarding the
35 height limit. Cmr. Katz pointed to a section of the draft regulations where items cannot be changed
36 through a development agreement. The Commissioners expressed their reservations about
37 increasing the height beyond the limits and considered ways of incorporating the idea of a base
38 height limitation in the draft regulations. Cmr. Larson asked to amend the motion on the table to
39 include a 35 foot base height, 45 foot bonus height limit, and to include non-negotiable language for
40 any height increase with a development agreement. Cmr. Morris asked for a vote on his original
41 motion. The Commission voted on Cmr. Morris' original motion. Chair Paisner suggested to Cmr.
42 Larson that she remove her last condition of her suggested amendment to Cmr. Morris' motion. He
43 said the resulting amendment would be a vote on the 35 foot base height maximum and the 45 foot
44 bonus height maximum. Cmr Morris indicated that he would accept that amendment to his original
45 motion. Cmr. Larson said that without the language regarding what is non-negotiable, the limits are
46 meaningless. Cmr. Katz said that is a fair opinion and a bonus height maximum signifies the
47 Commissions general tolerance on the height issue. She went onto say that she would not be
48 comfortable seconding the motion with the third item from Cmr. Larson's proposed amendment to
49 the original motion. Chair Paisner suggested that a vote occur on Cmr. Morris' original motion of
50 amending the draft regulations to incorporate a height maximum for proposed parking structures of
51 35 feet. Cmr. Fudge was disconnected from the phone call. He re-joined the meeting after a call

1 back. The motion was again voted on. Cmr. Morris left the room and then shortly returned. Motion
2 carried 4-3 (one abstention, Lebo recused).

3 The Commission discussed bonus height and the development agreement requirements. Cmr. Katz
4 suggested discussing the list of bonus/public benefits (page 15 of draft regulations). Chair Paisner
5 directed the Commission's attention to the provision for City use parking stalls in parking garages.
6 Cmr. Larson moved to require 50 stalls to be solely dedicated to City use as a base requirement (line
7 25 and 26 on page 15). Cmr. Gross seconded. Discussion occurred where Cmr. Morris indicated that
8 50 stalls seems excessive. Director Bennett said that his understanding is 50 stalls is roughly the
9 amount required to replace existing City parking. Cmr. Larson indicated that models presented said
10 that a 30 foot high garage does fit 300 stalls. The motion passed 7-1 (Lebo recused).

11 Chair Paisner said that he would like to see language that requires the garage to be solar ready. Cmr.
12 Saunders asked about how the language for that element would be conveyed. Discussion on the
13 issue occurred. Subjects such as connections and who gets the power generated were discussed. Ms.
14 Haworth indicated that she could research some specific language to use for this requirement. Cmr.
15 Gross spoke about how to install panels on the roof of the garage and how a solar system is
16 engineered. Cmr. Katz said that she wants to explore how the power gets to the grid. Cmr. Morris
17 supported the idea and said public comments were supportive as well. Cmr. Withers provided
18 information on solar buildings. Chair Paisner moved to add that garages be solar ready as defined in
19 the national renewable energy laboratory and that the language be included as a base requirement in the
20 proposed code language and that it be deleted from the bonus section. Cmr. Withers seconded the
21 motion. The Commissioners discussed the motion. Cmr. Saunders asked about how the language
22 would be removed and where it would be replaced. Cmr. Paisner withdrew his motion. Chair Paisner
23 moved to include as a base requirement in the code that the Sound Transit parking garage be solar
24 ready as described in the national renewable energy laboratory cited by Cmr. Withers. Cmr.
25 Saunders seconded. A vote occurred, motion carried 6-1 (Fudge abstained, Lebo recused). Chair
26 Paisner moved to remove the language that reads "or alternative carbon features". Cmr. Saunders
27 seconded. The Commission voted on the present motion and the motion passed (6-1) (Fudge
28 abstained, Lebo recused). Chair Paisner suggested eliminating, "carbon reducing features" language
29 and all agreed. Chair Paisner motioned that under (4), bonus features, that the language be removed
30 for "carbon reducing features." Cmr. Saunders seconded. All discussed the implications of removing
31 the language. The Commission voted on the present motion and the motion passed 7-1 (Lebo
32 recused).

33 Cmr. Katz discussed the issue of bonus height and cited some of the draft language. She
34 summarized some of the action taken tonight and indicated that there is now one required public
35 benefit and two options (crossing and solar project). She said that she realizes some concern with
36 the fee program, but supports the fee in lieu language of the public benefit component because the
37 City can control how the funds are used. She went onto discuss the pros and cons of each option
38 and that she doesn't have a solution or suggestion. Cmr. Larson said she has concerns with the fee in
39 lieu language. She suggested adding another required public benefit, such as civic space for meeting,
40 and suggested that language be developed to determine the dollar value of the public benefit being
41 proposed. Cmr. Saunders said that the Council should be involved in determining what the fees
42 would be. Cmr. Morris said that bonus height was to be for a partnership with another developer for
43 some public benefit, but said he sees it unlikely that bonus height will be used. Cmr. Paisner agreed
44 with the comment. Cmr. Withers clarified that these regulations apply to any freestanding parking
45 garage, not just the Sound Transit garage and for that reason these issues may be worthy of
46 discussion. Cmr. Larson and Cmr. Katz discussed where to put a potential amendment to the fee in
47 lieu provision. Cmr. Katz suggested that a formula for determining what the fee will be should be
48 identified. Cmr. Gross said that over time the fees will not be able to accommodate a future
49 construction project costs. Chair Paisner suggested resolution on the fee in lieu issue and for staff to

1 take meticulous notes of the conversations occurring. He said that he would like to highlight this
2 issue as something to forward to the City Council, and that further discussion regarding fee in lieu
3 provision and how valuation for improvements is determined should occur. The other
4 Commissioners agreed.

5 Cmr. Fudge spoke about item (L) (1) (b); and asked how the required amount of public space is
6 calculated. Discussion occurred and Ms. Haworth clarified that it is calculated based on the footprint
7 of the structure and Cmr. Larson said that there is a provision for a 45,000 square foot footprint
8 maximum within the draft regulations. Cmr. Fudge asked if the public space square footage is based
9 on footprint, then someone would be driven to build at the max height because the amount of public
10 space is the same, if the footprint area is the driver. Cmr. Larson said it is a condition of exercising
11 the bonus height option. Cmr. Fudge asked how the amount of public space can be determined and
12 suggested the topic be tabled for later discussion.

13 Cmr. Larson suggested on a non-negotiable clause for the bonus heights. Cmr. Katz said 60 foot
14 heights are not desirable from most in the public, but that she is comfortable with increased heights
15 if it means a garage that integrates with town center and provides some public benefit. She moved to
16 reduce the bonus height as currently drafted in draft LFPMC 18.42.090 (A) from 60 feet to a 45 feet
17 Cmr. Saunders seconded. No discussion occurred. The Commission voted and the motion carried;
18 4-2 (2 abstentions, Lebo recused).

19 Cmr. Paisner acknowledged Cmr. Larson's concerns about non-negotiable language and said that he
20 understands that code requirements cannot be altered via development agreement. Director Bennett
21 asked Cmr. Larson if she would like to separate the base requirements from the bonus and
22 differentiate between what can be achieved with the bonuses. Cmr. Larson said that a development
23 agreement isn't triggered if the base requirements are being sought. Director Bennett clarified that a
24 development agreement could be sought in a situation like that, so that two provisions distinct from
25 one another should be made. Chair Paisner agreed. Director Bennett asked Cmr. Larson if she
26 wanted to cap height for a potential garage at 45 feet. Cmr. Larson motioned that language within
27 draft 18.42.170, the development agreement section, be amended to include language indicating that
28 base requirements are non-negotiable. Cmr. Gross seconded, the Commission voted and the motion
29 carried, 6-0 (2 abstentions, Lebo recused).

30 Cmr. Fudge talked about his understanding of the commercial space requirement in the garage, and
31 asked about the square footage needed. Cmr. Fudge also said that we should clarify the amount of
32 commercial space the Commission intends to recommend. Cmr. Morris said that the south façade of
33 the garage was intended to be a commercial space. Cmr. Withers reminded all that these regulations
34 will apply to any parking garage built in town center. Cmr. Gross cautioned not to regulate which
35 façade where commercial space will be required. Director Bennett suggested making it an exception
36 to the commercial space requirement. Chair Paisner agreed and the exception was added into the
37 language.

38 Cmr. Larson moved to hold the bonus height at 45 feet for a parking structure as a non-negotiable
39 item. Cmr. Gross seconded. Discussion occurred and Cmr. Fudge asked if items like solar panels
40 would be included in the height calculation. Ms. Haworth clarified that those are exempt items from
41 any height calculation. Cmr. Katz said she is not comfortable capping the height in this non-
42 negotiable manner, because of the potential for good things to occur with some applications of
43 height. She would prefer to leave it off the non-negotiable list. Cmr. Saunders said that he would
44 like to have information on the entire town center prior to voting on this, and that in the short term
45 he would support a cap for the garage, but that other buildings in town center may be able to go
46 higher. Cmr. Larson said that 60 feet heights are out of scale with town center. Cmr. Gross said that
47 other uses are easier to regulate than garages and that 45 feet should be the maximum. Cmr. Morris

1 said that the community does want a height limit on the garage height. Chair Paisner said that
2 flexibility is key in order to receive public benefit and more stalls. The Commission voted and the
3 motion carried, 5-3 (Lebo recused).

4 Provisions for project level requirement for traffic study and other special studies

5 Director Bennett presented the draft code amendments regarding special studies within the process
6 portion of the draft regulations. A discussion on special studies occurred. Chair Paisner said that he
7 does not want staff to decide which studies should be required, because the traffic study component
8 is the most important item. He suggested that the Commission specify which studies to require of a
9 town center development. Cmr. Larson suggested that the code state which regulations apply to a
10 town center project. Director Bennett indicated that all environmental studies can be administered
11 and require through the SEPA process. Cmr. Withers agreed, but also wanted to make specific
12 studies mandatory as a component of an application. Cmr. Lebo asked if the non-project EIS issued
13 for the town center could be used for a project, and he said that the traffic analysis within that EIS
14 was not adequate for a specific town center project. Director Bennett suggested that there should be
15 some staff ability to determine the requirements based on a project's scale. Chair Paisner suggested
16 that a project level SEPA be required for any specific development in town center. Cmr. Larson
17 asked what would occur if a traffic study is flawed? Director Bennett said that peer review is used to
18 determine the validity of any traffic study submitted. Director Bennett suggested some revisions to
19 this section, which removes the administrative language and in its place puts a number of specific
20 studies, specifically traffic. All Commissioners said they were in favor of the mandatory traffic study.

21 Setback and buffer requirements

22 Cmr. Larson spoke about page 7, line 2 of the draft regulations which indicate setbacks from Lyon
23 Creek. She said that the setback should be measured from the OHWM. Cmr. Fudge asked where
24 the buffer figures came from, and said he wondered if the Commission had ever discussed those
25 topics. He asked why different setbacks are being considered for a parking structure. Chair Paisner
26 said that it is in the context of the parking structure regulations only. He said that he has concerns
27 about future adjacent property owner's privacy, and asked how setbacks help a potential multi-family
28 tenant. Cmr. Larson emphasized that development adjacent to Lyon Creek should have increased
29 buffers. Cmr. Fudge said that with the setbacks proposed any other future parking structure would
30 be constrained. Director Bennett said that the setbacks are to create predictability about where a
31 parking garage would go. Chair Paisner suggested that the group move on from this topic in the
32 interest of time. Cmr. Fudge indicated that he did not want to be cut off from discussing the topic.
33 Cmr. Fudge suggested that the setback from creeks should be reduced and that the setbacks should
34 be the same for all uses. Cmr. Fudge moved that existing setback widths from property lines and
35 critical areas be maintained for parking garages in town center. Cmr. Withers seconded. Cmr. Gross
36 asked what the current setbacks in town center are and Director Bennett responded and said that
37 they are currently 20 feet from any property line. The Commission voted and the motion failed 1-5 (2
38 abstentions).

39 Bicycle storage requirements and other bicycle related code

40 Cmr. Fudge asked about what the maximum peak ridership numbers are, and if we had a number.
41 Director Bennett said that it would be information recovered with the application for a development.
42 Cmr. Withers suggested that Sound Transit provided some rider numbers. Cmr. Larson asked if there
43 is a definition proposed for long and short-term rider parking. Ms. Haworth specified the difference
44 using conventional information. A discussion occurred on where bike parking facilities should be
45 located, and a revision to locate the bike parking on ground floor was recommended by Ms.
46 Haworth.

1 Cmr. Larson discussed some line items revisions that need to be made to the draft regulations. Chair Paisner
2 suggested that the recommendation to the Council on this issue should occur tonight. Cmr. Katz said that
3 she would like to do a walk-through of the code prior to recommending anything to the Council. Chair
4 Paisner suggested compiling all of the recommendations and votes from the Commission to this point, and to
5 make a recommendation to the Council tonight. Chair Paisner asked if there are any substantive changes that
6 anyone would like brought forward. Cmr. Larson said she has revisions to suggest to the draft parking garage
7 code. Cmr. Saunders suggested forwarding a draft of what they have at this point to the Council. Chair
8 Paisner suggested a memo with bullet points discussing all items on the parking structure be forwarded to the
9 Council. He urged the Commission to include a recommendation for the Council, with the content of their
10 discussions so that the Council may make decisions with the information from the Commission. Cmr.
11 Saunders said he would like to see whatever is sent to Council. Cmr. Katz agreed with Cmr. Paisner and
12 Saunders. Cmr. Gross said that bullet points may be confusing to the Council because they could be out of
13 context without the rest of the language in the draft code.

14
15 Councilmember French said that the moratorium puts limits on the timeline. He said the garage code is very
16 important. He suggested that the Commission send their recommendations as a draft. He said a meeting
17 next week to finalize the draft could make it to Council in time for their deliberations.

18
19 Chair Paisner said he is in favor of a bullet point summary to the Council for guidance on their
20 recommendations. A discussion on whether or not to meet next week occurred, so that the Commission can
21 go over last changes before sending onto Council. Chair Paisner asked if the Commission is comfortable
22 with him assisting City staff to pull together a summary of what was worked on tonight. He is worried that
23 further changes to the code will be re-litigated at future meetings.

24
25 Tuesday, 2-25-20 was suggested as the next meeting.

26 27 **New Business**

28 None.

29 30 **Reports and Announcements**

31 None.

32 33 **Public Comment**

34 Randy Sivonga:

35 She said that it is apparent that the public process works, and that public comments informed the
36 Commission's decision making. She encourages the Commission to insist on public engagement. She said
37 that public notice for the hearing did not reach the public, and that adequate notice should be provided for
38 public hearings. She went onto say that access to a larger facility with accurate information that is
39 understandable should be a priority. She said that the public comments showed that people distrust the
40 government. She said the location of the garage in town center was not known by most, but only known by a
41 few people. She said that some elected officials said that they would pursue an alternative location for the
42 garage if they were elected.

43
44 Mike Dee:

45 He appreciates public comment at end and beginning. He said that the discussions tonight were not made
46 known to the public. He said that he would like to see public comment before voting, and that the meeting
47 agenda is too generic. He said that programming for more than 300 cars is needed. He said that a draft code
48 should be reviewed by the public prior to sending it to Council. He said that Planning Commission terms are
49 ending, and next Tuesday is the parks and recreation board meeting.

1 Chair Paisner said that this is a special meeting, but the agenda is as specific as it can be and said that he is
2 familiar with the difference between special and regular meetings. He said that timeframe dictates their
3 progress.
4

5
6
7 **Agenda for Next Meeting:**

8 Similar to this.
9

10 **Adjournment:** Cmr. Withers moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Saunders seconded, all voted in favor and
11 the meeting adjourned at 9:58 pm
12

13 APPROVED:



14 _____

15 _____
16 Joel Paisner, Vice Chair