

City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting Minutes: June 9, 2020  
Virtual/Zoom Meeting

**Planning Commissioners present:** Chair Joel Paisner, Richard Saunders, Steve Morris, Rachel Katz, Jon Lebo, TJ Fudge; Ira Gross, Vice Chair Maddy Larson; Jon Lebo

**Staff and others present:** Tom French, Councilmember; Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Nick Holland, Senior Planner

**Members of the Public:** This was virtual meeting and there was no sign-in sheet

## **Planning Commissioners absent:**

**Call to order:** Chair Paisner called the meeting to order at 7:01PM

### Approval of Agenda:

Chair Paisner asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Cmr. Saunders asked for a discussion about how the timelines and changes in society impact the clock for the planning process and the Commission's timeline to approve recommended legislation. Cmr. Saunders suggested putting the item under Old Business, to be discussed first. Chair Paisner entitled the discussion 'Planning in the Age of Covid and for Equitable Society'. Cmr. Saunders suggested everyone announce the attendance for the meeting, by way of roll call. Chair Paisner stated the names of all the Commissioners that were attending the meeting. Chair Paisner asked if the announcement of all attendees of the online meeting was necessary and it was decided that it would not be. Mike Dee made a comment on chat that people at the meeting cannot be seen so perhaps they should be announced. It was recommended by Cmr. Larson that those who wanted to be recognized could do so through the Zoom chat function. Chair Paisner suggested moving on.

Cmr. Gross moved to approve the agenda as amended, Cmr. Larson seconded, and it was approved unanimously.

### **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

Mr. Gross moved to approve the meeting minutes from May 12, 2020. Mr. Fudge seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Meeting Dates:**

The next regular meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2020.

## Reading of Written Citizen Comments:

The following comments were read into the record of the meeting:

### Comment 1

1 Thanks for the opportunity to provide written comment to the Planning Commission. I would  
2 have not made this a verbal comment in a physical meeting. Residents of LFP can argue about  
3 the size of the new Town Center. These are my thoughts on the implications of what I have heard  
4 LFP discussing.

5 Parking in the new Town Center is designed to be under each new building with ground level  
6 commercial and 2 levels of residential above. We started the year using 50,000 square feet as a  
7 maximum building size for Town Center. Town Center has at least 850 parking spaces in the  
8 existing upper and lower parking lots. Since we know the tenants already in Town Center  
9 someone should run through the exercise to estimate existing parking demand based on the  
10 current business types and parking lot capacity. This exercise should also look at the tenants lost  
11 to the free standing garage and look at the reduction in general parking. Based on remaining  
12 square footage retail has general parking increased or decreased?

13 A short list of externalities and my assumptions. The pandemic has reduced the parking demand  
14 and increasing the curbside waiting activity. Transit is not going to be a safe ride until herd  
15 immunity is present which is currently estimated at 85% of the population. Immunity comes  
16 from vaccinations and surviving the infection. Transit won't reduce the traffic flows from the  
17 other side of 522 or the surrounding hillsides into Town Center and will have a small impact on  
18 the volumes of cars on 522 or 104. Transit adoption is under 15%, while cycles and walking are  
19 another 15% for commuting. We will need general parking, not reduced for TOD, in the new  
20 Town Center if it continues to serve all of LFP and not just the MG residents in the new plan.  
21 This city has failed to generate the Transit buzz where so much TOD residential would be in  
22 Town Center that we could ignore general parking and tell the cars "you have to live here to  
23 participate." The commercial side of the new Town Center will need an external customer base.  
24 A brightly colored bus extending the service hours is a change agent not a change goal.

25 The parking lots at Town Center have been used by Town Center employees and users, of the  
26 Burke Gilman trail, the LFP club house, hide and ride for the current buses (hopefully contained  
27 in the new ST garage) and satellite buildings on the edges of Town Center. This defines the  
28 baseline of a do nothing option. The code being managed by the Planning Commission should be  
29 tight enough to maintain the desired "feel" of Town Center if the builder doesn't use the design  
30 review board.

31 My sample for analysis is a 50,000 square foot building footprint and a general concept of a  
32 street level commercial floor and 2 apartment floors above it. This size of building will hold  
33 about 150 cars per garage level and 40 units per residential level. The commercial level will  
34 require 125 employees for retail spaces.

35 My concern is parking. The TOD rule says 1 car per unit and King County says 5 of the 80 units  
36 on 2 levels of housing would have no car. TOD reductions are appropriate for the residential  
37 units and employee counts (75+85 is) leaving 160 parking spaces. The commercial space would  
38 use a parking spot for every 200 feet or 250 cars for new commercial spaces. 75+85+250 is 400  
39 cars per building, not including any of the parking for the satellite buildings and trails for Town  
40 Center. A full level of garage space is 150 cars minus ramp space. It would take at least 3 levels  
41 of parking under each new 3 story building. Given the water table under the lower lot and MG's  
42 demand for residential units and their edict for no more standalone garages the planning  
43 commission should see a reasonable number of residential units will actually replace the existing  
44 commercial space in Town Center with ground level commercial and the new density requiring  
45 more parking than exists today. The parking space per building is larger than the ST parking  
46 garage restricted for transit users.

1 I am not using TOD for commercial parking spaces because the LFP customers are not transit  
2 enabled. I have used Internet sources at least as valid as the pickup truck in a Boise parking  
3 garage for all of my numbers. They should all be in the reasonable ballpark of what you would  
4 find searching for comparisons.

5  
6 Dave Lange  
7 Kenmore, WA  
8

9 **Comment 2**

10  
11 **From:** Tom Corbett <tccorb@gmail.com>

12 **Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 10:10 PM

13 **To:** Stephen Bennett

14 **Cc:** TJ Fudge

15 **Subject:** Comments for June 9th Town Center planning meeting

16  
17 We are very concerned about affordable housing in our community, even more so after the  
18 high unemployment and economic fragility resulting from the pandemic.

19  
20 Our ideal would include

- 21 1) a large number of Eco-condo/apartments of 350 to 500 square feet.
- 22 2) keeping purchase price / rents as low as feasible so they can be affordable for young people
- 23 starting out and seniors who are downsizing.
- 24 3) to encourage diversity, no age or child restrictions so that people of all ages could coexist.
- 25 4) reduced parking for these units to encourage use of mass transit.
- 26 5) some small ground-floor commercial units that could be used by small restaurants, e.g.
- 27 Acapulco Fresh at 61st and Bothell Way in Kenmore.

28  
29 We think the small units would encourage people to use nearby "Third Places" such as  
30 restaurants and common spaces, as is the case in Paris, Tokyo and New York.

31  
32 The apartments in this photo are 7 stories high, but still have a human scale that don't feel like  
33 monoliths.

34  
35 <https://www.shutterstock.com/image-photo/typical-apartment-buildings-paris-france-165257048>

36  
37 This article shows the winner of a New York City competition for micro apartments below 400  
38 sq feet.

39  
40 <https://www.businessinsider.com/nycs-first-micro-apartments-photos-and-cost-of-rent-2015-12>

1 There will be those who say this idea is not Lake Forest Park, but housing affordability in the  
2 area must lead us to think outside the box. We will be happy with anything the commission  
3 decides, and don't envy your task. We just wanted to toss this out there.

4

5 Thank you for your consideration.

6 Tom and Sally Corbett  
7 17500 Beach Drive N.E.  
8 Lake Forest Park. WA

9

10 **Comment 3**

11

12 **From:** David Shneidman <davidsh@gmail.com>  
13 **Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 5:08 PM  
14 **To:** Stephen Bennett  
15 **Subject:** June 9 Lake Forest Park Town Center planning meeting

16

17 Dear Mr. Bennett:

18 I do appreciate that you had read the previous letter we wrote at the meeting of May 12,2020.  
19 I understand there is to be an additional Town Center planning meeting June 9 with  
20 opportunity for resident input and I would like the following to be read then.

21 As I wrote earlier we are long term residents of Lake Forest Park having lived here since the  
22 1980s and live across the street from the Lake Forest Park Town Center.

23 I have watched the process defining the proposed commercial/housing development there with  
24 some dismay as it does not seem congruent with the scale and character of the community.  
25 I certainly acknowledge the right of property for the owner of that parcel to develop it, but I  
26 am strongly opposed to any modification, variance or weakening of current codes for such a  
27 development in terms of height, units per area, public space required per unit, set backs,  
28 parking requirements, sewer impact, and any or all other other codes germane to such a  
29 project.

30 I hope you will be responsive to the concerns of the people who actually live here, who will live  
31 adjacent to the consequences for your decisions here.

32 Thank you very much.

33 David Shneidman  
34 17356 Beach Dr. NE  
35 Lake Forest Park

36

37 **Comment 4**

38 Comments from Don Fiene  
39 4014 NE 178<sup>th</sup> Street, LFP, WA

40

41 47 years ago, I became a resident of Lake Forest Park. For the past 20 years I have been involved  
42 in the affairs of this City. I served on the Environmental Quality Commission, the Planning  
43 Commission, 8 years on the City Council and I continue to be active as a citizen to date. I  
44 actively participated in:

1       • “Sustaining A Livable Lake Forest Park: The Future of Town Center” 2004,  
2       • “Town Center Framework Design Guidelines” 2005,  
3       • “The Legacy 100-year Vision of LFP” 2008,  
4       • and the current ongoing Town Center Review Process.

5  
6       Throughout these past 16 years of process, this community has reinforced the importance of the  
7       Town Center being the heart of our community, a community center, not a transit center or a  
8       high density development.

9  
10      The majority of citizens express their desires through the election of Council Members and base  
11      their votes on concepts expressed by candidates. The most prevalent candidate statements are  
12      “Keeping the Forest in LFP” and preserving the “Livability and Quality of Life in LFP”.

13  
14      Citizen events of the past couple of years in which high density residential development at the  
15      Town Center was expressed as major negative concern of citizens include:

- 16       • April 2019 a public hearing on the development of the town center resulted in 311 letters  
17       received:
  - 18           ○ 153 against high residential development,
  - 19           ○ 96 expressing concern about protecting the environment at Town Center,
  - 20           ○ 50 concerned the infrastructure of Town Center supporting high density,
  - 21           ○ 178 were unfavorable to the DEIS which supported high density.
- 22       • A neighborhood group organized a meeting at Brookside School attended by about 100  
23       citizens which expressed concerns about high density at Town Center.
- 24       • Following this was a community open house and Council meeting at Lake Forest Park  
25       Elementary School attended by about 250 residents and the City Council resulting in the  
26       1<sup>st</sup> moratorium on Town Center Development.

27  
28      The majority of citizens of a community express their opinions through the election of their  
29      representatives. In LFP’s most recent election, a long-term Council Member who supported high  
30      density development in the Town Center was not reelected by the majority of citizen voters.

31  
32      In the 43 years that I have lived in LFP and the 20 years that I have been involved in the affairs  
33      of this city, the only year after year sustained series of public comments has been against a high  
34      density residential development at the Town Center.

35  
36      It appears that our community has, however, expressed a comfort level of 300 to 400 living units  
37      for the entirety of the Town Center. A density at those levels may be acceptable to our  
38      community.

39  
40      **Comment 5**

41  
42      **From:** Katherine Comeau <katherinecomeau@yahoo.com>  
43      **Sent:** Tuesday, June 9, 2020 11:57 AM  
44      **To:** Stephen Bennett; Shary Van  
45      **Subject:** Apartments at LFP

1 **This message originated from outside the City of Lake Forest Park. STOP! LOOK! THINK before  
2 you click. Use caution when clicking links or attachments**

3  
4 To reintegrate, again, that more than 500 apartments total , is not what we have agreed upon.  
5 The public has commented on this. Campaign statements have been made on this.  
6 Yet that number pops up, 300 now or in this spot and another 300 over there and in a few years  
7 another 700.

8 Let Bothell have their apartments, let Kenmore have their huge ugly cement buildings.

9  
10 When I started getting involved it was startling to find many people shrugging with hopeless  
11 frustration at how the city does not listen to us.I have been impressed with many individuals  
12 who work hard on this building project, yet that apartment number sneaks up. Please listen to  
13 us!

14 Merlone Geier is the only one who wants such a an impossible number of apartments in Lake  
15 Forest Park Center.

16

17 Please listen.

18 Kathy Comeau

19 4563 ne 201st place

20

21 **Comment 6**

22

23

24 **From:** Shary Van <shary.van@icloud.com>

25 **Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2020 3:23 PM

26 **To:** Stephen Bennett <SBennett@ci.lake-forest-park.wa.us>

27 **Subject:** Please read this letter for tonights meetings

28

29 Stephen,

30 Sorry for the confusion. Here's the letter for tonight –

31

32 Thank you,

33 Shary Van

34

35

36

37 Planning Commissioners,

38

39 Thank you for your time and effort working on the Planning Commission.

40

41 The citizens of LFP have been writing letters since the big response to the DEIS (300 + letters  
42 which the vast majority were against high-density development).

43

44 So many letters which beautifully explained how we all feel about Lake Forest Park.

1  
2 And now, reviewing the recent attachments (for tonight's meeting), it appears as though the  
3 density levels could potentially creep up.

4  
5 I hope you focus and define in the guidelines:

- 6 •lower density numbers (300 dwelling units total for the Town Center)
- 7 •open space
- 8 •extra dwelling units only for bonuses (500 dwelling units)
- 9 •environmental protections of the streams
- 10 •please don't skimp on parking spaces.
- 11 •Please don't create another Kenmore.

12  
13 Thank you again for your diligence and efforts.

14  
15 Thank you,  
16 Shary Van

17  
18 **Comment 7**

19  
20 **From:** maystork@aol.com <maystork@aol.com>  
21 **Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2020 3:16 PM  
22 **To:** Stephen Bennett <SBennett@ci.lake-forest-park.wa.us>  
23 **Subject:** "Density" within the Merlone-Geier redo of Town Center

24  
25  
26 Hello Steve,

27  
28 We are continuing our outreach regarding the proposed redevelopment of our city  
29 shopping center. Please include this in the June 9 meeting comments.

30  
31 We consider the Town Center as our local SHOPPING CENTER, not for housing that  
32 will remove the ease of parking, ingress and egress that we currently enjoy. We are  
33 looking forward to more of the stores able to reopen after being closed for so many  
34 months. Our community needs services and convenient shopping. We would like them  
35 to stay within the heart of our city.

36  
37 The idea that housing blocks are the best use for the property may work for a  
38 developer, but does little to nothing to raise the quality of life for the majority of Lake  
39 Forest Park residents. If there is not enough space for parking for the tenants of a  
40 housing block, how are the rest of us supposed to find parking? A two story garage  
41 would be fine, but where in any model do we have that for the business customers?

42  
43 We do not see where the businesses we frequent would go during such a disruptive  
44 redevelopment process. The available retail/office space in Kenmore has shrunk to  
45 almost nothing. We do not want that scenario for Lake Forest Park. We would like a

1 more interesting mix of retail and no further loss of office space. The Town Center could  
2 be made more attractive without tearing the whole place up.

3  
4 The city of Lake Forest Park is somewhat spread out with meandering, hilly roads and  
5 gulleys. It is not feasible for most residents to walk or bicycle to the Town Center, let  
6 alone carry home a quantity of groceries/other goods. We do need parking.

7  
8 We hope our voices are not raised in vain, and that our city can maintain its character,  
9 without going the way of our other nearby communities which now completely lack any  
10 charm or warmth.

11  
12 We respect our community and hope to see respect for the citizens as guiding you and  
13 the others making any decisions that will disrupt/change our quality of life.

14  
15 Submitted by Stephanie & Emile Ninaud

16  
17 **Discussion of citizen comments**

18 Chair Paisner asked if any Commissioners wanted to respond to the comments. Cmr. Larson asked  
19 about the reality of affordable housing in LFP and what the Planning Commission's influence to  
20 that outcome could be. Director Bennett talked about a provision in state law that could allow for  
21 property tax credit for the developer if affordable housing is provided. A discussion on affordable  
22 housing and local regulations ensued. Cmr. Morris summarized that the public wants clarity on the  
23 number of units and he asked if the Commission has come up with a number of units for a cap and  
24 a method to limit development of residential units in town center. Chair Paisner asked for any other  
25 comments. Cmr. Saunders said that a percentage of affordable housing is something he supports.

26  
27 **Report from City Council Liaison**

28 Councilmember French provided a report to the Planning Commission. He said there are a lot of  
29 conversation going on in the community and that an affordable housing program for tax reductions  
30 has been discussed but that the challenge lies with the numbers. He said that residential  
31 development in Town Center will be driven by unit count, character, and massing. He also said the  
32 Council has indicated that affordable housing should be included as a regulation. He said the  
33 Council recently met in a Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting to discuss what they will be  
34 considering in the future. He said that the Council will study issues, but decisions will not be made  
35 at this time until a normal meeting situation can occur and that social distancing is challenging. He  
36 said that at the recent COW meeting, the Deputy Mayor indicated that future Council discussion  
37 topics will include, what the Council's specific role is in design of a parking garage, what belongs in  
38 code and what belongs in the design guidelines. He said that they discussed proper role of Planning  
39 Commission and a design review board, and what is considered major and minor. He mentioned  
40 the should/shall matrix of suggested regulations that was presented to the Council. He said that  
41 they discussed the role of Planning Commission and Council and all decision making bodies  
42 addressed in the new town center regulations. He said that he wants to see more clarity in the code  
43 which would provide him with information to determine the roles of decision making branches. He  
44 said that Deputy Mayor Kassover is interested in determining if the stormwater regulations need to  
45 be more restrictive for baseline development. He indicated that, until a discussion with the public  
46 can occur, he would not make decisions without public support.

47

1 Cmr. Saunders asked if there is a Sound Transit update. Councilmember French said that they have  
2 not heard from Sound Transit. He said that Sound Transit is doing a realignment with regard to  
3 priorities he said there are upcoming meetings with that agency to discuss all projects. He said that  
4 they should hear back from Sound Transit about next steps soon. He said that some projects could  
5 be pushed back as much as a year.

6

7 **Old Business**

8

9 **Implementation of Town Center Vision**

10       ○ **Discussion of Open Space and Density**

11

12 Chair Paisner asked Cmr. Saunders to speak to his agenda item added earlier. Cmr. Saunders sent  
13 out a couple of articles via link on chat. He summarized an article from American Planning  
14 Association (APA) where they highlighted planning under a heated and controversial public  
15 environment. . He said that the article's provides some interesting things to think about in terms of  
16 affordable housing. He also summarized another article and said that he doesn't have any specific  
17 ideas about how to regulate the issues discussed in the articles but wanted to raise awareness.

18

19 Cmr. Morris said that Transit Oriented Development (TOD) has been lost in all of the discussion.  
20 He said that the environmental issues of Puget Sound require public transportation and it is critical  
21 to the region and that he is frustrated with the letters from the public. He believes TOD and  
22 housing should be advocated for because of the benefits it provides for the future. Cmr. Katz  
23 agreed. She said that the Seattle region struggles with segregation and its relationship with historic  
24 zoning laws. She said that neighborhood character should not dictate how communities are planned  
25 in the modern area. She spoke about how single family housing dictates what populations move  
26 into an area. She mentioned that different zoning could promote more diversity. She said she  
27 favors more diversity and TOD in town center. Cmr. Larson said that she hopes that code revisions  
28 will build on the vision that has been developed. She said she supports open space, safety, and  
29 affordable housing. Cmr. Fudge said that he is confused about planning for the future. Equity issues  
30 are not new he said, and he is not inclined to talk about how planning affects equity among people.  
31 He added that the pandemic might affect mass transit like never before.

32

33 Chair Paisner said he agrees with all statements and that he would like to be visionary about what  
34 the Planning Commission does. He added that it is difficult to talk about density and TOD which  
35 would help affordability when the only comments the Planning Commission gets from the public  
36 are from those who are opposed to what is being talked about. He said that the Planning  
37 Commission is always paying attention to the public comment, but as Planning Commission  
38 members, they have to balance the hard topics with the public good. He said that public sentiment  
39 expressed has been largely "not in my back yard". Cmr. Morris asked if the unit count should be  
40 linked to unit size because it defines the density and population limits. Cmr. Lebo talked about how  
41 the regulations can define the type of housing that gets built in Town Center. He expressed his  
42 dislike of the Kenmore site and talked about pedestrian-oriented spaces that create community. He  
43 said there should be a focus on livability and that the presence of cars should be reduced or  
44 eliminated by the regulations. Cmr. Fudge expressed his thoughts on public comments, and he also  
45 said that Planning Commissioners should articulate better what they are talking about. He said that  
46 the EIS process undermined the trust of the public. He said the meeting format has not been  
47 effective for communication with the public. Chair Paisner said that he has enjoyed the lack of  
48 traffic during this time. He said that vehicular traffic should be limited. Cmr. Saunders said that

1 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) would be another way to help with the diversity of the housing  
2 stock. Chair Paisner said that some cities are considering eliminating single family zoning districts.  
3 Cmr. Larson said that some companies have allowed additional teleworking, so micro-unit style  
4 housing may not be needed. She indicated that any regulations adopted may need to consider these  
5 types of scenarios. She added that she would like to talk about open space, not unit count.  
6

7 **Density and open space**

8  
9 Director Bennett introduced the topic for discussion and said that it did not appear that the Spencer  
10 project in Kenmore was required to have any open space beyond the private open space provided  
11 for the residents. He said that the current town center vision calls for roughly two acres of the town  
12 center to be dedicated for public open space that could take various forms. He noted that his memo  
13 to the Commission referenced some example of what has been done so far in the Kenmore  
14 Downtown. He then responded to the previous discussion about housing by suggesting that the  
15 original town center framework might provide an alternative approach to regulating housing without  
16 establishing a maximum density. He noted that there were not a lot of specifics in the original  
17 framework and that the EIS process had required some assumptions about potential density in order  
18 to analyze the impacts.  
19

20 Cmr. Saunders thanked Director Bennett for putting together the content of his memo. Cmr. Katz  
21 said she liked to read how Kenmore's code was written because it described the type of incentives to  
22 developers and clearly identified how to achieve those incentives. Cmr. Fudge indicated that he  
23 would like to know more about how of the land was owned by Kenmore and how that worked in  
24 terms of ownership rights. Director Bennett said additional research could be done on Kenmore's  
25 model. Cmr. Morris commented on how much he likes the Hanger space. Cmr. Fudge said he  
26 needed clarification on what code changes would be needed to achieve the vision. . Cmr. Morris  
27 said that incentives for developers were talked about in the past in exchange for public amenities.  
28 Cmr. Katz talked about how height limits and open spaces could be enforced as a priority in town  
29 center. Cmr. Larson said that the problem with the current code was that it could be negotiated  
30 away with a development agreement. Cmr. Saunders asked Director Bennett what the Commission  
31 could do to ensure they get the important items in the regulations. Director Bennett responded that  
32 the Commission could make important requirements non-negotiable.  
33

34 The Commissioners discussed a way to determine an appropriate site plan for the town center.  
35 Cmr. Lebo explained his view on site planning including strategies for reducing impervious surfaces,  
36 parking spaces, and increasing open spaces and setbacks. He indicated that unit count may not be  
37 the best way to determine town center benefits. Cmr. Larson said that the Commission should  
38 recommend development that benefits all segments of society. Cmr. Lebo said that other sites have  
39 had to wait for developers who will built the kind of buildings that citizens want. He said that LFP  
40 development should reflect community values. Director Bennett asked if the Commission it would  
41 useful to look at other real life projects. He asked the Commission if they wanted to learn more  
42 about the Thornton creek development. Cmr. Saunders wanted to know more about how  
43 incentives are provided in the Kenmore codes. Director Bennett agreed to research whether any  
44 Kenmore project took advantage of bonus provisions in the code. Cmr. Larson asked Director  
45 Bennett if he'd had any conversations with any colleagues who could advise LFP. Director Bennett  
46 agreed to could contact other planners in the area about developments in their communities. There  
47 was discussion about the applicability of Thornton Creek an example to research givin that the scale  
48 isn't LFPs size. Cmr. Lebo indicated the real item to track was the developer's coordination with the

1 community in terms of the Thornton Creek development. Cmr. Fudge said that public opinion limits  
2 the direction of the Commission and wondered how to convey the passion of the Commission out  
3 to the public. Cmr. Morris said that the desirable part of the equation comes later in the process.  
4 Public amenities are often delayed in a development. Cmr. Katz clarified that the Planning  
5 Commission isn't proposing a development, but that they are recommending regulations for  
6 developments.

7  
8 Chair Paisner said public input is necessary, but the Planning Commission is responsible for figuring  
9 out what makes sense and what is in the interest of the community. He said that unit count is less  
10 important, but favors affordable housing regulation with open space.

11  
12 Cmr. Larson suggested that the Commission should come to consensus about height restrictions  
13 and open spaces and make unit count less of a prescriptive requirement. Cmr. Morris said he wants  
14 to see examples of all successful developments and the codes that regulated those developments.

15  
16 Director Bennett summarized what he understood the direction from Commission and stated that a  
17 gap analysis from current framework should be done, as well as talking to other colleagues and  
18 surrounding planners and communities to learn which developments they think have been  
19 successes or failures. He said that it would be helpful to know what a successful open space is within  
20 cities of a comparable size. Chair Paisner asked if Cmr. Saunders if he wanted to see specific codes  
21 from other jurisdictions. Cmr. Saunders said that he wants to see some examples, perhaps at a  
22 future meeting, of what code language worked well for other cities. Director Bennett agreed to  
23 research the topics discussed. Cmr. Paisner said that discussions among the Commission about  
24 vision is helpful and that prescriptive requirements may not be needed.

25  
26  
27 **Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

28 At Chair Paisner's request, Director Bennett led the election of officers. He noted the restrictions in  
29 the nominations and votes.

30  
31 Chair Nominations:

32 Director Bennett asked for nominations for Chair. Cmr. Gross nominated Cmr. Larson and Cmr.  
33 Larson nominated Cmr. Katz. Cmr. Morris nominated Cmr. Saunders. There were no more  
34 nominations. Director Bennett asked for a motion to close nominations and Cmr. Gross so moved.  
35 Cmr. Morris seconded. Cmr. Saunders said that he appreciates being nominated and that he has  
36 been Chair in past and would like others should lead so he declined the nomination. Cmr. Katz said  
37 that she would like to participate as Vice Chair. A vote was taken on the nomination of Cmr.  
38 Larson for the position of Planning Commission Chair: Cmrs. Fudge, Saunders, Katz, Lebo, Paisner,  
39 and Gross voted in favor of Cmr. Larson. A vote was taken on the nomination of Cmr. Katz for  
40 the position of Planning Commission Chair: Cmr. Larson voted in favor of Cmr. Katz. Cmr.  
41 Larson was elected as Planning Commission Chair

42  
43 Vice Chair nominations:

44 Director Bennett asked for nominations for Vice Chair. Cmr. Larson and Cmr. Saunders nominated  
45 Cmr. Katz for the position of Planning Commission Vice Chair. Cmr. Larson moved to close  
46 nominations and all Commissioners agreed. Cmr. Katz said that she would be happy to contribute  
47 as Planning Commission Vice Chair. A vote was taken on the nomination of Cmr. Katz for the  
48 position of Vice Chair and she was elected unanimously.

1  
2 Cmr. Gross asked if chat comments are recorded and Director Bennett said that the video of the  
3 meeting will contain the chat discussion. Cmr. Larson asked if live public comments can be  
4 accommodated. Cmr. Saunders said zoom comments could be recorded via text file. Director  
5 Bennett said he would check with the City's IT manager on that possibility. Cmr. Morris said he was  
6 opposed to live public comment. Chair Paisner agrees with Cmr. Morris. Cmr. Fudge said it would  
7 be technically challenging and would prefer to utilize the current format for public comments.  
8 Councilmember French said there are challenges to live public comment. It was decided that the  
9 format would remain the same for the time being.  
10

11 **Reports and Announcements**

12 None.

13  
14 **Agenda for Next Meeting:** Similar to this agenda.  
15

16 Cmr. Morris moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Katz seconded, and the motion carried  
17 unanimously.  
18

19 **Adjournment:** 9:13pm  
20

APPROVED:

21  
22  
23 

---

  
Maddy Larson Chair