

City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission
Draft Regular Meeting Minutes: June 8, 2021
Virtual/Zoom Meeting

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Maddy Larson, Vice Chair Rachael Katz, David Kleweno, Richard Saunders, T.J. Fudge, Ira Gross, Melissa Cranmer

Staff and others present: Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Nick Holland, Senior Planner, Councilmember Lorri Bodi (Planning Commission Liaison)

Members of the Public: Mike Dee, Don Fiene, Randi Sibonga, Elizabeth Fiene, Jack Tonkin, Dale Cote, Paul Sanford, Taira Ortega, Richard Larson

Planning Commissioners absent: Lois Lee

Call to order: Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Land Acknowledgement:
Cmr. Saunders read the land acknowledgement.

Approval of Agenda
Cmr. Saunders made a motion to approve the agenda, Cmr. Gross seconded and the motion to approve the agenda was approved unanimously.

Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 11, 2021
Cmr. Gross made a motion to approve the May 11, 2021 meeting minutes as presented, Cmr. Saunders seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting Dates:
Next regular meeting is scheduled for July 13, 2021. Cmr. Fudge and Cmr. Cranmer indicated that they would not be available for the July meeting.

Citizen Comments:
Mr. Dale Cote who resides at 17402 44 AVE NE explained that he could not develop an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on his property due to conflicts with the LFP code. He went onto explain how his situation did not comply with current LFP code and that finding an allowable location for an ADU was the main issue for them. He mentioned that Lyon Creek bisects their property. Chair Larson indicated that she was contacted by Mr. Cote and invited to inspect their situation.

Report from City Council Liaison
Councilmember Bodi said that the work on ADUs is important to the Council, and she said that the recommendations from the Planning Commission are being anticipated. She said that ADUs are important to housing diversity and said that the challenges of the permit process are real for applicants. She said that the matrix that was prepared was a good way to discuss the issues. She said that the lobbyist at the State level indicated that legislation for ADUs passed but had been vetoed by the Governor. She said that passing a local LFP ordinance is important because it should stand without State interference.

Chair Larson asked for an update on Sound Transit's progress. Councilmember Bodi responded with an update on the status of the BAT lanes in the wake of declining revenues. She said that Sound Transit has filed an appeal to the Puget Sound Growth Management Hearing Board on the LFP Town Center code updates. She said that the City would like to work collaboratively with Sound Transit in negotiating a settlement before the appeal goes to hearing.

1
2 **Old Business**
3

4 *Evaluation of LFP's Accessory Dwelling Unit and Accessory Building Regulations*
5

6 • *Discuss potential areas of amendment in LFP Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code provisions*

7 Chair Larson introduced the topics of discussion. She mentioned that she would like input on identifying the
8 priorities. Chair Larson said she would like to start the conversation with information on building siting.

9 Cmr. Saunders asked about the goals for the next few meetings. Chair Larson summarized her understanding
10 of the direction. Director Bennett indicated that staff would draft amendments to the current code, based on
11 the discussion at this meeting. Cmr. Fudge asked if code recommendations were to be expected by August.

12 Chair Larson said that Council would like the work done as soon as possible. Cmr. Fudge said that
13 community input should be priority. He said that the ADU topic has taken up more than the allowable
14 percentage of the Planning Commission's work plan. Director Bennett said that, in his experience, asking the
15 public to comment on proposed code changes from the Commission could generate more useful feedback.

16 Cmr. Cranmer asked about the public survey. Cmr. Katz said that the agenda had been agreed upon for
17 tonight, and the Commission had voted to proceed with a discussion that could produce ideas for code
18 changes. Chair Larson summarized the direction of the Commission for the next few meeting.
19

20 Councilmember Bodi emphasized that the Planning Commission represents the community and that they
21 function as members of the community.
22

23 Director Bennett shared his screen and introduced a matrix that he and Chair Larson had prepared which
24 summarized the ADU requirements for LFP and surrounding communities for ADUs. He also noted that the
25 matrix included related policy questions. Chair Larson asked for some feedback on whether detached ADUs
26 should be allowed in the front yard. Cmr. Gross indicated that he was in favor of allowing ADUs in locations
27 other than the rear yard. There was discussion about setbacks and building height as they relate to the
28 location of ADUs in single family zones. Chair Larson asked for input from Cmr. Kleweno. Cmr. Kleweno
29 said that he would need some data points to understand the topic. He asked why detached structures are only
30 allowed in the rear yard. Director Bennett responded that it was a conservative approach that the Council at
31 the time probably thought would result in fewer unintended consequences. Cmr. Kleweno said that whatever
32 is decided, there will be unintended consequences. Cmr. Fudge said that he was in favor of locating ADUs in
33 areas other than the rear yard.
34

35 Cmr. Cranmer said that she would welcome alternative placement of ADU structures but that she was also
36 concerned about environmental impacts of building placement. She said that buffers for structures are
37 important. Cmr. Katz said that she is in favor of alternative placement for ADUs and that setbacks should be
38 kept consistent with existing single-family homes. Cmr. Saunders said that alternative placement for ADUs
39 should be considered and that it could be a major barrier to overcome. He suggested that proximity to other
40 residential buildings should be the main concern rather than strict building setbacks. Chair Larson
41 summarized the position of Commissioners and said that everyone seems to be on board with changing the
42 allowed location of accessory buildings for ADU purposes. She asked about how this would affect other code
43 requirements. Director Bennett indicated that staff could come up with options for the Commission to
44 consider that would not conflict with other code requirements. Chair Larson mentioned having potential
45 design standards for ADUs. Cmr. Fudge said that the character of ADUs is driven by the height and bulk of
46 the structure. Discussion continued regarding the potential ADUs rules and legislation. Cmr. Kleweno said
47 that the Master Builders Association has created a list of key areas to increase ADUs. Chair Larson asked if
48 there was an interest in taking away other barriers to ADU construction.
49

1 Cmr. Saunders and Cmr. Katz expressed their support for ADU height limits that are consistent with the
2 underlying single-family zones. Cmr. Cranmer said the height should be a function of the property line
3 setback. Cmr. Gross asked for clarification on what the front yard area is defined as, and Director Bennett
4 provided clarification. Chair Larson asked for staff to explore the issues of parking, the owner occupancy
5 requirement, and the number of ADUs per parcel. Cmr. Katz indicated that she was not in favor of the
6 owner occupancy requirement. Cmr. Cranmer provided perspective on the owner occupancy requirement as
7 it relates to occupancy rules in California and short-term rentals. Chair Larson suggested moving onto the
8 next agenda item. Cmr. Katz said that short term rentals could be regulated in other areas of the code.

9
10 • *Discuss public engagement strategy and draft survey*

11 Chair Larson asked for input on the draft survey that was distributed to the Commission members. She said
12 that Cmr. Cranmer helped develop the survey. Cmr. Kleweno asked about the potential of small houses
13 being included with this ordinance. Cmr. Cranmer provided perspective on the potential for small/tiny
14 homes. Chair Larson asked if home size should be a component of the survey. Cmr. Fudge said he
15 appreciated the format of the survey as drafted. Cmr. Saunders said that he liked the the survey as well.
16 Director Bennett suggested asking the public if ADUs should be allowed in the front yard. Cmr. Kleweno
17 said he wanted the survey to determine how far the community wants the ADU code changes to go and if the
18 community would like more than one ADU per parcel. Cmr. Katz said she liked the survey as drafted. Cmr
19 Fudge agreed and said that the technical aspects of the site design can be confusing to the public and it would
20 require a lot of explanation to ask the additional questions being discussed. Chair Larson summarized the
21 amendments she would make to the survey to reflect the discussion. Chair Larson asked for a motion and
22 Cmr. Fudge moved to accept the survey, as discussed, for timely release. Cmr. Cranmer seconded the
23 motion. Chair Larson asked for discussion. Chair Larson called for a vote on the motion and the motion
24 passed unanimously. Chair Larson asked how the survey can get distributed, Director Bennett responded by
25 summarizing the various platforms the City can distribute the survey on. Councilmember Bodi asked if the
26 survey would only reach citizens of LFP. She cautioned that some would contribute who do not live in LFP.
27 Chair Larson said that people who receive the survey are required to answer a question about whether or not
28 they live in LFP. Cmr. Fudge asked how long it will take to get the survey out, Director Bennett said that the
29 City could probably post the survey by the end of the week. available There was general agreement that the
30 survey should be left open through the end of June.

31
32 **New Business**

33 None

34
35 **Reports and Announcements**

36 None from staff

37
38 **Additional Citizen Comments**

39 Jack Tonkin said that said that the issue of ADUs is different than the town center or the parking garage. He
40 said that the residential customers may not want an ADU in their back yard. He suggested a different series of
41 questions for the survey and said that people may not know what ADUs represent. He talked about the
42 potential profit that could be yielded from ADU investments. He said he agrees with the idea of a survey, but
43 people should know what it represents. He said that some of the examples of ADU ordinances that have
44 been presented by the Master Builders Association and others are because of an investor who wants to get
45 the maximum investment of their dollar.

46
47 Don Fiene said that the last year and a half was spent talking about the missing middle of the housing
48 spectrum and what LFP can do to encourage development in that sector. He said that some of the area and
49 dimensional requirements and discussions may not apply to all residential lots. He said that the front yard
50 definition should be looked at and potentially amended. He described the configuration of his house and lot

1 as an example of where the front of the house does not face the official front yard. He also mentioned that
2 his backyard is bifurcated by Lyon Creek.
3

4 **Agenda for Next Meeting:**

5 Similar to this agenda. Cmr. Fudge said he does not favor extra meetings during the summer months.
6

7 **Adjournment:**

8 Cmr. Gross moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Katz seconded, and the motion carried unanimously. The
9 meeting was adjourned at 9: 10 pm.
10

11 APPROVED:
12

Madlyn Larson

13
14 _____
15 Maddy Larson, Chair
16