

**City of Lake Forest Park
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Summary
17425 Ballinger Way NE—Council Chambers
Date February 5, 2013**

Commissioners present: Chair Richard Saunders, Vice Chair George Piano, Ray Holmdahl, Chuck Paulsen, Chuff Barden, Doug Gochanour, Debra Born, Mark Phillips

Staff and others present: Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Ande Flower, Assistant Planner; Councilmember Catherine Stanford, City Council Liaison to the Planning Commission; Al Fure, TRIAD; Dan Swallow; John Owen, MAKERS

Call to order: Chair Saunders called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

The Planning Commission reviewed the draft agenda. There was a suggestion to allow for additional public comment at the end of the meeting because the earlier start time of 6:00 pm can be difficult for commuters. Cmr. Barden moved to adopt the agenda as revised. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Public Comment:

Mr. Swallow asked about parking between Single Family and Transition; allowance for platting; whether a cantilevered, bay window may be up to 3 feet; the possibility for auto courts; and clarification on some dimensions such as the recessed porch.

Alan Fure, a consultant from Triad Associates asked about LID (Low Impact Development), and asked about how site conditions qualify as being conducive for LID. He suggested that with an urban site plan there is often need for vaults. He mentioned the Ballard rain garden as a failed example. The soils were not conducive, therefore the project was not successful, and it cost \$500,000 to repair. Mr. Fure said that he wants site conditions to be taken into account and that he was concerned that the initial language reads like a mandate.

Documents Reviewed:

- SG Corridor Zone Regulations 02-05-2013
- SG Transition Zone Regulations 02-05-2013
- SG SF Residential Zone Regulations 02-05-2013
- Design Guidelines for SG Corridor Single Family 02-05-2013
- Design Guidelines for SG Corridor Corridor and Transition 02-05-2013

Old Business:

Southern Gateway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

There was a brief discussion about the public hearing for the Southern Gateway DEIS, during which the Commission heard the community's concerns about traffic, safety, building heights and setbacks. Cmr. Paulsen said that he echoed those concerns and the concern that the DEIS was hard to understand.

1 Mr. Owen described a DEIS as a public document that the layman should be able to understand,
2 and conceded that the LFP Southern Gateway DEIS did not succeed at achieving this. Cmr.
3 Holmdahl asked about the Commission making a shared comment for the DEIS. Mr. Bennett
4 said that it would be equally valid to make comment as an individual as it would be for the
5 Commission to comment in a single voice. He also reminded the Commissioners that the Final
6 EIS is a study, not regulatory document.

7
8 Concern was expressed about the traffic study not including 37th Avenue NE. Mr. Owen said that
9 at this scale and without specific information, the EIS cannot be expected to address all adjacent
10 streets. Cmr. Born said she was surprised nothing was mentioned in the EIS about police
11 staffing, cost to city, and schools. It was suggested that the increased tax-base will fund the
12 increased needs, although tax forecasting is not part of an EIS study.

13
14 Cmr. Phillips said he would like to have separate meeting dedicated to discussing the EIS and
15 Councilwoman Stanford mentioned that the feedback to City Council would be helpful. It was
16 suggested that the meeting should be set for some time in February prior to the deadline for
17 DEIS comments: February 20, 2013. Cmr. Paulsen motioned for a meeting to be set, Cmr.
18 Barden seconded and the motion was approved.

19
20 Southern Gateway Regulation Review

21 Discussion of final review began with a review of recent edits to the regulations. Mr. Swallow
22 was invited to ask Mr. Owen questions. Cmr. Piano offered to keep track of Mr. Swallow's
23 comments. Mr. Owen presented his "cheat-sheet" that included yellow highlight for big changes.

24
25 There was discussion about the zoning for Corridor and Transition requiring too little open space
26 in trade for the increased height allowance to 75 feet between NE 145th and NE 147th Streets.
27 There was discussion about expanding the 600 square foot minimum requirement for common
28 open space to 1,000 square feet, or allowing an option for the developer to contribute to facilities
29 somewhere in the neighborhood. Enhancing this requirement would reflect public opinion from
30 the DEIS Public Hearing.

31
32 Cmr. Phillips suggested that the public space requirement could be worth only one additional
33 floor, instead of two. Cmr. Piano responded by saying "we have to make it pencil out and make
34 sure it isn't a disincentive to developers."

35
36 Mr. Owen said that the biggest danger of the Corridor zone is if developer builds typical one-
37 story strip commercial. Mr. Bennett continued that the value of our efforts is lost if we continue
38 to allow for strip commercial.

39
40 Mr. Owen reviewed 18.46.110 (B), the parking mitigations for all three zones. There were no
41 objections to the new language from the Commission.

42
43 In response to an oversight being pointed out, single-family was added to the list of allowable
44 uses in the Transition Zone with a limitation of allowing only up to 50%. The minimum density
45 of 25 units per acre remains. Chair Saunders clarified that the Commissioners' intent has been to
46 encourage other, more dense uses, but to allow single family structures.

1
2 Mr. Owen asked if open space should be required in the transition zone. It was noted that the
3 corridor is not a place to let ones kids run. It was also noted that private open space is required
4 within multi-family developments.

5
6 There was discussion about the building height difference between Transition and Single-family
7 zones. There was agreement that the midpoint measurement for maximum height in the
8 Transition zone and the interior of the Single-family zone was appropriate for pitched roofs.

9
10 Clarification was made regarding the density definition to refer to the net area rather than gross
11 area, which will result in denser development. Mr. Owen described that normally when planning
12 for a subdivision, the roads are not included in the density calculation. He stated that the
13 Transitional zone is intended to more intense, ideally including commercial as well as
14 residential. Cmr. Phillips asked how much of the Intracorp development will be open space and
15 roads, which does not factor into the net area. Mr. Swallow said that he did not have that number,
16 but that all the setbacks are established with the zoning and Design Guidelines. Mr. Owen
17 offered that this modification reflects his intent. Cmr. Holmdahl stated that it is a hard concept to
18 visualize and that he would be looking for guidance from those who are familiar with this. Mr.
19 Bennett and Mr. Owen both agreed that the change from gross to net would result in the density
20 of development discussed throughout the process.

21
22 Transferability provisions in 18.45.120; to share, or roll-over, requirements between SF and
23 Transition zones were reviewed and discussed. Cmr. Holmdahl asked if there is a maximum
24 amount of transferability. Mr. Bennett explained that there are limits because density is not
25 transferrable. He said that transferability could only be applied for such factors as parking, open
26 space, storm water LID, and canopy coverage goals. Mr. Owen added that any proposal must be
27 part of site plan approved by the Hearing Examiner, and that all of the required support elements
28 must be provided concurrently with a development proposal.

29
30 Mr. Bennett reminded Commissioners that these Southern Gateway Design Guidelines and
31 zoning override anything in the Chapter 17 Subdivision code, which had been created in the
32 1970's.

33
34 Design Guidelines for SG Corridor and Transition

35 There was discussion about LID, and various Commissioners supported the inclusion of the
36 phrase "where soil conditions make it feasible" in B.6.2. Also, Cmr. Piano viewed the language
37 in B.6.3. as requiring developers to do their homework ("the applicant must demonstrate that
38 that infiltration through low impact development practices has been used as part of the overall
39 stormwater handling system or that infiltration has been considered in the planning process and
40 found infeasible due to soil conditions or other site features").

41
42 Regarding street furniture, Cmr. Paulsen asked if there should be specificity with regard to
43 benches. Mr. Owen explained that sometimes a wall works just as well.

1 There was a question about whether pedestrian corridors could count as part of the open space
2 requirements. Mr. Owen shared his concern that this could mean that the large spaces could
3 minimize greatly.

4
5 Cmr. Piano said that the public and some from other commissions have been asking him if the
6 public spaces will be available to all public. If so, he stated, then this concept for development
7 would be closer to the vision for this site in the Legacy Plan.

8
9 The option to allow auto-courts was discussed, and Mr. Owen pointed out that the entry to homes
10 from the auto-courts could be graceful. Cmr. Paulsen said that he liked how it could allow for
11 more swales. New language was proposed to guide the design of auto courts. A development in
12 Redmond called Winwood was mentioned as a as an example of a project where this was done
13 successfully.

14
15 Mr. Swallow asked for clarification regarding recessed porches and whether it would count as
16 private open space, which resulted in a change in regulation language from “must be extended
17 out” to “must have at least a dimension of 6’ perpendicular to face or rear of house.” The
18 language allows for a deck to be recessed into the residence and still count as open space, which
19 was supported by the Commission.

20
21 Mr. Swallow initiated a discussion about the open space requirements for ground floor units. Mr.
22 Owen recommended holding fast to the initial prescribed guidelines in order to create “a private
23 realm separation between what is considered common and what is considered owned.”

24
25 In response to Mr. Swallow’s final request, Mr. Owen stated his concern for how requirements
26 for the property adjacent to parcel #1626049030 (the Déjà vu site) has changed from to from 50’
27 to 35’ wide through the review process, and stated that it is threatened to become a very narrow
28 corridor if the developer is allowed to take 8’ off on either side for landscaping.

29
30 Edits were recommended for the Storm Water Infiltration Chapter (B.6.2 in the SG-SFR Design
31 Guidelines). Mr. Owen was encouraged to remove a “penalty clause” to require offsite
32 mitigation. Cmr. Piano said that as a developer, he understands resentment with the term
33 “required,” even if the prescribed measures are guaranteed to work. Although he initially
34 proposed it, Cmr. Piano said that he now thinks it should be taken out. Mr. Owen recommended
35 striking the requirement language, and replacing it with “if the analysis indicates that it’s
36 feasible, and then the following LID treatment is required.”

37
38 Cmr. Paulsen clarified the proposal that a developer would have to demonstrate that, unless the
39 construction costs for an LID system would be in excess of 110% for a traditional drainage
40 system, LID would be required.

41
42 Mr. Owen was asked about the green infrastructure menu of incentives that had formerly been
43 drafted by the Planning Commission. Mr. Owen suggested caution regarding trying to “fit” these
44 into the draft regulations. He said that such things should be encouraged; however, at this point
45 they do not fit into the proposed regulations. He added that the Commission may want to think
46 about incorporating these in the future, beyond these interim regulations.

Resolution 13-01

Cmr. Paulsen moved to adopt the Resolution 13-01 recommending the Southern Gateway regulations as amended to the Council for adoption. Cmr. Gochanour seconded the motion and it passed by a vote six to two. Cmr. Holmdahl and Cmr. Born voted against the motion. Cmr. Holmdahl stated that his decision is based on the seven stories height limit. Cmr. Born stated that she could not approve the motion based on community input.

Commissioners agree to meet again, to discuss the EIS, prior to the February 20th so that the Commission's comments can be added to the DEIS record. Commissioners agree to meet on February 12, 2013. Mr. Bennett said that he would extend an invite to Stephanie Hansen, representative of Perteet, MAKERS' subcontractor who authored the EIS.

Adjournment: 10:00 PM

The next meeting is scheduled for February 12, 2013.

APPROVED:

Chair Ray Holmdahl

