

**City of Lake Forest Park
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Summary
17425 Ballinger Way NE—Forest Room
Date: September 2, 2014**

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Ray Holmdahl; Vice-chair Jon Lebo; Semra Riddle; Jean Maixner; Doug Gochanour; Connie Holloway; and Richard Saunders

Staff and others present: Casey Bradfield Consultant from Studio 3MW; Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Ande Flower, Assistant Planner; Mark Phillips, City Councilman; and Donald Gerrards, Transportation Commissioner

Planning Commissioners absent: Joel Paisner and Rocky Oliver

Call to order: 7:04 PM

Approval of Meeting Agenda: Cmr. Saunders recommended adding a discussion of the online course on Open Government to the agenda. Cmr. Gochanour motioned to approve the agenda, as amended. The motion was seconded by Cmr. Saunders and approved unanimously.

Approval of meeting minutes: Meeting notes were reviewed for July 15, 2014. Cmr. Gochanour moved to approve the minutes as proposed. The motion was seconded by Cmr. Riddle and approved unanimously.

Old Business:

Comprehensive Plan Update: Draft Policies and Goals for Land Use Element

Ms. Bradfield presented the initial draft Land Use document and pointed out that the updated policies are less regulatory and prescriptive approach. Ms. Bradfield then read through each of the goals. Cmr. Lebo clarified that what is being reviewed is only an outline. Ms. Bradfield affirmed that this meeting is for reviewing the outline so that Studio 3MW may draft a full element for future review.

Ms. Bradfield read through Goal 2, Community Identity, and stated that many comments about this topic have been shared during the outreach process with LFP residents. Cmr. Saunders recognized that the word “legacy” could be misleading, given our city’s planning document with the same name. Mr. Bennett suggested a revision that would eliminate the end of the phrase. Cmr. Gochanour then suggested substituting the word “identity” with the word “character”.

There was discussion about the idea that Goals 2 and 3 could be paired together. Mr. Bennett suggested that it is more important to get the substance to resonate as the important themes, and that the document may fall into place once additional information is collected and presented.

In discussing Goal 4, Cmr. Riddle suggested that there could be a better description than the term “natural landscape.” Cmr. Holloway asked if the final draft will include a list of definitions. Ms. Bradfield described their intention of including text boxes containing definitions of key terms to make the document user-friendly.

Cmr. Lebo suggested using the term “encourage” instead of the word “focus” in relation to the reference to multifamily development. Discussion ensued about different kinds of multifamily, for

1 instance, a duplex versus multi-story apartments. One Cmr. stated that, while some multifamily (MF)
2 developments are not necessarily compatible with single-family uses, they can be made more so with
3 good design provisions. Most Commissioners agreed that in reference to MF, two points are
4 necessary. One point will focus on MF compatible with single-family, and a second would reference
5 high density MF.

6
7 In reviewing Goal 6, Mr. Bennett suggested that regulations for Town Center may be due for an
8 update and that these policies could give guidance. Cmr. Riddle suggested that the information in this
9 section could relate to potential growth areas throughout the city.

10
11 Cmr. Lebo suggested changing the term “healthy foods” to “healthful foods.”

12
13 Outreach Activity Update

14 Ms. Bradfield announced that nine Visioning Events have taken place and made a request for
15 Commissioners to volunteer for the remaining events.

16
17 Update from Commission Liaisons

18 Cmr. Saunders shared that the two most important topics to the Community Services Commission are
19 the Recreation and Open Space and the Human Services. He then offered to invite the CS
20 Commissioners to both PC meetings in October and to let them choose which meeting each may
21 want to attend.


22
23 Retail Marijuana Regulatory Policy

24 Mr. Bennett shared a series of map that demonstrated neighboring cities’ approaches as far as zoning
25 designations for parks. Kenmore does zone the Burke Gilman as a park, whereas the City of Bothell
26 and City of Seattle do not have a zoning district dedicated to parks but list the Burke Gilman as part
27 of their respective park systems. There was discussion about whether a park zone should be
28 established. Mr. Bennett explained that one downside of having a new zoning designation is that a
29 zoning change would be required for any proposed park within a single-family zone. A zoning
30 change is a much more onerous a process than a conditional use approval, which is what is currently
31 required to establish a new park. Additionally, creating a new zoning district requires that specific
32 criteria must be developed for the zone. There was discussion about how establishing a park zone
33 could potentially affect the marijuana regulations. It was noted that financing new park development
34 could also be affected by zoning regulations.

35
36 Cmr. Lebo asked if by adding complexity to the current process: is there a problem to solve? He
37 raised the issue that Commissions and Committees often lean toward more regulation, and that we
38 should guard against that if it’s not justified.

39
40 **Adjournment:** 9: 04 PM

41 APPROVED:

42
43 
44 Ray Holmdahl, Chair