

**City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission  
Draft Regular Meeting Minutes: July 14, 2020  
Virtual/Zoom Meeting**

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

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

## **Members of the Public:** virtual meeting – no sign-in sheet

**Planning Commissioners absent:** TJ Fudge, Joel Paisner

**Call to order:** Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 7:01PM. She said that the meetings over the summer are for just information and not decision making.

### Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Gross moved to accept the agenda, Mr. Katz seconded, and the agenda was approved unanimously.

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

Mr. Gross moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 9, 2020. Mr. Katz seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Cmr. Saunders said that he would like to change the last page, line 3, which reads "Cmr. Saunders supports live comments." He clarified and said that zoom can record live comments, he suggested that the line read: "zoom comments could be recorded via text file."

A vote was taken to approve the minutes as amended and the amended minutes were adopted unanimously.

### Meeting Dates:

The next regular meeting is scheduled for August 11, 2020.

## Reading of Written Citizen Comments:

## Comment 1

**From:** Dave Lange <umbrellahouse@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 1:30 PM

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

**Subject:** Comment on the PC meeting tonight

Thank you for accepting comments for tonight's meeting

1  
2 Tonight's primary document wasn't intended for Code Development. How many years has LFP  
3 been working on the redevelopment of Town Center? Bring in a good editor and give them the 2  
4 most recent Developer submissions, the results from the last 2 attempts to survey the public, the  
5 existing Development Code for the Town Center and the Council summary. Use the document  
6 organization of the current Dev Code and start cutting and pasting all the content from the other  
7 documents into that structure. Separately the Planning Department should make a list of graphics  
8 to use in the sequence of the Dev Code structure. Create a new baseline/foundation with  
9 everything known today about TC and expectations, as of June 2020. If done right there will be  
10 no more restarts back at square 1. I see at least 3 documents to maintain. 1) the public overview  
11 2) the official Development Code 3) drafts of the information optimized for PC and Council  
12 discussion.

13  
14 We have 3 meetings left before the moratorium expires and the PC should have been passing  
15 their results to Council tonight or next month. If the PC wants at least 2 physical meetings and  
16 the Council needs 2 work sessions and 2 physical meetings the moratorium should be extended  
17 to at least March, 2021. If we can't have physical meetings we should be creating summary  
18 documents to help move the process faster when the public can be invited back.

19  
20 Dave Lange  
21 Kenmore

22  
23  
24 **Commission discussion of public comments**

25  
26 Chair Larson said that the virtual meetings are for information gathering, and not decision making,  
27 which was something that all Commissioners agreed upon. She indicated that the Council knows  
28 the strategy and that the mandate to not make decisions will be the status quo. Cmr. Morris said  
29 that the community didn't want any decisions made during this time, which the Commission learned  
30 via public comment; and that is the reason why the Commission was taking the path they are  
31 currently on.

32  
33 **Report from City Council Liaison**  
34 Councilmember French said the Council has met three times and discussed recommendations from  
35 the Commission on the parking garage. He said the Council has identified changes in the draft code  
36 and the guidelines including changing 'shoulds' to 'shall.' He said that the Sound Transit board did  
37 meet on a realignment strategy, but that decisions may not be made for some time. Director Bennett  
38 said that Sound Transit is working on a memorandum of understanding with the City.

39 Councilmember French said that information gathering at this stage is the status quo and that  
40 parking garage decisions will be made when they legally have to make decisions. He said he does not  
41 support a forum where a decision can be made without all being able to make public comments. He  
42 said that the Council is keeping the conversation moving forward but adoption of code may not  
43 occur in a virtual environment.

44  
45 Chair Larson asked if the Council is going to adopt revisions to the code for the garage prior to  
46 additional recommendations from the Planning Commission. Councilmember French said that if  
47 there is a need to make revisions based on a statutory timetable, the Council may need to adopt

1 regulations. He said that a surgical approach to the scope of the code amendments may need to  
2 occur. Director Bennett added that the intent of the Planning Commission recommendations was  
3 to address what the Council needed to be in place for the potential free standing garage application.  
4

5 Cmr. Katz asked about the memorandum of understanding with the City. She asked about the  
6 content of the memo. Director Bennett clarified the intent of the memorandum. He also said that  
7 Sound Transit asked for a meeting with the City for the purpose of discussing the lack of any joint  
8 venture proposals on the LFP garage. He said the City will be the regulatory body for a garage  
9 proposal and that there are no current plans to become involved as an applicant. Discussion  
10 continued on Sound Transit and their next steps.  
11

12 Chair Larson asked Councilmember French if the Council has made efforts on getting public input  
13 on the content of the Planning Commission's recommendation. Councilmember French said that  
14 conversations with the administration have occurred and that public comment has been sought. He  
15 said that by rule a hearing will occur on the FEMA floodplain regulations update prior to adoption.  
16 He said it is necessary for the public to participate in that hearing. He said that the hearing will  
17 occur virtually and that public comment will occur live. He said that, if adoption of the parking  
18 garage code has to occur because of time sensitivity, the Council will make every effort to get the  
19 public involved. He indicated that the FEMA ordinance hearing will be a good example of how  
20 virtual hearings work.  
21

## 22 **Old Business**

- 23 • Implementation of Town Center Vision

### 24                   **Review of Current Town Center Framework Design Guidelines (adopted in 2006)**

25 Chair Larson mentioned an email that Cmr. Fudge sent regarding the town center framework and  
26 suggested that the Commission discuss what areas of the current code should be changed to meet  
27 the community's needs. She asked if the Commission were willing go through the existing code prior  
28 to reviewing the framework document. Cmr. Morris and Cmr. Gross said they wanted to review the  
29 current code. Cmr. Katz said that the table provided for the current zoning code should cover the  
30 current code language. She said that the framework guidelines are referenced in the current code.  
31 Cmr. Saunders said that the town center framework is a part of the code. Cmr. Morris said that the  
32 City Council can amend the City code at any time and recommendations from the Planning  
33 Commission may not be adopted in full. Cmr. Katz said she was in favor of going through LFPMC  
34 18.42.  
35

36 Director Bennett led the discussion on the existing LFPMC 18.42. He mentioned a track changes  
37 version of 18.42 has been prepared by the City Attorney that shows the Planning Commission  
38 recommended updates in context with all of the existing provisions. He said that sections .010  
39 through .130 were the original code prior to 2006 when the framework guidelines were adopted.  
40 Cmr. Katz said that edits were proposed to the Purpose section and she wondered what those were.  
41 Director Bennett said that he thinks it would be helpful for the Commission to review the track  
42 changes document showing all the Commission's changes recommended to this point. He added  
43 that recommendations on changes to permitted uses and limitations to uses had been proposed  
44 through that previous work. Director Bennett recited the current permitted uses in the town center  
45 code and explained all of the current code language with respect to limitations on use and all other  
46 sections. Chair Larson asked if a stand-alone residential project can occur. Director Bennett said

1 that he thought it could and went on to explain the maximum 35-foot height limit and the 40-foot  
2 mixed use maximum, as well as, setbacks and the land coverage maximum.  
3

4 Chair Larson suggested discussing the site plan review sections (18.42.120-130) as a potential  
5 process that could be updated for use in review of non-development agreement projects. Cmr.  
6 Saunders mentioned that his understanding is that a gap analysis is only currently being discussed,  
7 and that changes to code are not being entertained. Chair Larson asked Director Bennett if the  
8 current code can be viewed side by side with the suggested revisions. Director Bennett agreed. Cmr.  
9 Morris suggested reviewing the strikethrough document as an alternative.  
10

11 Director Bennett continued to review the existing code provisions. Chair Larson said that 18.42.130  
12 should be reviewed and analyzed. She asked Councilmember French about the edits to the original  
13 density limit in the code and said that the base code no longer controls density. Chair Larson asked  
14 if the Commission had recommended to Council a change in the town center maximum residential  
15 density. Director Bennett said that it had been recommended and explained what the  
16 recommendation was. She asked Councilmember French if he was concerned that the Commission's  
17 recommended updates have removed the density limit. Councilmember French said that height and  
18 density are the foremost topics on the Council's agenda and decision making process. He would like  
19 to see a robust public process before code is adopted.  
20

21 Cmrs. Gross, Larson and Saunders spoke in favor of the Commission considering and formally  
22 recommending provisions on density to Council. Cmr. Morris said that the adoption of code  
23 amendments without a density provision won't happen because the Council has said that they won't  
24 adopt anything without public comment and an analysis of what the community is looking for.  
25 Councilmember French said that the Council will probably amend the language that the  
26 Commission brings forward for adoption. Director Bennett suggested that, if the Council extends  
27 the current moratorium on development in the Town Center, it could narrow the scope of the  
28 moratorium so that it allowed certain types of development like a parking structure but not others  
29 which include residential units. That would give the Council more time to arrive at a consensus on  
30 an appropriate density while not holding up development related to transit improvements.  
31

32 Director Bennett continued to explain his understanding of the town center code in its current form.  
33 Chair Larson asked for an explanation of section .140 and .150. Director Bennett explained that  
34 those sections adopt the town center framework design guidelines by reference much like a sub area  
35 plan might be adopted. He added that section .150 explains the current process for development in  
36 town center.  
37

38 Cmr. Morris said that on the Commission should discuss section 18.42.150 (B) because it seems to  
39 mandate redevelopment of the entire town center. Discussion continued on which provision should  
40 be in the code and which would be more appropriate in the design guidelines. Cmr. Katz suggested that  
41 "should" statements be contained in design guidelines and "shall" statements be contained in the  
42 code language. Chair Larson agreed. A discussion of what process applies for each type of  
43 development occurred. Director Bennett said that different "hoops" are required for different types  
44 of development. Cmr. Larson said she understands the development application process as one  
45 where a developer can build a project per code or go through a negotiation with a development  
46 agreement. Director Bennett talked about 18.42.170 (Design departure) and said that, if there was a  
47 departure from the design criteria through a development agreement, there would need to be a  
48 formal finding that the departure met those criteria.

1  
2 Chair Larson asked for input from the Commission on the current code. She said that the track  
3 changes version of the Commission's recommended changes should be used to inform discussions  
4 about future recommended changes. She asked which sections should be discussed at the next  
5 meeting. Cmr. Saunders asked for clarification on the next steps and what the Commission should  
6 be working on. He said he would like to look at the framework guidelines. Cmr. Katz said that the  
7 draft design guidelines from Otak should be looked at in conjunction with the current framework  
8 guidelines.  
9

10 Chair Larson said that she would like to update the current code and not replace it. Cmr. Morris said  
11 he would like to learn about how density can be described or mandated. He said that comparisons  
12 with other cities is a good way to do this. Cmr. Saunders asked about what other cities have done.  
13 Director Bennett said that the Senior Planner Holland had spoken with Kenmore about the  
14 incentives and how they were used. He said that Kenmore hasn't had a project yet that takes  
15 advantage of the bonus provisions in their downtown code. Chair Larson suggested looking at  
16 other US cities that have been recognized for good use of open space and density. Director Bennett  
17 responded that scale is key in order to arrive at realistic expectations regarding the amount of open  
18 space that can be required. Cmr. Katz agreed that it would be helpful to look at projects from other  
19 cities.  
20

21 Chair Larson asked Commissioners to provide examples of projects in other cities that they think  
22 have successful open spaces, pedestrian facilities, public benefit, and density so they can be  
23 discussed at the next meeting. Director Bennett indicated he would send out a reminder of this  
24 assignment and the track changes document.  
25

26 **Reports and Announcements**

27 None.  
28

29 **Agenda for Next Meeting:** Similar to this agenda.  
30

31 Cmr. Katz moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Morris seconded, and motion carried unanimously.  
32

33 **Adjournment:** 9:08pm  
34

35 APPROVED:  
36  
37

---

Maddy Larson, Chair