

**City of Lynnwood**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
**February 28, 2002**

Commissioners present:  
Dave Johnson, Chair  
Brian Bigler  
Patrick Decker  
Cynthia Olson  
Tia Psycheff  
Jacqueline Powers  
Commissioners absent:  
Mick Teno

Staff present:  
James Cutts, Community Development Director  
Ron Hough, Comprehensive Planning Manager  
Kevin Garrett, Current Planning Manager  
Dennis Lewis, Senior Planner  
  
Also present:  
Ruth Ross, Councilmember

**SUMMARY OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2002, MEETING MINUTES**

**Regional Shopping Center Parking Code Amendment – Public Hearing**

Planning Manager Garrett provided information on the proposed code amendment. No public testimony was offered. The Commission recommended City Council adoption of this code amendment.

**Developmental Regulations Update Program (DRUP)**

Senior Planner Lewis gave a presentation on the progress of the DRUP and outlined proposals the DRUP Advisory Committee is working on.

**College District Plan – New Option “B”**

Planning Manager Hough briefly explained the background and history of the College District. He described the proposed new land use option to the Commission and discussion followed.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Powers moved to approve the February 14, 2002, minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Olson, and carried unanimously.

Chair Johnson acknowledged Councilmember Ruth Ross who was attending in her capacity as Council Liaison.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Regional Shopping Center Parking Code Amendment**

Planning Manager Garrett explained the purpose of a proposed code amendment to reduce the number of required parking spaces and revise requirements for landscaping at regional shopping centers. Mr. Garrett introduced Barry O'Connor, Manager of Alderwood Mall, who was attending the meeting. At the conclusion of Garrett's presentation and discussion with the Commission, Chair Johnson opened the public hearing for the Regional Shopping Center Parking Code Amendment. No testimony was given and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing. Planning Manager Garrett then responded to questions from the Commissioners. Mr. Garrett further explained that this code amendment would apply to the Alderwood Mall area and the commercial centers to the east and west.

Commissioner Decker moved to recommend City Council approval of this code amendment. Commissioner Bigler seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

## DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Community Development Director Cutts reported on the following:

- Update on the purchase of the Tutmark Hill property: This matter was discussed in relation to the Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA) boundaries during the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting. The property is located in the UGA and outside the city boundaries on the east side of I-5. Community Development was not aware that this purchase was taking place. Mr. Cutts advised that this property is being purchased with a grant from the county and it is meant for the general populous of the county. It's not essential that the future park be in Lynnwood. If this area eventually becomes part of Mill Creek, they will be able to use the money to purchase the property or the property could be transferred.
- MUGA Boundaries: The boundaries between Lynnwood and Mill Creek have continued to be an issue. A suggestion was made for a subcommittee of the City Council (Loren Simmonds, Don Gough, Lisa Utter) to meet with a similar subcommittee of Mill Creek's Council to resolve this issue. If not resolved, other options could apply such as the County determining the boundaries or leaving the area in its present status. Planning Manager Hough added that the Growth Management Act assigns the responsibilities of establishing urban growth area boundaries to the counties, but following input from the cities. The county has the authority to place urban growth boundaries around an unincorporated area that is urbanizing, an individual city, or around a group of cities as it has in our area. In our part of the County, the cities were given the opportunity to work out their own boundaries. That's what we're attempting to do.
- North Gateway Annexation – On March 1 the suit involving this annexation will be heard. The main issue is 164th Street and whether or not to include it in our annexation area. This street will require considerable roadwork and expense. The City does not want to take this on.
- Alderwood Court suit – A suit had been filed for damages due to the moratorium, but the court upheld the City's position.

Planning Manager Hough reported that:

- A public open house was held prior to tonight's meeting to provide information and solicit input for changes to the Comprehensive Plan. It was advertised but not well attended.
- The 204<sup>th</sup> Street annexation has been completed and the area has been added to the City maps.
- Public Works is agreeable to presenting an update on the Tree Ordinance at a joint meeting at either a future Planning Commission meeting or a Parks Board meeting. After discussion, it was decided that the April 2 Parks Board meeting would be most convenient and those Commissioners wanting an update would attend the meeting. It was noted that the ordinance will eventually return to the Commission for a public hearing prior to adoption.
- Included in the Commissioner's folders are copies of recent minutes of City Council regular meetings and work sessions.
- Commissioner Mick Teno informed staff that his letter of resignation was in the mail but, to date, has not been received.

## WORK SESSION

### Development Regulations Program Update

Senior Planner Lewis advised the Commission on the progress of the Development Regulations Update Project (DRUP). Mr. Lewis added that the DRUP Advisory Committee meets every Tuesday from 4-6 pm. He then outlined proposals the Committee has been working on and responded to the following:

Commissioner Bigler requested a clarification on certain GMA requirements. Mr. Lewis responded that the County is responsible for assigning population and employment allocations. The minimum density for urban areas has been established, through Growth Hearings Board cases,

at four dwelling units per net acre. Lynnwood's current plan and development regulations are not compliant in this regard, but the City has not been challenged on this issue. Mr. Bigler stated he would not want to see four houses per acre because of unsightliness. He gave Ballard as an example. Mr. Lewis pointed out that some new subdivisions in adjacent communities have adopted this density requirement successfully. Chair Johnson added that this density would probably be applied as a transitional zone and would occur only in limited areas of the City. Additionally, it could provide affordable housing as required by the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Bigler asked if a new zone that allowed 4,000 sq. ft. lots would require modified setbacks for the small lots. Mr. Lewis advised that specific development standards are developed for every zone and that setbacks would probably be established to accommodate the 4,000 sq. ft. lots.

Commissioner Olson inquired where a mixed-use of retail, commercial, and residential space in high rises would fit into the zoning. Mr. Lewis responded that the 'Multi-family, High rise' zone will be proposed for elimination, but its uses will be consolidated with another zone called 'Multi-family, High density.' He does not perceive this restricting the mixed-use commercial/residential idea being proposed for the City Center development or other applicable locations.

Ms. Olson asked Councilmember Ross if the City Council's 60/40 ratio is intended to preserve the existing single-family residences, and not to specifically pursue a 60/40 ratio. Ms. Ross responded that she was not serving on the Council when this issue was established, but does not believe it was designed just to preserve the current status. Chair Johnson commented that his understanding was that the 60/40 ratio was a goal that Council wanted to reach.

Commissioner Decker asked if all RS-7 zones would be changed to RS-6. Mr. Lewis responded that most would be changed to RS-6, but some could be changed to RS-4. The determining factor to change to RS-4 will be the location. Discussion then occurred relating to lot size averaging and whether or not large lots and small lots could be within the same development. Currently, the zoning code allows for lot size averaging within specific parameters. Mr. Decker would be opposed to large lots on one portion of a plat, and postage-size RS-4 lots on another portion of a plat. Mr. Decker asked for clarification on the requirement that proposed commercial development within a zone occurs only with pre-planned and coordinated development. Mr. Lewis replied that this activity would be reviewed and approved by staff and the appropriate bodies. Within the PRD zone there must be coordination between the developers of the separate business, under the approval of the City.

Commissioner Powers inquired about staff's comment that the mixed-use zoning district is an ineffectual approach. Mr. Lewis explained that currently there is one mixed-use zone on the east side of I-5 and there is no residential use within that zone.

Commissioner Psycheff: Ms. Psycheff suggested that it would be helpful to have pictures illustrating good design or good uses that the Commission is unfamiliar with when making presentations, such as the 4,000 square foot lots.

### **College District Plan – New Option 'B'**

Planning Manager Hough briefly explained the background and history of the College District Plan and the Commission's recommendation to City Council in May 2000. He explained that the Council was unable to take action on the recommendations primarily because of two significant concerns: 1) The need for mixed-use development at this location was not clear, and 2) The proposed plan would result in the loss of single-family residences in the area. Mr. Hough then described the proposed College District Plan – Option 'B', which would reduce the size of the mixed use area and preserve most of the single-family houses.. He then responded to questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Hough agreed to provide Commissioner Decker a copy of staff's May 2001 response to the Council's concerns, as noted in the staff report.

Commissioner Decker asked whether second-story dwellings above commercial would be considered multi-family or single family. Mr. Hough responded those would be considered multi-family if there were apartments above a business, but a single unit might also be considered an accessory dwelling if related to the primary business. Mr. Decker further inquired if a condominium was over a retail business, would that too be considered multi-family. CDD Cutts responded that under the current definitions, condominium units are considered multi-family.

Commissioner Olson asked if the 201<sup>st</sup> Place area could be zoned RS-4. Mr. Hough explained that area is proposed to be zoned RS-7, or possibly RS-6 if the RS-7 zone is changed. Based on the lot sizes and configurations, he does not envision RS-4 for this area. However, a nearby area of larger underdeveloped lots might be a good candidate.

Chair Johnson recalled that the public testimony received from the residents in this area was generally in favor of the original College District Plan. Hough agreed that most public testimony has been in support of the Plan, or was to ask questions about the proposals. Very little opposition.

Commissioner Powers asked if the College would need 69<sup>th</sup> Place for future parking. Mr. Hough replied that the College intends to build parking structures and, therefore, will not need to expand into adjacent residential areas. Acquisition of the 69<sup>th</sup> Place neighborhood for parking was an option considered early in the planning process, but later rejected.


Commissioner Psycheff was in agreement with the original plan that Council denied May 2000.

#### OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Decker announced that he is now receiving advanced copies of the City Council agenda. He will discuss the items with Chair Johnson to determine whether or not it will be necessary to attend Council meetings as the Planning Commission Liaison.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Decker, seconded by Commissioner Olson, moved to adjourn. The motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

  
Dave Johnson, Chair