

City of Lynnwood
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
March 28, 2002

Commissioners present:
Dave Johnson, Chair
Brian Bigler
Patrick Decker
Tia Peycheff
Jacqueline Powers

Staff present:
Ron Hough, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Kevin Garrett, Current Planning Manager
Marc Amrine, Associate Planner

Others present:
Ruth Ross, Councilmember Liaison
Lisa Utter, Councilmember
David Kleitsch, Economic Development Director

SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 28, 2002, MEETING MINUTES

Zoning Code Amendments – Shared Parking

Planning Manager Garret briefly explained the purpose of the shared parking code amendment. The Commission recommended that this code amendment be forwarded to City Council.

College District Plan – Option “B”

Planning Manager Hough explained the background and reason for Option “B” and addressed questions from the Commission. An informal public meeting was held to accept comments from interested parties. This item will be discussed at a City Council work session on April 15.

Neighborhood Planning Purpose, Function and Boundaries

Associate Planner Amrine gave a brief explanation of the steps necessary for neighborhood planning and answered questions from the Commission. A more definite plan will be prepared for the next Planning Commission meeting on April 11.

2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendments Preliminary Study List

Planning Manager Hough advised that the preliminary study list is for review by the Commissioners so they will be able to make an informed recommendation for a study list to the Council. A public hearing on this issue will be held during the April 11 Planning Commission meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER DISCLOSURES

Chair Johnson advised that he is a part-time faculty member for the Edmonds Community College District, and his position at the college will not affect his ability to make any decisions on any items before the Commission this evening. Mr. Johnson also announced that he has contracted with the City of Lynnwood to teach cooking classes through the Recreation Center and that association would not affect his ability to make decisions on any items before the Commission this evening.

PUBLIC HEARING
Zoning Code Amendments ^{and} Shared Parking

Planning Manager Garrett briefly explained the purpose of the shared parking code amendment that would allow land uses with different days/times of peak parking to apply for shared parking. At the conclusion of his presentation, Chair Johnson opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. With no public testimony, Mr. Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Decker moved to recommend the code amendment be sent to City Council as prepared by staff. Commissioner Bigler seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

INFORMAL PUBLIC MEETING
College District Plan – Option “B”

Planning Manager Hough presented background information relating to the College District Plan and the process to date. Briefly he explained that on May 25, 2000, the Planning Commission recommended that the College District Plan be adopted by the City Council. However, the Plan was not approved because of concerns raised by the Council relating to a need for mixed-use development across the street from the college and the probable loss of existing single-family dwellings to new development. Since that time, staff has prepared Option “B”, addressing Council’s concerns.

During discussion, Mr. Hough responded to the following:

- The previous environmental review and traffic study would require only minimal changes, if any.
- No changes to the transit center have been proposed.
- The College provides adequate parking; however, the students continue to park in the neighborhoods. Parking restrictions can be imposed to decrease this activity.
- The mixed-use designation will be revised during the code amendment process.

Commissioner Decker suggested changing one of the basis for the new option to read: **Intent:** Whenever reasonable, remaining single-family...

At the conclusion of the presentation and discussion, Chair Johnson invited public comment on the proposed Option “B”. The following people came forward to speak on their views relating to the proposal:

Barbara Campbell, 6705 204th St SW, #B206 (Parkwood Condominiums)

Ms. Campbell stated that the condominiums were in need of repair and the cost was to be passed on to the homeowners. She asked whether or not the city intended to purchase the property. Planning Manager Hough responded that the city has no intention of purchasing any property. He continued to say that this is a long-range twenty-year plan and would allow developers to purchase privately. Mr. Hough added that perhaps some public facilities improvements might be made in this area. Chair Johnson added that the plan rejected by City Council had proposed this property to be zoned mixed-use that would have allowed for developers to purchase, but in Plan “B” the property remains residential. Commissioner Decker asked if this area could be zoned mixed-use so that if market conditions allowed mixed-use development could occur. Mr. Hough responded that it would make sense to include all the lots in the area (five single-family lots, the condominiums, and the single-family lots on 202nd Street) to create a slightly larger mixed-use zone.

Kevin Hostbjor, 6721 202nd St SW

Mr. Hostbjor moved to this address in February and is concerned about the effect Option “B” would have on his property values. He was agreeable to the parking restrictions that are proposed, and asked for clarification on the pedestrian environment with coffee shops, retail shops, and four-story buildings built on zero lot lines. Mr. Hostbjor was concerned that potentially the lots on either side of his could be developed with multistory facilities to his lot line. He also asked why this information was not disclosed to him when he was purchasing the property. Planning Manager

Hough responded to his questions, explaining that this Plan was still in the development stages and nothing definite has taken place. Mr. Hough further explained that there is a provision in the code requiring a minimum size of one acre for a transition zone, which would preclude development on either side of his property. Mr. Hostbjoer responded that he was distressed with Option "B" when asked by Mr. Johnson if he was for or against this option.

Geoffrey Nunn, 6726 202nd St SW

Mr. Nunn agreed with the comments of his neighbor, Mr. Hostbjoer. Mr. Nunn expressed concern about the one-acre minimum requirement for the transition zone, when it would be very difficult to achieve that size. Mr. Hough responded that the acre designation was included in the first Plan and when the Plan was revised to Option "B", the ordinances were not amended because they wanted reaction to the Plan. If this Plan is accepted, the ordinances would be adjusted accordingly. The zoning ordinance text is not being considered at this meeting, only the Plan. Mr. Hough added that before the Plan could be reconsidered for recommendation by the Planning Commission, the ordinances would be updated to ensure harmony. Mr. Nunn asked who in the neighborhood provided comments on the Plan. Mr. Hough responded that a series of meetings were held when the Plan was being developed and citizens from the neighborhood provided comments. Many of the comments related to traffic issues, availability of shopping areas, and pedestrian access. Mr. Hough did not recall any opposition to the plan from those attending the meetings.

Mr. Nunn inquired about the link between the college and the community and what was envisioned to be that link. Mr. Hough responded that early in the plan it was noted that 68th Avenue creates a barrier between the college and the neighborhood. A suggestion was made to create some sort of connection between the college and neighborhood such as meeting rooms off campus or related uses on the campus that neighbors could use. Mr. Nunn is not sure this is a realistic link and there could be down sides such as more litter from people moving between the campus and the neighborhood.

Vera Stritzel, 6705 204th St SW, #B101 (Parkwood Condominium)

Ms. Stritzel identified traffic issues she has encountered while students are rushing to class: tailgating, parking in front of mailboxes, excessive traffic on 68th, etc. She feels the condominiums are an island in this area and sees no help for the various problems that occur. Ms. Stritzel's main objection was extending 204th Street to Highway 99 which will increase traffic. She does not understand how that will solve parking problems in front of residences. Mr. Hough responded that the traffic study revealed that the 204th Street extension was a high priority in the original Plan to relieve traffic into the area because it would feed directly into the college parking lots.

Robert Botley, 4410 176th St SW, #16

As a representative of Edmonds Community College, Mr. Botley stated that the college is opposed to Option "B". The college was in favor of the original option. Specifically, the 200th and 204th Street plans. The original plan called for most of the traffic between 200th and 204th to be pedestrian, bicycles, and transit. He continued that the Master Plan for the college had identified two parking garages in front of the college if funding was available. He noted that the college has been making efforts to reduce single occupied passenger vehicles.

At the conclusion of the public comments, Planning Manager Hough stated that this item is scheduled for a City Council work session on April 15. Staff will then present Option "B" and all comments received tonight from the public and Commission to the Council and ask for further direction.

Chair Johnson announced that anyone can submit their concerns about this Plan to the Planning Department. The Planning Department will incorporate all comments as part of the record to be included in the Council and Commission packets for consideration.

Planning Manager Hough requested comments from the Commission and received the following: Chair Johnson – Mr. Johnson stated that he has worked on this Plan since 1998 and believes that the original recommendation that was sent to the City Council was the best approach to create a college district.

Commissioner Bigler – Mr. Bigler also supports the original plan. He noted that staff has been forced to develop a Plan “B” that is a mere vestige of what the hard work of the Commission and citizens developed. Mr. Bigler does not feel that this Plan “B” is realistic in that it does not provide enough area or incentive for builders to develop in the area.

Commissioner Psycheff – Ms. Psycheff agreed with Mr. Bigler’s comments. She noted there is no critical mass area to develop any realistic retail in the area.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Planning Manager Hough reported on the following:

- March 18 – City Council Work session
Mobile Home Park zoning process explained by Associate Planner Amrine. Council requested information about mobile home spaces, rental information, and owner/rental balance. Mr. Amrine is preparing this information and will present it at the April 1 Council meeting.
- April 1 – City Council meeting
Development Regulations Update
Alderwood Mall Expansion
Parking Code Amendments for Regional Shopping Centers
- April 2 – Park’s Board meeting with discussion on the Tree Ordinance
- State Supreme Court ruled the petition method of annexation is unconstitutional.

WORK SESSION

Neighborhood Planning – Purpose, Function & Boundaries

Associate Planner Amrine briefly explained the steps necessary for neighborhood planning:

1. Getting organized
2. Understanding the neighborhood
3. Creating a neighborhood action plan
4. Plan approval process
5. Follow through

Mr. Amrine distributed a “Neighborhood Action Planning Kit” developed by the City of Vancouver. He also noted that examples of Everett and Shoreline neighborhood by-laws are included in the staff report.

Commissioner Powers asked what initiated the neighborhood planning process. Planning Manager Hough responded that it was a priority of the City Council over the last couple of years. Goals and objectives relating to neighborhood planning were included in the Comprehensive Plan and became priorities on the five-year implementation program.

Commissioner Psycheff added that the City of Seattle has a very active neighborhood group and noted that this infrastructure adds considerable time to accomplishing anything in Seattle. Ms. Psycheff expressed concern as to why this is being done, what benefit will be derived, how will participation be sustained, the costs, and the possibility of disproportionate influence on the City Council from very active neighborhoods.

Commissioner Powers asked if these neighborhood areas would be restricted to single-family areas of the city. Planning Manager Hough responded that neighborhoods are defined in many ways and are not restricted to single-family areas.

Mr. Amrine concluded by stating that this subject would be back in two weeks to discuss neighborhood-planning boundaries.

2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Preliminary Study List

Planning Manager Hough explained that the list included in the staff report is being presented to familiarize the Commission with major issues in order to recommend a study list to the Council. Mr. Hough advised that a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Study List will be held on April 11.

Chair Johnson advised that David Toyer, Master Builders Association, filed a Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal to delete 60/40 references. Staff confirmed this statement and stated that it was not included with the Commissioners staff reports because staff did not receive the suggestion until after the agendas were mailed out.

NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Decker reported on the following meetings he has attended:

City Council Meeting – March 18 (Manufactured Home Zoning Issues). Mr. Decker felt that the City Council generally is open and amenable to a site-by-site examination of the mobile home/manufactured home parks and the appropriateness of the zoning recommended by the Planning Commission based on surrounding land use. He added that there was some discussion on property owner rights vs. citizens' rights; i.e., protecting property owners and protecting residents living on property. Specifically, zoning the manufactured home parks in such a way that would limit the use of property and not allowing the property owners to use it in the highest and best use. Associate Planner Amrine added that staff presented an option to Council that includes five parks that Council can consider rezoning to RS-7. If the Council wants this option, it will come back to the Planning Commission for discussion. Mr. Decker shared that Councilmember Hikel pointed out that the City Council has recognized the need to examine the sites on a case-by-case basis.

CBD Oversight Meeting – Mr. Decker feels that there is a lack of focus with this group. A great deal of frustration was noted because the plan has not moved forward and the uncertainty of the members' roles.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

In response to a question from Chair Johnson, Planning Manager Hough advised that there have been no applications submitted for the vacant Commissioner position.


INFORMATION ITEM

Upcoming Commission Meetings

Chair Johnson was agreeable to Planning Manager Hough's request that the College District Plan item scheduled for April 11 be moved to a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Powers, seconded by Commissioner Decker, moved to adjourn. The motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.



Dave Johnson, Chair