

Lynnwood Planning Commission
Meeting of January 22, 2004

Staff Report

Agenda Item: F-1

Parking Standards for Colleges

File: 2003CAM0006

- Public Hearing**
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Old Business
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Ron Hough 425.670.6655

Introduction:

On November 13, 2003, Community Development staff described recent activities on and around the campus of Edmonds Community College (EdCC) and informed the Commission of a traffic and parking analysis that was completed in October 2003.

Based on the conclusions of the parking analysis and a request from the College, the Planning Commission initiated a review and possible amendment to the off-street parking requirements for colleges and similar institutions.

City staff, representatives of the College and consultant Rob Bernstein discussed various parking requirement options and brought those options to the Planning Commission's December 11, 2003 meeting where they were discussed. The staff report was also discussed with the Mayor, who offered a fourth option.

All four options have been studied and the option that is being recommended is the one that appears to be most fair and reasonable in its application to today's college programs and needs.

Background/Discussion:

In 1998, the City of Lynnwood, Edmonds Community College and consultants began the task of updating the campus master plan. The project was expanded to develop a neighborhood plan for off-campus areas to the north and east. Rob Bernstein, P.E., consulting transportation engineer/planner, was hired to conduct a special traffic analysis, at the request of the City's Environmental Review Committee. The College District Plan was adopted by the Lynnwood City Council in November 2002.

The College recently completed another extensive Traffic and Parking Analysis in preparation for the design and construction of its next addition – a new Instructional Laboratory Building (ILB). The analysis concluded that the City's off-street parking standards no longer adequately address the characteristics of today's student population and campus operations and direct application of those standards will result in an excessive number of parking spaces at excessive expense to the college.

Justification for a Change:

In his letter of October 15, 2003, EdCC Senior Vice President Robert Botley pointed out significant changes in the student population over the past 30 years. The numbers of part-time students increased from 28 percent to 39 percent during that period. More notable was an increase in students who worked full time. In 1970 very few students worked full-time. However, by 1999, 80 percent were employed full-time.

Part-time students are not on campus for a full eight-hour day and many of those who work during the day are taking evening courses. During the Fall and Winter quarters, 20 percent of EdCC students were taking evening classes. This number will increase to 29 percent in the Spring and Summer quarters and will affect the demand for parking.

Public transit is also a factor. At least five Community Transit bus routes now serve EdCC and four additional routes follow Highway 99 within walking distance of the campus. A transit center near the center of the campus makes bus commuting a convenient and attractive option and free bus passes are available to EdCC students.

The Traffic and Parking Analysis was done for the College in the fall of 2003 by Robert Bernstein, P.E. Bernstein determined that the "observed peak parking demand" is **1,595** spaces. However, Lynnwood's parking code, as currently written, would require more than 700 additional parking spaces. Since this gap between the code requirement and actual need will become a major hardship and will decrease the College's ability to service the community, the College requested that the code be adjusted to better reflect today's actual parking needs.

The Current Code:

Off-street parking standards are contained in Lynnwood Municipal Code Chapter 21.18 This code amendment pertains only to parking standards in the category of:

Colleges, Universities or Institutions of Higher Learning.

The current off-street parking requirement is:

One parking stall per employee and faculty member, plus one per three full-time students (including conversion of part-time students into equivalents of full-time students)

The College currently has **744** employees, **5,150** student FTEs and **1,866** parking stalls. If the City's current code standards were applied today, the college would need **2,460** spaces, or about 600 more than currently available on the main campus.

Parking Demand and Availability:

Of the **1,866** parking stalls available to EdCC students . . .

- 1,742 spaces are located on the main campus.
- 124 spaces are in remote off-campus parking lots.

An additional 108 spaces are provided at the North Campus complex. Another 50-100 on-street parking spaces in adjacent neighborhoods are also available and utilized (but not included in the off-street parking calculations).

The Parking Analysis determined the main campus peak parking demand to be **1,595** stalls when school is in session. This is 147 spaces fewer than currently provided. The close-in and most accessible parking areas are the most sought after, while more distant spaces remain available as the last resort. As a result, the perception at peak times is that there is not enough parking, although the existing **1,742** spaces on the main campus were observed to be about **85%** occupied at peak times and the remote lots were **52%** occupied at peak periods.

Golf Course Considerations:

A number of on-campus spaces are reserved for golf course users. Those spaces were also not included in the college's parking inventory. However, because these spaces are on the campus, parking violations tend to occur, especially during peak periods. When students can't find convenient parking, they sometimes park in spaces reserved for the golf course. The parking standard for the college does not apply to the golf course. However, the City's Parks Dept. and golf course managers are concerned that any reduction in the parking standard might result in increased congestion and higher numbers of parking violations.

Alternatives Reviewed:

The Traffic and Parking Analysis concluded that the City's parking requirements were excessive – about **132** percent of the actual parking demand.

To bring the City's code more in line with actual demand, the Planning Commission discussed the following three "code equivalencies" at its December 2003 meeting. These are based on the Spring 2003 parking demand, plus 10%:

- 1 space per employee, plus 1 space per **5 student** FTEs = 1,775 spaces
- 1 space per employee, plus 1 space per **4 day-student** FTEs = 1,710 spaces
- 1 space per **FTE employee**, plus 1 sp. per **3 day-student** FTEs = 1,720 spaces

It was decided that it's more appropriate to base the parking standard on day-student FTEs than to mix evening students into the formula. The peak parking time is during the day, so the number of evening students on campus is not a factor. And, since many employees and faculty are not full-time, or may work evening or night shifts, it made sense to use "FTE employee" figures rather than all employees.

Another consideration was to find a standard that is easy to apply and not overly complex. The third option requires the calculation of full time equivalent employees in addition to day students. The second option simplifies the formula by removing the need to calculate FTE employees while arriving at virtually the same result.

A Fourth Alternative:

Since the December Planning Commission work session, there was deliberation on another possibility. Could the parking be based directly on the number of students on campus during the peak period of the day?

This question was considered by consultant Rob Bernstein, EdCC staff and City staff. After review and discussion of this "fourth alternative," staff concluded that, although this

approach could be made to work, it contained inherent difficulties with factors and coefficients that had already been worked out for the other three options. This approach would arrive at a parking standard based on the maximum number of students on campus at a point in time. It was pointed out that total enrollment is often not the same as the number of people (students, faculty, staff, visitors, etc.) that may be on campus at the same time. And, there are always a number of students who may be enrolled but not in class because of illness or other reason. And, there are always students on campus between classes studying, doing research or engaged in other activities. Thus, it was concluded that the fourth alternative would not be as consistent as the other options and would be a departure from more commonly used and tested methods. Therefore, staff supports the earlier recommendation.

Proposals:

The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on Jan. 22 to accept comments on a possible amendment to Table 21.18.03 of the Off-street Parking chapter of the City's Zoning Code. The proposals will affect only one category of parking – Colleges, Universities or Institutions of Higher Learning.

Three alternatives are identified earlier in this staff report and were discussed at the Planning Commission's December 11, 2003 meeting. A more recent fourth alternative is also described in this report. The Commission may receive comments on any or all of these alternatives at its public hearing.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the public hearing be opened as advertised, testimony accepted, and the hearing continued to the Commission's February 26 meeting. Some additional issues and/or concerns have not yet been fully resolved and testimony from this hearing may assist. Also, if any other suggestions are made by staff or others, the continued hearing will provide an open opportunity to comment on those changes.

An administrative recommendation will be made prior to the Commission's recommendation to the City Council.

Environmental Review:

A SEPA Checklist was prepared for this proposed amendment and submitted for review by the City's Environmental Review Committee. The ERC reviewed it with staff on Jan. 7 and will make its threshold determination prior to action by the Planning Commission.

Reference: [Included with the Dec. 11 Planning Commission report.]

TRAFFIC AND PARKING ANALYSIS – Edmonds Community College Instructional Laboratory Building. By: Robert Bernstein, P.E. – Oct. 10, 2003



**Lynnwood Planning Commission
Meeting of January 22, 2004**

Staff Report

Agenda Item: G-1

**Annual Report of the
Planning Commission**

- Public Hearing
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Unfinished Business**
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Department of Community Development — Staff Contact: Ron Hough, Planning Manager

Recommendation:

Approve the 2003 Annual Report and forward it to the City Council.

Background:

The Planning Commission's Annual Report is a summary of its activities during the previous year. It highlights some of the more significant projects and provides a specific monthly summary of activities, recommendations and City Council actions.

The first draft of the report was discussed at the Planning Commission's Dec. 11 meeting. No changes were proposed. Since not all Commissioners were in attendance, it was suggested that photos be taken during the January 8 meeting to update the photo page of the report. The Jan. 8 meeting was cancelled due to lack of business and this business item was carried over to Jan. 22.

Following any final changes and the Commission's approval, this report will be adjusted and forwarded to the City Council. It is expected to be on the City Council's work session agenda in late January or February.

Reference:

- 2003 Annual Report of the Planning Commission – Included with the Dec. 11 meeting packet. No changes have been made.

Lynnwood Planning Commission
Meeting of January 22, 2004

Staff Report

Agenda Item: I-1
R&D Land Uses Code Amendment
(2003-CAM-0005)

- Public Hearing
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Old Business
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Kevin Garrett (425) 670-6292

Recommendation:

No action at this work session.

Background/Discussion:

On October 9, 2003, the Planning Commission initiated a code amendment to consider revising the city's zoning regulations for R&D land uses. The City's zoning regulations for R&D and light manufacturing land uses have not been updated in a number of years. This code amendment will update the regulations for R&D land uses in both the commercial and industrial zones. Current regulations (for both commercial and industrial zones) allow only R&D uses that do not handle hazardous materials.

The purpose of this work session is to brief the Planning Commission on the significant issues for zoning of R&D land uses and to review the current draft of the code amendment. A copy of the current draft is attached.

In preparing the current draft, staff from the Community Development and Fire departments spent substantial effort in discussion of the appropriate permitting process for businesses that use or store hazardous materials. (It appears that this question had not been reviewed in many years.) In brief, the question is whether the use or storage of hazardous materials should require approval of a conditional use permit. The conditional use permit process includes a public hearing before and action by the Hearing Examiner; completing this process usually requires 4-6 months, with substantial effort by both the applicant and staff.

A key factor in determining the appropriate zoning process is the effectiveness of other current City, state and federal hazardous material regulations. If these regulations provide adequate review of the use and storage of these materials, no additional review under zoning regulations would be needed.

The Uniform Fire Code (UFC) includes regulations for the storage and use of hazardous materials. The UFC provides different permitting requirements for hazardous materials

according to the hazard posed by the material and the quantity of the material present at the building. Federal and state regulations provide primarily for a system of reporting storage/use of hazardous materials to local agencies, for regulation through the UFC. Taken as a whole, staff has concluded that the combination of these regulations provide an adequate system for managing hazardous materials and that there is no need for requiring a conditional use permit for businesses that use hazardous materials.

Purpose of this Code Amendment:

Update City zoning regulations to reflect current land use terms and practices for R&D and related land uses.

Next Steps:

A public hearing on the code amendment is scheduled for February 12, 2004. Following the hearing, the Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation on the code amendment to the City Council.

Attachments:

Draft Code Amendment.

**Lynnwood Planning Commission
Meeting of January 22, 2004**

Staff Report

Agenda Item: 1 - 2

**Development Regulations Update– Phase 2,
Residential Chapters, Group B (follow-up)
and Group C (partial)**

- Public Hearing
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Old Business
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Dennis Lewis, Senior Planner

BACKGROUND:

Staff and Planning Commission have been discussing amendments to the residential development regulations for the past several Commission meetings. The original schedule anticipates one more meeting to present and have initial discussion on proposed amendments. Additional work sessions will be necessary. Public hearings on the amendments would follow the work sessions. This meeting is for follow-up discussion on Group B issues and discussion of some of the Group C issues. Additional Group C issues will be presented and discussed at the February 12, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

After receiving comments and direction from the Commission on all the issues in Groups A, B, and C the staff will use the information to prepare a draft with specific proposed amendments to the LMC text in strikeout/underline format. The draft should be available for review with the Commission at the second meeting in February. The Commission may decide then that the material is ready for public hearing, or may decide further review and revision is necessary.

GROUP B FOLLOW-UP:

During the discussion of the development standards at the last Commission meeting, Director Cutts stated that he wants the Planning Commission to consider some standards that were recommended by the Commission to the City Council in early 2001. Those recommendations were considered and rejected by the City Council. The primary intent of these previously recommended standards was to make single-family home additions more feasible. Enough time has passed that reconsideration of these standards is appropriate.

The proposed development standards presented and discussed at the last Commission meeting are presented first. Some changes have been incorporated based on the input received from the Commission. Those development standards are followed by the set of single-family residential development standards proposed to the City Council in the past. A brief comparison of the standards follows the tables.

21.42.200 Development standards.

**Table 21.42.02
Development Standards**

Standard	RSL	RSM	RSH
Minimum Lot Area+++	8,400 sf	7,200 sf	4,000 sf
Minimum Lot Width	70 ft. +++	55 ft.	40 ft.
Minimum Frontage at Street	30 ft. +++	30 ft.	25 ft.
Minimum Front Yard Setback			
Interior Lot	25 ft.	20 ft.	15 ft.
Corner Lot	25 ft.	20 ft.	15 ft.
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	25 ft.	25 ft.	20 ft.
Abutting a Private Road or Access Easement	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks – Corner Lot			
Street Side	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Interior Side	5 ft.	5 ft.	5 ft.
Both Sides Combined	20 ft.	20 ft.	20 ft.
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	25 ft.	25 ft.	20 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks – Interior Lot			
Each Side	5 ft.	5 ft.	5 ft.
Both Sides Combined	15 ft.	10 ft.	10 ft.
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	25 ft.	20 ft.	15 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage by Buildings	35 percent	40 percent	50 percent
Maximum Building Height	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.
* Unless any structure extending into the side yard is open and allows emergency access to the rear yard, in which case a five-foot side yard may be the minimum of each side.			
+++ See LMC 21.42.210.			

21.43.200 Development standards.

**Table 21.43.02
Development Standards**

Standard	RML	RMM	RMH
Minimum Lot Area⁺⁺⁺	7,200 sf	none	none
Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling	3,600 sf	2,400 sf	1,000 sf
Minimum Lot Width	70 ft.	70 ft.	100 ft. plus 1 ft. for every 10 ft. of lot depth after the first 100 ft.
Minimum Frontage at Street	25 ft.	25 ft.	25 ft.
Minimum Front Yard Setback			
Interior Lot	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Corner Lot	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks – Corner Lot			
Street Side	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Interior Side	5 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Both Sides Combined	20 ft.*	30 ft.	30 ft.
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks – Interior Lot			
Each Side	5 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.
Both Sides Combined	15 ft.	30 ft.	30 ft.
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	25 ft.	25 ft.	25 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage by Buildings	50 percent	40 percent	30 percent
Maximum Building Height	35 ft., or 2 stories from average finished grade	none ⁺⁺⁺	none ⁺⁺⁺
* Unless any structure extending into the side yard is open and allows emergency access to the rear yard, in which case a five-foot side yard may be the minimum of each side.			
+++ See LMC 21.43.210.			

NOTES: Work on Sections 21.42.210 and 21.43.210 will be done and presented with Group C revisions at the February 12, 2004 Commission meeting. Work will be done to make these sections more concise and to put more of the regulations in tabular form.

Standard	RS-8	RS-7
Minimum Lot Area ⁺⁺⁺	8,400 sf	7,200 sf
Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling	NA	NA
Minimum Lot Width	70 ft ⁺⁺⁺	60 ft
Minimum Frontage at Street	30 ft ⁺⁺⁺	30 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback – Habitable Area		
Interior Lot	20 ft	20 ft
Corner Lot	20 ft	20 ft
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	20 ft	20 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback – Garage		
Interior Lot	25 ft	20 ft
Corner Lot	25 ft	20 ft
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street	25 ft	25 ft
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks - Corner Lot		
Street Side	15 ft	15 ft
Interior Side	5 ft	5 ft
Both Sides Combined	15 ft	10 ft
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street– Garage	25 ft	25 ft
Abutting a Principal Arterial Street – Habitable Space	20 ft	20 ft
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks - Interior Lot		
Each Side	5 ft	5 ft
Both Sides Combined	15 ft	10 ft
Minimum Rear Yard Setback ⁺⁺⁺	25 ft	25 ft
Minimum Building Separation [*]	none	none
Maximum Lot Coverage by Buildings	35%	35%
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	35 ft
Minimum Floor Area ^{**}	900 sf on one floor; 1,350 sf on two floors.	None

* Minimum distance of dwelling from any other main building in zone.

** Excluding garage or storage.

*** Unless any structure extending into the side yard is open and allows emergency access to the rear yard, in which case a five-foot side yard may be the minimum of each side.

+++ See Section 21.42.210.

Section 2: New Subsection. A new Subsection G is added to Section 21.42.210, to read as follows:

“G. Rear Yard Setback

“In single family zones, a portion of the main building may encroach into the required rear setback no more than 10 feet provided that the total encroachment area does not exceed 200 square feet.”

Comparison of Standards:

This comparison is between the standards proposed in 2001 for the RS-8 and RS-7 zones, and the standards for the same zones which have been presented to the Planning Commission as part of the Group B issues.

- Lot width:** 2001 – No changes were proposed
2004 – Proposal is to reduce RS-7 to 55 feet
- Front yard:** 2001 – Proposal to make 20 feet the universal standard
2004 – Proposal to leave standard unchanged for RS-8/RS-7, but to add a standard for lots abutting a private road or access easement
- Side yard:** 2001 – No changes proposed
2004 – Arithmetic corrections
- Rear yard:** 2001 – Proposal to allow 200 square feet encroachment into the required rear yard
2004 – Proposal to reduce RS-7 rear yard to 20 feet
- Max. Cov.:** 2001 – No changes were proposed
2004 – Proposal to increase allowable coverage in RS-7 to 40%
- Height:** 2001 – No changes were proposed
2004 – No changes proposed
- Min. Area:** 2001 – Retains standard for minimum floor area in RS-8
2004 – Eliminates minimum floor area standard

Lynnwood Planning Commission
Meeting of Jan. 22, 2004

Staff Report

Agenda Item: **J-2**

Upcoming Commission Meetings

- Public Hearing
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Old Business
- Information**
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Ron W. Hough, Planning Manager

■ The following schedule is for planning purposes – subject to adjustments.

Feb. 12 **Public Hearing:** R&D Land Uses – Zoning Code Amendment
Work Session: Code Amendment – CDO Zone Hwy. 99 Dev. Standards
Development Regulations Update – continued

Feb. 26 **Public Hearing:** Zoning Code Amendment for College Parking (Cont'd.)
Code Amendment – CDO Zone Hwy. 99 Dev. Standards
Work Session: Hardy Annexation – Comp. Plan & Zoning

March 11 **Public Hearing:** None scheduled
Work Session: TBA