

City of Lynnwood
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
July 22, 2004

Commissioners present:

Dave Johnson – Chair
Brian Bigler
Patrick Decker
Elisa Elliott
Tia Peycheff
Jacqueline Powers
Donna Walther

Staff present:

Gina Coccia, Assistant Planner
Ron Hough, Planning Manager
Dennis Lewis, Senior Planner

Others present:

Council Member Ted Hikel
Council Member – Martin Nelson (Liaison)

SUMMARY OF THE JULY 22, 2004, MEETING MINUTES

Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Public Hearing:

The Commission conducted its first public hearing to accept public comments on this year's Plan amendment proposals. The following nine proposals were ready for this hearing. Following the testimony, the hearing was continued to August 26.

Raskin Plan Map Amendement

Kingsbury West Plan Map Amendment

College District Plan

Growth Policies Review

Parks & Recreation Element

Implementation Program Update

Residential Balance – Revisions to the replacement goal.

Data Updates

Policy Adjustments

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dave Johnson called this meeting to order at 7:04 pm. A quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made to approve the July 8, 2004 meeting minutes. It carried unanimously.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION MEMBER DISCLOSURES

Chair Johnson informed the commission that he works part time as a faculty member of Edmonds Community College.

PUBLIC HEARING

Planning Manager Ron Hough gave an explanation and PowerPoint presentation of each of the proposed Plan Amendments.

Chair Dave Johnson opened the Public Hearing to accept public comments.

a. **Raskin Plan Map Amendment**

Planning Manager Hough explained that the intention of applicants, MJR Development, Inc. and Polygon Northwest, is to develop a multi-family project in the vicinity of the Interurban Trail and west of the Lynnwood Park and Ride. In order to make such a development possible, they have requested a plan designation change from Business/Technical Park (BTP) to High-density Multi-family (MF-3).

Hough also explained that two other development options are active on this property. A previously approved office development Planned Unit Development (PUD) is still active but the current office market prevents its development. The underlying zoning is Light Industrial (LI), which allows a variety of industrial uses. Although the applicants are asking the City for the MF-3 designation, there is no guarantee that it will be approved. In case their request is denied, they have begun a process that could lead to approval of a flex-space industrial development on the property to preserve that option.

- Larry Calvin, owner of NW Development Advisors, P.O. Box 12391, Mill Creek, Washington 98082. Mr. Calvin is represented Mike Raskin (President of MJR Development, Inc.). He informed the Commission that the MF-3 is a more viable option than an industrial development. However, in case it isn't approved, they are working on an industrial flex-space development as an option. He felt that the 60/40 goal was the primary obstacle to their 2003 proposal, but are more confident this year because that goal is being considered for removal.
- Ted Hikel, Lynnwood City Council Member, disagreed that the 60/40 was the main problem. Instead, he pointed out that the Raskin property contains 85% of all developable industrial land in Lynnwood and the Council is aware that we need more industry and jobs.

b. **Kingsbury West Mobile Home Park**

The applicant is Palmer Living Trust, represented by Jeffrey Palmer, Manager of both Kingsbury West and Kingsbury West Annex mobile home parks. Kingsbury West is zoned RS-7 and its plan designation is Medium-density Single-family (SF-2). Kingsbury West Annex is zoned RML and its Plan designation is Low-density Multi-family (MF-1). Mr. Palmer is requesting that both parks be viewed as one and that both parks be designated High density Single-family (SF-3).

- Jeff Palmer, Attorney Walt Olson and 21 park residents were in attendance.
- Lynn Silsbee (former Planning Commissioner and a mobile home owner) - Mr. Silsbee presented a photo (as an example) of his Arizona "park model" home as a possible option for local mobile home parks. He pointed out the features and the advantages of such a park.
- Ishbel Dickens – Columbia Legal Services – Ms. Dickens is a mobile home tenant advocate. She urged the City to keep the park as it is, or change the designation of the Annex from MF-1 to SF-2 to be consistent with the rest of the park. She recognized the park provides affordable home ownership to the residents and changing the designation would definitely have an adverse affect on the homeowners.

Commissioner Decker asked Ms. Dickens about Mobile Home Park vacancy rates. She stated the vacancy rate throughout the state is less than 1%. There are very few, if any, spaces available in our local mobile home parks. To verify this Ms. Dickens offered to conduct a survey to find out for certain.

- Diane Claire Houton (Kingsbury West resident) – Ms. Houton stated that she doesn't trust their park management and doesn't understand why he wants the SF-3 designation unless he has other intentions.
- Edward Wallace (Kingsbury West resident) – Mr. Wallace wanted to know if Kingsbury West (excluding the annex) was inside a quarter of a mile from Highway 99. The Commission confirmed that it is.
- June Provencial (Kingsbury West resident) – Ms. Provencial directed a question to Mr. Olson, asking why Mr. Palmer was applying for the designation? She expressed fear of not having a place to live in the near future.
- Walt Olson – Attorney for the Palmer Living Trust – Mr. Olson explained that this is a "non-project" proposal. The owner simply wants to maximize his long-range options, but has no plans to change the park. He explained that any wetland that might have existed on the Annex site no longer exists and the SEPA process confirms that. He calculated that, after streets are removed, the RS-4 zone could allow about ten more units than the 89 that currently exist. Staff arrived at the same conclusion. Commissioner Decker asked what the age of the oldest unit was. Mr. Olson replied that Mr. Palmer's 1968 model is the oldest and the newest is a 2001 model. In response to a question about lot sizes, Mr. Olson stated that the residents rent spaces, not subdivided lots. The spaces range from about 3,000 to 5,000 square feet depending on the unit's size and whether it's a single-wide or a double-wide unit.
- Carmella Ford – Ms. Ford's Father lives at Kingsbury West and she felt the people who testified at this hearing were treated disrespectfully. Chair Johnson apologized for any indications of disrespect.
- Marlyn Higgins – (Kingsbury West resident) She was concerned about Mr. Olson's statement regarding the density and how ten more units could be placed in an already full park. The commission explained that, under current zoning, Mr. Palmer could redevelop his park for single-family homes without a change in the code. Mr. Hough clarified that the City's Development Code chapter that pertains to regulations for creating, modifying and redeveloping mobile home parks was revised two years ago to make it easier for older mobile home parks to remodel and redevelop into a more modern mobile home park. However, each park is locked into a density cap, based on their current density. The density cap for Kingsbury West is eight units per acre.
- Barbara Boudreaux – (Kingsbury West resident) She asked the question "If the RS-4 goes through what is going to happen to the current homes and the seniors who reside there?"
- Hugh Verge (Kingsbury West resident) Mr. Verge asked about the viability of the senior citizens who live in the mobile homes and the mobile homes themselves? Commission Decker said this is a question definitely for future consideration, but these are not factors for consideration in the Plan amendment proposal.
- Jeff Zimmerman (Kingsbury West resident) – Commented that he is not opposed to the zoning, but would be opposed to adding more mobile homes to the park.
- Ed Wallace (Kingsbury West resident) – He told the Commission that deciding in favor of this could create some adverse feelings with the park residents.
- This discussion will be continued to the August 26 meeting.

c. **College District Plan** – *No comments were offered.*

- d. **Growth Policies Review** – *No comments were offered.*
- e. **Parks & Recreation Element** – *No comments were offered.*
- f. **Implementation Program Update** – *No comments were offered.*

g. **Residential Balance**

Staff explained that the applicant, Martin Nelson, is asking that the “Residential Balance” subgoal of the Land Use Element be removed on the basis that it is without merit, unrealistic and impossible to achieve.

If the Commission recommends removal of the Residential Balance subgoal, it should also offer a replacement goal that clearly addresses a need in the community and does not merely reflect other goals and policies in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Ted Hikel** (Lynnwood City Council member), informed the Commission that this is “only a goal” and not a “rule”. It’s something to aim for in the future. He proceeded to point out the need for a proper balance of housing. He said 85% of our single-family residences are owner occupied, compared to only 15% of multi-family units. Single-family residences are at least twice as valuable, selling for an average of over \$200,000 compared to about \$100,000 per unit for apartments. The average cost to the City to provide services is between \$950 and \$975 per person, regardless of whether they live in an apartment or a house. Apartment buildings are not paying their way and as we gain more of them, the City will have to either lower its levels of service (police, fire, parks, recreation and the library) or raise taxes. This is where the need for “balance” comes into play. Mr. Hikel also noted that 200–300 single-family homes have been illegally converted into duplexes. The City Council is currently discussing this problem.
- **Chair Johnson** does not feel there is any flexibility in this goal whatsoever. He believes it has become a rule and is not a simple goal. He also believes there is no compelling or legal reason to have such a goal.
- **Commissioner Powers** wasn’t satisfied with Mr. Hikel’s figures. She asked staff to look into tax revenue from Single-family residences vs. Multi-family residences. She also wanted to know when we first noticed a drop in tax revenues from retail and how much it has dropped since that time. How much money has the City lost during the economic down-turn?
- **Commissioner Pecheff** expanded the discussion of balance as it relates to the City’s finances. She suggested that we also need to look at the balance of commercial and industrial businesses. These two land uses pay much more in taxes than they use up in services. So, from a fiscal point a view, they would be preferable to single-family housing.
- **Commissioner Decker** asked Mr. Hikel about his commitment to single-family residences and, if so committed, why he voted in favor of the Senior Housing Assistance Group (SHAG) development a few years ago. Mr. Hikel felt that was a different type of “balance” and the zoning was already in place.

The Commission asked if Mr. Hikel and Mr. Nelson could work together and try to achieve a substitute goal that addressed Mr. Hikel’s “balance” concern while removing the rigid 60/40. They agreed to work together.

- h. **Data Updates** – *No comments were offered.*

