



AGENDA

Lynnwood Planning Commission

Meeting

Thursday, April 23, 2015 — 7:00 pm

Council Chambers, Lynnwood City Hall
19100 44th Ave. W, Lynnwood, WA 98026

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. March 26, 2015 meeting

C. CITIZEN COMMENTS – (on matters not scheduled for discussion or public hearing on tonight's agenda) Note: Citizens wishing to offer a comment on a non-hearing agenda item, at the discretion of the Chair, may be invited to speak later in the agenda, during the Commission's discussion of the matter. Citizens wishing to comment on the record on matters scheduled for a public hearing will be invited to do so during the hearing.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update and Zoning Map amendment.

E. WORK SESSION TOPICS

F. OTHER BUSINESS

G. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

H. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

I. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

J. ADJOURNMENT

The public is invited to attend and participate in this public meeting. Parking and meeting rooms are accessible to persons with disabilities. Upon reasonable notice to the City Clerk's office (425) 670-5161, the City will make reasonable effort to accommodate those who need special assistance to attend this meeting.

This page intentionally blank.

**CITY OF LYNNWOOD
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
March 26, 2015 Meeting**

Commissioners Present:	Staff Present:
Chad Braithwaite, Vice Chair	Corbitt Loch, Dep. Director Comm. Devt.
George Hurst, Second Vice Chair	Todd Hall, Senior Planner
Robert Larsen	Mary Monroe, Project/Tourism Mgr.
Michael Wojack	David Kleitsch, Econ. Devt. Director
	Sarah Olson, Deputy Director Parks
Commissioners Absent:	Gloria Rivera, Senior Planner
Richard Wright, Chair	
Maria Ambalada	Other:
Doug Jones	Councilmember Van AuBuchon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Braithwaite at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of minutes of the March 12, 2015 Meeting

Motion made by Commissioner Hurst, seconded by Commissioner Wojack, to approve the minutes as presented. **Motion** passed unanimously (4-0).

Citizen Comments

None.

Public Hearing

None.

Work Session

1. Comprehensive Plan: Draft Economic Development Action Plan Update

Project/Tourism Manager Mary Monroe explained that this Plan is dramatically different from the 2004 Plan, primarily because of the amount of time that has passed. She stated that the Plan Update process was begun in 2013, and in 2014 the Mayor appointed citizens to an ad hoc Economic Development Advisory Group to provide guidance for this Plan. Commissioner Larsen reviewed his experience as a member of that group. Deputy Director Loch explained that this

1 document would lead to the preparation of the Economic Development Element.
2 Director Kleitsch reviewed the schedule for completion of this Update.

3
4 Ms. Monroe compared the original Plan to this draft Plan. The new Plan ties
5 closely to the community vision and references the community vision in the
6 strategies and goals. One of the biggest areas of difference is between the
7 Strategic Themes in the new Plan and Guiding Themes in the 2004 Plan.

8
9 Commissioner Wojack asked if the 2009 community vision is going to be part of
10 the Comprehensive Plan amendment process this year. Deputy Director Loch
11 replied that the community vision is currently referenced within the
12 Comprehensive Plan and is reiterated in the draft update, primarily in the
13 Introduction Element so that it applies equally to all of the elements.

14
15 Ms. Monroe continued to explain that in the 2004 Plan one of the overarching
16 themes is economic development as a new citywide priority. Economic
17 development is no longer identified as an overarching theme because economic
18 development has since been integrated into City services and plans. A positive
19 business climate was a theme of the 2004 Plan, this Plan update moves more
20 towards defining what "positive" is. In 2004, strategic partnerships were identified
21 as being essential to the City's success. While this remains important, successful
22 partnerships are common now, so it is less necessary to identify it as an
23 overarching theme.

24
25 The "value of measuring results" was important in 2004 because of the
26 importance of figuring what metrics to track and how to track them. Now, there
27 are processes in place where staff routinely tracks key metrics such as job
28 growth, unemployment, revenues, lodging, etc. In 2004, the City Center was a
29 guiding theme. Since then, City Center has advanced dramatically and no longer
30 needs to be a theme. Instead the Economic Development Plan updates the
31 emphasis on marketing, attracting development, etc. to achieve the City Center
32 Plan.

33
34 The Plan's new strategic themes are more relevant to what the City is currently
35 facing and what is expected to come up in the next 5-8 years. These themes
36 are: accommodating forecasted growth; harvesting the power of a diverse
37 economy; focusing on housing and amenities that attract residents; identifying
38 opportunities to grow mixed use centers; diversification of the economic base;
39 the changing face of retail; and capitalizing on investments and infrastructure.

40
41 Ms. Monroe explained specific differences between the 2004 Plan and 2015 Plan
42 Update:

- 43 • The new Plan still has a focus on business retention and attraction, but
44 there is a stronger emphasis on family wage jobs than there was in 2004.
45 There is more emphasis on reaching out and supporting businesses.

- 1 • Strengthening communication and Lynnwood's positive business climate
2 is now a goal where previously it was a strategy.
- 3 • Implementation activities have been added that address improving
4 perceptions of permitting.
- 5 • There is a stronger emphasis on customer service and problem solving.
- 6 • New communication strategies now include social media, electronic
7 newsletters, and business outreach components. There is more in the
8 Plan about collaborating with property owners and real estate managers
9 as a means of communicating what is needed.
- 10 • There is a goal for prioritizing high quality development.
- 11 • The Economic Development Infrastructure Fund is specifically called out
12 where it did not exist before. It will be used as a means of attracting the
13 kind of development desired in the City.
- 14 • The current Plan has a stronger emphasis on transit-oriented development
15 than the previous Plan did.
- 16 • Open space and parks are called out as a tool for attracting high quality
17 development.
- 18 • For image and identify, the City will be working on planned implementation
19 instead of brand development.
- 20 • The *Shop, Eat, and Stay* program is a program to engage businesses and
21 attract tourism.
- 22 • Livability and sense of place was previously a strategy. Now it is a goal.

23
24 Overall, the Plan is focused on developing programs, plans, and strategies. It is
25 aimed at implementation improvements that have already been started.

26
27 Director Kleitsch commented that the items contained in this Plan are not solely
28 to be done by the Economic Development Department; instead it is a citywide
29 plan. It also looks at internal partnering of the departments to work together to
30 achieve the various goals, objectives, and strategies.

31
32 Commissioner Larsen summarized that Lynnwood is somewhat focused on
33 retail-level jobs, but has recognized the need to increase the number of family
34 wage jobs. He commented on the number of light industrial uses in south
35 Lynnwood and how this might relate to a potential strategy to increase family
36 wage jobs. Ms. Monroe added that studying and figuring out a strategy for south
37 Lynnwood was part of the 2004 Plan, but hasn't yet been accomplished.
38 Preparing such a strategy is included in the new Plan and will be an interesting
39 challenge.

40
41 Ms. Monroe commented on the amount of multifamily housing that has come into
42 the City. Current studies show that the people moving into urban multifamily
43 properties are not necessarily lower income or aging. It has become a more
44 attractive lifestyle for young adults without children, especially if the housing is
45 near transit. She has not read any studies indicating whether this particular group
46 is a greater or lesser user of police and fire services. Director Kleitsch added that

1 the City has made a policy commitment to prevent encroachment in single family
2 neighborhoods. At the same time under the Growth Management Act there is
3 pressure to take increasing population and employment projections. The City's
4 solution is to have denser development along the Interstate 5, Highway 99, and
5 transit, and light rail.

6
7 Commissioner Hurst questioned if there was economic analysis for residential
8 projects that took advantage of the Multi-Family Housing Property Tax
9 exemption. Director Kleitsch reported that there had not been an analysis of
10 these projects, but Lynnwood Place indicated that housing generates economic
11 activity for the community. Commissioner Hurst stated that he was looking into
12 research that studied the economic benefits of multifamily housing.

13
14 Commissioner Wojack asked how much influence Snohomish County had on this
15 Plan. Director Kleitsch commented that the PSRC projections have more
16 influence on the Plan than the County. PSRC does the forecasting, and those are
17 the allocations that the City is provided. If the City does not take those allocations
18 there are sanctions. The projections used in this Plan were the PSRC
19 calculations.

20
21 Commissioner Wojack referred to the tax abatement and which taxes were
22 included. Director Kleitsch thought that all property taxes were included (city,
23 county, state), but indicated staff could confirm this. Commissioner Wojack
24 commented that he is familiar with the Target store in downtown Seattle and it is
25 doing extremely well because so many people have moved downtown in the past
26 15 years. He spoke in support of the City's plans for Highway 99 so that people
27 don't have to travel far to access transit service.

28
29 Vice Chair Braithwaite asked about the Business Improvement District which is
30 referenced on page 47 under item 1.4.4. Director Kleitsch explained the Business
31 Improvement District is enabled by state law. It would be for a specific
32 geographic area and is authorized by property owners within that area, who then
33 assess themselves a fee to increase service delivery. An example of this would
34 be in downtown Seattle where a Business Improvement District assessment pays
35 for litter cleanup, increased security, maintenance of public amenities, etc. A
36 Business Improvement District is enacted by a vote of the property owners.

37
38 Vice Chair Braithwaite referred to entertainment and cultural arts as a focus. He
39 commented he and his wife often go to events in Edmonds and often wish that
40 Lynnwood had similar opportunities. He spoke in support of trying to attract those
41 kinds of activities here. Ms. Monroe agreed, noting that the Economic
42 Development Advisory Group also stressed that goal. Staff hopes the further
43 development of the downtown core will result in a better venue for those sorts of
44 activities.

45

1 Referring to the discussion about focusing on family wage jobs, Vice Chair
2 Braithwaite said he believes Lynnwood needs to play to its strengths. One of
3 those strengths is that Lynnwood is a nexus for retail activities. Retail businesses
4 tend to have lower wages than other industries, but he believes keeping that as a
5 focus is still important. Ms. Monroe concurred. There is a section of the Plan that
6 focuses on the fact that Lynnwood is a retail mecca and will remain that. She
7 spoke to the importance of having a diversified economy and stated that the City
8 expects employment to grow significantly over the next 15 years. Retail will
9 always be a fundamental part of Lynnwood's economy.

10
11 Vice Chair Braithwaite commented there are a lot of higher-wage jobs all around
12 Lynnwood in Bellevue, Seattle, and Everett. Lynnwood is at a crossroads of all of
13 those locations. From that perspective Lynnwood seems to be a good, central
14 location for businesses. He asked how much analysis has been done on other
15 communities to see how much office space inventory is available in those areas.
16 Ms. Monroe stated one of the metrics tracked is office vacancy rates in
17 communities in and around Lynnwood. When the vacancy rate goes down in
18 Seattle it goes down in Lynnwood too. She agrees that the City needs to develop
19 more office space, but right now vacancy rates are too high and lease rates are
20 too low. It is anticipated that as Lynnwood grows and community amenities are
21 improved, the vacancy rate will decrease. Lynnwood has more Class B and
22 Class C space than Class A. The vacancy rate in the Class A buildings is about
23 20%. Director Kleitsch commented that the vacancy rate has come down since
24 2004. The City had very strong relationships with the property owners and the
25 brokers of the Class A buildings before the recession. Staff is in the process of
26 re-establishing those connections since many of those properties had turnovers
27 in ownership. He commented that the vacancy rate of Class C buildings is very
28 low (about 7%). The Plan calls for a recruitment strategy to get the vacancy rate
29 of Class A buildings down as well. Ms. Monroe added that retail space vacancy
30 rate is also very low.

31
32 Vice Chair Braithwaite asked what kind of consideration is being given to
33 infrastructure projects related to improving the accessibility from the highways
34 other than the Poplar overpass project which would add to the desirability of
35 Lynnwood by businesses. Ms. Monroe stated there are quite a number of
36 infrastructure projects in the City Center that would improve traffic flow inside of
37 Lynnwood. With regard to getting to and from Lynnwood, there will be one or two
38 light rail stations in Lynnwood as well as bus transit and other multi-modal forms
39 of transportation. Director Kleitsch added that another project includes the
40 completion of the couplet (ring road) from Alderwood Mall to the City Center.
41 There is discussion about widening 196th. The 204th Street extension around the
42 college will improve access to Highway 99. Construction on 36th Avenue will also
43 help. He noted that the issue really is finding the money and being "shovel ready"
44 for competitive grants. Vice Chair Braithwaite asked if it is feasible to address
45 on/off ramps from I-5 to 44th. Director Kleitsch noted that those are in the I-5

1 Corridor Improvement Project previously adopted by the City, but implementation
2 will not occur until later years.

3
4 Commissioner Wojack agreed on the importance of theater activities. He has
5 worked with two theaters in two different cities that both started in convention
6 centers. He discussed how these progressed. Director Kleitsch commented the
7 Plan talks about working in partnerships. One of those partnerships would be
8 building a stronger relationship with Edmonds Community College and their
9 cultural and theatrical arts programs.

10
11 Deputy Director Loch recalled a question at the last meeting about what would be
12 done with the neighborhood map. Page 40 of the Plan Update (Better
13 Neighborhoods) gives an idea about what would occur with a focus on
14 neighborhoods.

15
16 Vice Chair Braithwaite asked about the possibility of designating south Lynnwood
17 as a redevelopment zone in order to offer develop incentives and economic
18 benefits. Deputy Director Loch replied that options to offer incentives in
19 Washington State are limited, but agreed that looking at some of these for south
20 Lynnwood could be appropriate. Ms. Monroe stated the Plan calls for
21 investigating those opportunities. Vice Chair Braithwaite noted the City of
22 Portland allows some parts of the development rights to be transferrable between
23 properties. He encouraged the City to find creative ways to promote new
24 investment.

25
26 Commissioner Hurst asked about a general forecast for retail at Alderwood Mall.
27 Ms. Monroe replied that retail activity at the Mall continues to be strong. Retail
28 properties are at the top of the list in terms of performance. Trends indicate that
29 people will shop online, but there is still a large contingent that prefers to shop in
30 physical stores.

31
32 Commissioner Wojack remarked that the Target in Lynnwood is the top
33 performing Target store in Washington State. Director Kleitsch added that the
34 Lynnwood Sears is also a top performer.

35 36 **2. Comprehensive Plan: Draft Community Character Element**

37
38 Parks & Recreation Department Deputy Director Sarah Olson referred to the
39 theater conversation during the previous agenda item indicating that the Arts
40 Commission is currently drafting a Cultural Arts Plan. Deputy Olson referenced
41 that there are several policy statements included in the Element relating to
42 planning for a regional arts theater and better partner with Edmonds Community
43 College's Black Box Theater. In the Capital Facilities Plan there is a planned
44 Phase 2 project to the Recreation Center which is the Community Center portion
45 of the project. The concept for that project includes a performing theater space

1 which is attached to activity space including a commercial kitchen, rental
2 facilities, senior center, teen activity space, etc.

3
4 Regarding infrastructure questions, Deputy Olson stated that Parks is working
5 very closely with both Economic Development and Public Works on a number of
6 multimodal infrastructure projects including improvements to the Interurban Trail
7 and Scriber Creek Trail. This trail connects to the Interurban Trail at the
8 Lynnwood Transit Center, continues northwest to Wilcox Park and eventually will
9 be extended to Lund's Gulch in northwest Lynnwood. When completed, this trail
10 will be an important corridor for pedestrians and cyclists. Additionally, Lynnwood
11 is involved in a 5-year BikeLink project which will connect or construct over ten
12 (10) miles of bicycle facilities in South Snohomish County. Four of those miles
13 are planned in Lynnwood. Construction will be complete by 2018.

14
15 Deputy Olson reiterated that the Economic Development Plan is a citywide plan
16 being conducted by all the departments working together. The Parks Department
17 understands that addressing deferred park maintenance is important to the
18 Economic Development Plan. Also related to the Economic Development Action
19 plan is the Art Commission's inclusion of Neighborhood Identity as a strategy and
20 a goal in the new Cultural Arts Plan.

21
22 Discussion of the Draft Community Character Element:

23 The Healthy Communities Section is a new section to the Comprehensive Plan.
24 The Healthy Communities Program was initiated six years ago so it was not part
25 of the previous Comprehensive Plan. The program has two priority goals: 1)
26 improve access to physical activity; and, 2) improve access to healthy food.

27 Regarding access to healthy food, the Farmers Market was launched, and the
28 first city-managed community garden was created. Access to healthy foods is
29 also related to policy advocacy such as, menu labeling in restaurants, access to
30 food banks that are well-supported, and working with partners such as Edmonds
31 School Foundation and Nourishing Network Foundation that helps to feed nearly
32 400 homeless youth in the community. Improving access to physical activity is
33 largely infrastructure-based. Projects such as BikeLink, trails, connecting with
34 City Center, and larger Public Works and Economic Development infrastructure
35 projects support this goal.

36
37 Deputy Olson then reviewed plans for the future. This fall the City will be
38 launching an initiative to create a citywide, 10-year Healthy Communities
39 Strategic Plan. Once completed, staff will recommend future revision to the
40 Community Character Element. The additional goals sections are around Historic
41 Preservation, Arts & Culture, and Sustainability which were previously
42 standalone elements. The Arts section went through a modest update, but staff
43 hope to come back to do a more thorough update next year after the Cultural
44 Arts Plan has been completed.

45

1 Historic Preservation is split between Parks and Community Development. Parks
2 operates Heritage Park which houses a number of non-profit partners, artifacts,
3 and a restored Interurban trolley car. Parks also works in partnership with the
4 Historical Commission to work on the broader historic preservation of the City.
5 Senior Planner Gloria Rivera reviewed the goals and policies in the Historic
6 Preservation section on pages 33-35.

7
8 Questions and Comments:

9
10 Commissioner Larsen asked if there is currently a docent program at Heritage
11 Park. Deputy Olson replied there is a modest docent program that strives to have
12 docent present when the Visitor Information Center is open.

13
14 Commissioner Larsen noted the significant cultural diversity within the community
15 and suggested Parks could offer programs with those population groups to help
16 forge new cultural connections. He also suggested that those who come to
17 Lynnwood from other parts of the world might be interested in sharing their own
18 cultural heritage.

19
20 Vice Chair Braithwaite observed that, as an example, there is a large and
21 growing Korean community in Lynnwood, but there aren't any cultural resources
22 that embrace and engage that community segment.

23
24 Deputy Olson commented that there are nearly 10,000 weekly visitors at the
25 Recreation Center and it serves a very diverse population. She stated from a
26 general recreation perspective, Parks provides opportunities for the full
27 community to participate. In the upcoming survey for the Park, Arts, Recreation,
28 and Conservation Plan, the City is seeking input on a number of amenities which
29 might appeal to diverse audiences. Regarding culture, Parks works
30 collaboratively with the Diversity Commission in terms of community offerings
31 and events. Last year the Diversity Commission and Parks held a community
32 celebration called Celebrate. 90% of the entertainment and activities that were
33 offered were ethnic music, dance, art, and activities. On Monday, there will be a
34 youth summit to identify areas or gaps specifically around youth programming.
35 Deputy Olson thinks the multicultural component will be lifted out of that. In April,
36 the City is planning an event specifically for the Korean community in an effort to
37 build better connections with that community.

38
39 Commissioner Wojack referred to Goal 17 on page 32 and asked if this was the
40 correct title. He thought it should be "Social Networking Development" instead of
41 "Social Human Development."

42
43 Vice Chair Braithwaite referred to the performing arts theater in Kirkland which is
44 integrated into the retail community and commented that a facility located near
45 the Recreation Center will not create that kind of connected, community feeling.

1 He then asked if the library is still considering expanding and locating their main
2 facility in Lynnwood.

3
4 Deputy Director Loch thought the library was still interested, but there are no
5 plans at this time. He noted it would require an affirmative vote of the residents of
6 the Sno-Isle Library District.

7
8 Vice Chair Braithwaite commented that a library is a great nexus of art, culture,
9 and community activities. He suggested making it a goal to encourage the library
10 to expand their facilities in Lynnwood.

11
12 Deputy Olson pointed out that Subgoal HR-6, Policy CC- 19.5 on page 37 refers
13 to advocating and participating in the planning and design of a possible regional
14 performing arts center. This performing arts center would be a separate
15 entertainment venue in City Center and not connected with the recreation center
16 or with Edmonds Community College. She added that the City of Edmonds
17 subsidizes the operation of its performing arts center. The City hopes that
18 urbanization within City Center will bring a lot of people, dining, and
19 entertainment establishments. Lynnwood has the potential to offer a central
20 location that is more accessible for the region.

21
22 Deputy Olson then referred to the first policy statement under Subgoal HR-8 on
23 page 38 which references partnership and collaboration with the community
24 college and the library. The City has an ongoing relationship with the library. The
25 Arts Commission features and sponsors the library art gallery sees the library as
26 an excellent partner in arts in general. The Sno-Isle Library System offers a
27 wealth of programming that is also arts related.

28
29 Commissioner Hurst referred to page 40, Policy CC-22.6 regarding light pollution
30 and suggested rewording of this. He noted that the goal is not necessarily to turn
31 lights off at night time, but just to have them go off when not needed.

32 Commissioner Wojack referred to CC-22.4, also under the Light Pollution
33 section, and suggested that this should be required, not just promoted.

34
35 Vice Chair Braithwaite asked who controls the streetlights in the City. Deputy
36 Director Loch stated that some are owned by PUD and some are owned by the
37 City. Vice Chair Braithwaite asked about including engaging with the PUD to
38 retrofit the streetlights to LED lights and also proceeding with this for City-owned
39 lights as a goal in Light Pollution. The energy cost savings makes it worthwhile,
40 but the light pollution reduction is another important benefit. There was general
41 consensus among the commissioners to integrate this suggestion.

42
43 Commissioner Larsen had the following comments:

- 44 • He referred to importance of the yellow “flags” or highlighting throughout
45 the Comprehensive Plan. On page under Community Character there is

- 1 an opportunity to highlight what this chapter is about where it says, “The
2 goal of this element is . . .”
- 3 • On Goal 3: Neighborhoods on page 19, he noted that *code enforcement* is
4 a term that is a sensitive issue to a lot of people in Lynnwood so *code*
5 *compliance* is sometimes used as a softer term. He is not familiar with
6 *code administration* and thought the meaning might be lost on the readers.
7 Either *code enforcement* or *code compliance* might be better here.
 - 8 • On page 20, Policy CC-3.9, *limit* is a soft word that makes him
9 uncomfortable. He recommended substituting the word *discourage*.
 - 10 • On page 22, Signage and Wayfinding, the second sentence down, the
11 recommended substituting the word *travelers* for *community* to respect the
12 multimodal goals that the City has.
 - 13 • On page 23, he asked why *greenhouse gas* was removed since this is
14 such an important term. Deputy Director Loch explained that it was just a
15 matter of using the abbreviation GHG which is identified in the preceding
16 paragraph.
 - 17 • It might be possible to combine Goal 10: Sustainable Community on page
18 27 and Goal 11: Sustainable Built Environment on page 28.
 - 19 • In Healthy Communities on page 31, he recommended putting the last
20 sentence at the beginning of the section.
 - 21 • In the first sentence of the Historic Preservation section page 33 he
22 recommended inserting “and truck farms” after logging. Deputy Olson
23 noted that the common terminology used at Heritage Park is *stump farms*.
24 She wondered if that was the same as *truck farms*. Commissioner Larsen
25 stated that stump farms were what were left after the land was logged.
26 After the stumps were removed, and the land was used for agriculture, the
27 products were shipped by truck to Seattle so those farms were called truck
28 farms.
 - 29 • On page 35, Subgoal HR-3, Policy 18.17, he wondered if *City Steward* is
30 still a relevant term. Deputy Olson replied it should be *Park Stewards*
31 which is the name of the current program.
 - 32 • He asked if there is a Diversity Action Plan. Deputy Olson explained that it
33 has not been started. The Diversity Commission has worked on their
34 mission and purpose, but has not created a specific plan. Commissioner
35 Larsen spoke in support of continuing to pursue creating a Diversity Action
36 Plan as a goal.
 - 37 • On page 41, regarding Noise Pollution, he asked about moving the last
38 sentence of the narrative down below to become Policy 23.1.1. He
39 commented that requiring noise attenuating walls and windows sounds
40 like a really good idea.

41
42 Vice Chair Braithwaite thanked Commissioner Larsen for his comments and
43 edits, particularly the comments about code enforcement and the sentence on
44 Healthy Communities. There was consensus among the Planning Commission to
45 integrate those suggestions.
46

1 Commissioner Hurst asked why *code administration* was used. Deputy Director
2 Loch explained that code administration covers everything that staff does
3 regarding rules including writing, application, inspection, and enforcement.
4

5 Deputy Director Loch stated that the recommendations would be integrated. Staff
6 will also continue, as time allows, to make edits for clarity and readability. Any
7 substantive amendments from here forward will be shown as strikeout or
8 underlined changes. He stated that all the draft Elements will be on the website
9 with some background documents so that anyone may review them. A public
10 hearing has been scheduled for April 23. This will be one of multiple opportunities
11 for citizen engagement on the Comprehensive Plan. He thanked the Planning
12 Commission for their hard work.
13

14 **3. Zoning Code: Omnibus correction ordinance**

15

16 Deputy Director Loch explained these are all housekeeping-type corrections that
17 staff has come across in code administration which have been put together into
18 one ordinance as a labor-saving effort. Staff will be advertising a public hearing
19 sometime soon for these amendments as part of the regular legislative process.
20

21 Commissioner Larsen asked if the City has a formal process for dealing with
22 scrivener errors. Deputy Director Loch replied that text changes to the municipal
23 code must be approved by the City Council by ordinance. Commissioner Larsen
24 suggested the addition of limited authority of staff to correct scrivener errors.
25

26 **Other Business**

27

28 **Council Liaison Report**

29

30 Councilmember AuBuchon had the following comments:

- 31 • He agreed with Commissioner Larsen that Lynnwood remains as a nexus
32 within the region because of its geographical location. It also puts
33 Lynnwood in a very good location for the high-tech industry. Lynnwood is
34 right in the middle between the largest airplane manufacturer and the
35 largest software publisher. It is the bedroom community that feeds Seattle
36 many of its workers including many of its Amazon employees. He noted
37 Amazon is now 25% of the employment of the City of Seattle.
- 38 • He announced that the Council will be considering an Ordinance next
39 month that will finally establish an IT Department for the City of Lynnwood
40 with its own IT Director and budget.
- 41 • Regarding the streetlights, the PUD has been installing LED lights as
42 lights need replacing. The lights dim down when nobody is around and
43 illuminate up when a car comes down the street. The new lights are very
44 bright and very directional.
- 45 • He commended the Planning Commission for their hard work on the
46 Comprehensive Plan.

- 1 • He stated he received notification that the Planning Commission's Annual
2 Report is complete and will be transmitted to the Council, but will not be
3 presented by the Director. Deputy Director Loch stated that the Planning
4 Commission's Annual Report and the Hearing Examiner's Annual Report
5 will be on the Council's agenda as an FYI item. If the Council wishes to
6 discuss either report, they would have the prerogative to ask for that.
7 Councilmember AuBuchon noted that this is the second year since 2007
8 that there hasn't been a specific discussion about the Planning
9 Commission Annual Report.

10
11 **Director's Report**

12
13 Deputy Director Loch invited the Planning Commission to the Volunteer Dinner
14 on April 8, 2015. On May 19, 2015, there will be a joint meeting of all of the
15 advisory boards. He encouraged the Planning Commission to attend if possible
16 to learn about some of the initiatives that are being undertaken Citywide.

17
18 **Commissioners' Comments**

19
20 Commissioner Hurst asked if the Planning Commission would conduct a
21 business meeting on May 19, 2015. Deputy Director Loch replied that he did not
22 think the Planning Commission would have a need to. If the Planning
23 Commission would like to convene a meeting that evening, it would be from 8 to
24 9. There is time reserved at the end of the meeting so that if commissions and
25 boards want to break out and have a meeting they will be able to do so. If the
26 Commission wishes to have a breakout meeting, staff would need to have a list
27 of topics on the agenda in order to notice the meeting properly.

28
29 Commissioner Larsen asked about the agenda. Deputy Director Loch replied that
30 an emphasis will be on economic development initiatives that are cross-
31 departmental and cross-discipline. Vice Chair Braithwaite stated the consensus
32 of the Planning Commission seemed to be not to have a separate meeting that
33 evening.

34
35 **Adjournment**

36
37 The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

38
39
40
41 _____
Richard Wright, Chair

2015 Comprehensive Plan Update

Agenda Item: D.1

Staff Report

- Public Hearing
- Work Session
- Other Business
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Staff Contact: Corbitt Loch, Community Development

Summary

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide a public hearing on the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Following the public testimony portion of the public hearing, the Commission may begin its deliberation on the matter--and ultimately make one or more recommendations for the City Council.

At a future date, the City Council will conduct a second public hearing on the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, and thereafter take action of the proposal.

Action

Receive public input on the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update.
Deliberation by the Commission will follow the public hearing.

Background

Over a course of many public meetings, the Commission has reviewed draft Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has incorporated input from the Commission and has prepared the attached, final draft of the complete 2015 Comprehensive Plan. A historical synopsis of the Commission's review of the Plan is provided as Attachment 1.

Many of the documents and records that offer context and supporting information for the final draft are available for public review on the City of Lynnwood website. For brevity, those documents are not reproduced in this packet, but instead are incorporated by reference. For example, the Lynnwood Housing Profile, minutes of past meetings and "track-change" versions of the original Elements are available at:

<http://www.ci.lynnwood.wa.us/City-Services/Planning-and-Development/2015-Update-of-the-Comprehensive-Plan.htm>

The documents provided for this packet include:

1. Public meeting history for the Update.
2. Summary of Changes for each Element
3. Draft map changes
4. Written public comment
5. Draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update

On March 26, 2015, the SEPA Responsible Official issued a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) for the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. The MDNS recognizes that the many past studies, adopted policies, and adopted development regulations provide meaningful mitigation of potential adverse impacts that might otherwise occur. To date, no written comment or appeal on this Determination has been received.

In staff's view, this new iteration of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan is primarily comprised of "housekeeping" amendments intended to either: a) improve readability/clarity; or b) update Plan language necessitated by the passage of time. Many edits are proposed in order to make the Comprehensive Plan more concise. Some additional edits are forthcoming in response to suggestions from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). Those edits are not expected to materially alter the content of the draft Comprehensive Plan. In order to facilitate the review of the draft Elements, a Summary of Changes (Attachment 2) provides an overview of the edits made. As mentioned above, "track change" versions of each Element are available on-line.

One of the more-significant matters addressed in this update is the matter of the 2035 Population and Employment Growth Targets mandated by the Growth Management Act (GMA), Vision 2040, and Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). This topic is discussed in more detail in the Introduction and the Land Use Elements. Lynnwood is required to ensure there is theoretical or hypothetical land capacity for a 2035 residential population of 54,404 and employment population of 42,229. These targets are based upon Lynnwood's 2012 corporate boundary.

Interestingly, a recent change to the development regulations for the PRC (Planned Regional Center) and PCD (Planned Commercial Development) zones provides the theoretical/hypothetical land development capacity to achieve the growth targets. The land zoned PRC and PCD (at and near the Mall) is within the Lynnwood Regional Growth Center—where Lynnwood is expected to allow greater concentrations of people and jobs, and served by regional transportation systems. This theoretical land capacity exists in this area because: a) the expansive amount of land that exists in and near the Mall; and b) the predominance of low-scale structures served by large surface parking lots. Whether extensive redevelopment on these many properties ever occurs will be determined by real estate market forces. The City does not have an obligation to realize the population and employment growth targets.

This recent PRC/PCD code amendment allows the City to satisfy the growth targets without changes (i.e., up-zones) to the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. The code amendment also maintains the Comprehensive Plan's objective of protecting and preserving existing single family residential areas.

An important issue related to the growth targets is the requirement to forecast infrastructure needs that will result from the residential and employment populations. The draft Transportation Element and Capital Facilities and Utilities Element accomplish that requirement. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the infrastructure that would be needed to serve those future populations (such as extension of light rail through the Regional Growth Center). City-sponsored improvements and upgrades would be designed and constructed at the time when additional capacity is needed. At this time, the wastewater conveyance system for the Mall area has capacity issues that are being evaluated. In order to maximize the long-term value of infrastructure improvements, near-term decisions on system improvements to streets and utilities will take into consideration the demand associated with the 20-year growth targets.

The proposed amendments include a change to the Future Land Use Map and a corresponding change to the Zoning Map. These changes are also considered “housekeeping” in nature, and were reviewed by the Planning Commission on March 12, 2015. The proposed change involves 15 parcels totaling 21.4 acres as summarized below:

Table 1: Proposed Map Changes:

Future Land Use Map: From Mixed Use (MU) to Regional Commercial (RC)
 Zoning Map: From Mixed Use (MU) to Planned Commercial Development (PCD)

Tax Parcel No.	Address	Existing Use	Acres
East of Alderwood Mall Parkway			
27041400301200 (portion)	19401 Alderwood Mall Pkwy	Retail (DSW, etc.)	0.6
27041400302000	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	1.5
27041400301800	19225 Alderwood Mall Pkwy	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	3.6
00560100000700	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	1.1
00560100000600	2716 192 nd PI SW	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	0.3
00560100000500	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	0.3
00560100000400	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	0.3
00560100000300	2707 192 nd PI SW	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	0.3
00560100000200	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.)	0.2
27041400301900	--	Retail (Best Buy, etc.) & vacant	1.4
00372800900302	--	Vacant	1.7
00372800900301	--	Vacant	1.4
00372800900201	--	Vacant	1.0
West of Alderwood Mall Parkway			
00372601200100	19230 Alderwood Mall Pkwy	Retail (Video Only, etc.)	3.4
00372601200301	19324 Alderwood Mall Pkwy	Hotel (Hampton Inn0	4.3
			21.4

Previous Planning Commission Action

See Attachment 1.

Funding

NA. The majority of work on the Comprehensive Plan has been completed using in-house resources. Public Works utilized consultant services during the

preparation of the Transportation Element and the Capital Facilities and Utilities Element.

Adm. Recommendation

1. Receive public input on the draft Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map change.
2. Upon closure of the public testimony portion of the hearing, begin deliberation.
3. At the conclusion of the Commission's deliberation, either:
 - a. Recommend approval of the draft Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map change as written; or
 - b. Recommend approval of the draft Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map change--as amended by the Commission; or
 - c. Direct staff to prepare revisions for the Commission's review at a future meeting. If the changes desired are substantive, it would be appropriate to continue the public hearing to allow public comment on those forthcoming edits.

Suggested motions:

1. "I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval the 2015 Update of the Comprehensive Plan."
2. "I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendment of the Zoning Map for certain properties located along Alderwood Mall Parkway, from "Mixed Use" to "Planned Commercial Development".

Attachments

1. History of 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update
2. Summary of Comprehensive Plan changes
3. Draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update
4. Proposed map amendments
 - a. Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map change
 - b. Zoning Map change
5. Written public comment

2015 Comprehensive Plan Update - Review History

As of 4/23/15

Element/Topic		Planning Commission		City Council	
		Date	Description	Date	Description
	ALL	4/23/15	PUBLIC HEARING		
	Cover & Title Pages				
1.	Introduction	10/23/14	First review. Review complete.		
2.	Land Use	6/26/14 7/24/14 8/28/14 9/11/14 3/12/15 3/12/15	Deferred to future meeting. Deferred to future meeting. First review. Second review. Neighborhood map. MU zoning on Alderwood Mall Blvd., south of I-5.		
3.	Community Character	10/23/14 3/26/15	First review. Second review.		
4.	Economic Development	3/26/15	First review of Econ. Dev. Action Plan Update.		
5.	Transportation	2/26/15	First review.		
6.	Parks, Recreation & Open Space	11/13/14 2/26/15	First review (formatting only). Second review.		
7.	Housing	11/13/14 1/8/15	Review of Housing Profile. First review.		
8.	Environment	2/27/14 8/28/14	First review. Second review.		
9.	Capital Facilities and Utilities	2/12/15	First review. Review complete.		
10.	Implementation	1/22/15	First review. Review complete.		
	Appendices				
A.1	City Center Subarea Plan, 2007				
A.2	College District Subarea Plan, 2002	2/12/15 3/12/15	Discussion of College District Overlay and College District Mixed Use Zone. Discussion of College District Overlay and College District Mixed Use Zone.		
A.3	Highway 99 Subarea Plan, 2011				
	General	12/19/13 1/23/14 2/26/15	Project scope and overview. Public participation plan Schedule update.	2/3/14 4/6/15	Project scope and overview. Project update.

This page intentionally blank.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES, BY ELEMENT

The following pages provide a synopsis of the more-substantive changes made to the existing Comprehensive Plan. The summaries are offered to facilitate public review of the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, since the Plan has been heavily edited for clarity, brevity and readability. However, the substantive changes proposed are relatively few.

For those interested, “Track Change” versions of each Comprehensive Plan Element are provided on the City’s website.

<http://www.ci.lynnwood.wa.us/City-Services/Planning-and-Development/2015-Update-of-the-Comprehensive-Plan.htm>

These versions depict virtually all edits made, including instances where information is moved, but not edited. The following Summaries follow the order of the Elements within the Comprehensive Plan:

Chapter	Element
1.	Introduction
2.	Land Use
3.	Community Character
4.	Economic Development
5.	Transportation
6.	Parks, Recreation and Open Space
7.	Housing
8.	Environment
9.	Capital Facilities & Utilities
10.	Implementation

No amendments are proposed to the adopted subarea plans to be incorporated as appendices.



This page intentionally blank

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Introduction Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction to Lynnwood		READ	Rewritten in informative/factual voice rather than narrative. Factual information provided on a broader range of topics.
Lynnwood Moving Forward – Our Community Vision		READ	Revised for clarity. Moved forward in document.
Planned Growth: Population, Employment and Land Area		LAW READ	Revised for clarity. Moved forward in document.
Purpose of the Comprehensive Plan		TIME READ	Revised for clarity. Text added to reinforce significance of related planning work, such as preparation of vision statement in 2009. Text added to acknowledge Comp Plan promotes environmental protection and stewardship, and therefore provides mitigation for adverse environmental impacts that might otherwise occur.
Characteristics		LAW	One bullet added: Incorporation by Reference. To acknowledge that other adopted plans, studies or regulations augment the contents of the Comp Plan.
Organization of the Plan and Elements		READ	Description of each element deleted. However, explanation of the organization of Elements added to help clarify the layout.
Relation of this Comprehensive Plan to Other Plans, Reports, Technical Studies and Legislation.		TIME READ	Rewritten to broaden the topic to all other related plans, studies, reports, etc. that work in concert with Comp Plan.
Environmental Review (SEPA)		TIME	Rewritten to provide updated information regarding environmental review.
Public Participation		LAW TIME	Rewritten to reflect current conditions and to acknowledge public participation conducted for related matters.
Growth Management Act Goals		READ	Moved forward in document and revised.
Concurrent		READ	Section deleted as little substantive information provided.

¹ Draft Introduction Element dated __/__/2015.

LAND USE ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Land Use Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction		READ	Rewritten for brevity, clarity and readability. Portions moved to the Introduction Element
Land Use Findings (previously “Planning Context”)		READ	Text already provided in Introduction Element deleted to avoid duplication. Revisions for brevity, clarity and readability.
Background Report Summary and Conclusions		TIME	Removed description of 2001 Background Report.
Summary of Land Use Planning Issues		READ	Removed, with statements of fact moved to “Findings” section of Element. Statements of policy moved to “Policy” section of Element.
Land Use Plan Concept		READ	Largely removed for brevity, clarity and readability.
Land Use Plan Description		READ	Statements of policy moved to “Policy” section of Element. Descriptions of land use designations moved to “Policy” section and reformatted as tables for clarity.
Land Use Goals, Policies and Strategies		READ	“Subgoals”, “Objectives” and “Policies” reorganized/integrated as “Policies”. Edits made in addition to those to improve brevity, accuracy, and readability include:
Policy LU-1		GMA	Added: specific reference to Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map.
Policy LU-2		READ	Added: guidance regarding amendment of Future Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and development regulations.
Policy LU-3		READ	Moved: descriptions of land use designations moved from earlier section.
Policy LU-4		READ	Revised for clarity.
Policy LU-6		OTHER READ	Several existing Subgoals and Objectives revised and integrated for readability and clarity. Deleted Objective LU-3 which calls for a 80:20 ratio for single family to multifamily. This Objective is not feasible. Rewritten as a policy calling for no net loss in the number of single family dwellings.
Policy LU-__		READ	Moved and revised: numerous subgoals and policies

¹ Draft Land Use Element dated __/__/2015.

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
			relating to the Lynnwood Urban Growth Area.
Policy LU-2.8		GMA READ	Revised for clarity. Subsection i deleted as project aesthetics are no longer appropriate criteria for zoning map changes.
Policy LU-6.1		OTHER	Added: policies that protect residential areas from impacts created by public land uses.
Policy LU-8		READ	Moved: policies relating to urban design moved to Community Character Element.

NOTES:

COMMUNITY CHARACTER

COMMUNITY CHARACTER ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Community Character Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	3.1	READ	Newly drafted section.
Background	3.1	READ	Newly drafted section.
Urban Design	3.1	READ	New section which discusses the evolution of urban design within the city as well as goals and policies highlighting the importance of urban design and character within the community.
Light and Noise Pollution	3.3-3.4	READ	Sections moved from Environmental Resources Element
Public Spaces & Identity	3.5	READ	New section focusing on importance of public spaces within the City, including gathering spaces, streetscape, gateways and the visual character.
Signage & Wayfinding	3.7	READ	New section focusing on street, wayfinding and business signage as a way to promote and enhance the community.
Healthy Communities	3.8	READ	New section focusing on creating a healthier Lynnwood various strategies and City programs.
Sustainability	3.9	READ	Revised text from previous Energy & Sustainability Element, which briefly summarizes concepts and efforts from the State, while mostly focusing on sustainability at the local level.
Historic Preservation	3.18	READ	New section discussion historical preservation programs and efforts.
Culture & Diversity	3.20	READ	New section about Lynnwood’s cultural diversity and resources.

NOTES:

¹ Draft Community Character Element dated 3/25/2015.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Economic Development Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Within the updated Element, each Strategy includes a number of action steps. Many of the action steps in the revised Element are new strategies. Others have been deleted because they have been completed or no longer applicable. Still others have been added to reflect the current economic profile and the Citywide Vision.

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	4.1	TIME	Revised to address 2015 Economic Development Action Plan updates.
Economic Development Action Plan	4.1	TIME	The 2005-2010 City of Lynnwood Economic Development Action Plan has been reviewed and updated to address circumstances that changed over time and to incorporate Lynnwood's Community Vision.
Strategic Themes	4.1-2	TIME	Updated to reflect demographic changes, coming light rail and known development activity.
Inventory & Existing Conditions	4.2	TIME	Updated to reflect the current economic and demographic profile of the City.
Goal 1	4.5		
Strategy 1.1	4.5	TIME	Updated to address family wage jobs, employment diversification, and arts and culture.
Strategy 1.2	4.5	TIME	Revised, placing stronger emphasis on outreach and providing support to businesses.
Strategy 1.3	4.6	TIME	New strategy to facilitate business success by connecting Lynnwood businesses with available resources to aid in their growth and development.
Strategy 1.4	4.6	TIME	New strategy to coordinate the space needs of targeted sectors with space inventory in Lynnwood.
Strategy 1.5	4.7	TIME	New strategy to ensure a qualified talent pool to keep pace with new and growing Lynnwood businesses.
Goal 2	4.7	TIME	New goal focused on strengthening and communicating Lynnwood's positive business climate.
Strategy 2.1	4.7	TIME	New strategy to continue to improve and enhance permitting and code enforcement functions.
Strategy 2.2	4.8	TIME	New strategy to develop a culture of customer satisfaction by providing the customer with results in a timely fashion and in a friendly environment.
Strategy 2.3	4.8	TIME	New strategy to enhance communication between the City and local businesses
Goal 3	4.9	TIME	New goal to focus on high-quality development and

¹ Draft Economic Development Element dated 4/13/2015.

Economic Development Element – Summary of Changes

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
			infrastructure projects.
Strategy 3.1a	4.9	TIME	Revised to remove actions that have been completed, and to support continued implementation of the City Center Plan.
Strategy 3.1b	4.10	TIME	Revised to remove actions that have been completed, and to support continued implementation of the College District Plan.
Strategy 3.1c	4.10	TIME	Revised to remove actions that have been completed, and to support continued implementation of Highway 99 revitalization.
Strategy 3.1d	4.10	TIME	Revised to include HUBZone marketing.
Strategy 3.2	4.10	TIME	Revised to focus on mixed-use housing, code compliance and outreach.
Strategy 3.3	4.11	TIME	New strategy promoting infrastructure as a necessity for increasing productivity, providing amenities and enhancing the quality of life in Lynnwood.
Strategy 3.4	4.11	TIME	New strategy to foster creation quality open space to aid in attracting businesses and residents to Lynnwood.
Strategy 3.5	4.11	TIME	Revised to focus on studying annexation and developing an annexation strategy.
Goal 4	4.12		
Strategy 4.1	4.12	TIME	Revised to implement the Lynnwood Brand now that it has been created.
Strategy 4.2	4.12	TIME	New Strategy to position Lynnwood as a premier Shop, Eat and Stay destination for the central Puget Sound region.
Strategy 4.3	4.13	TIME	Revised to focus on supporting, rather than creating, community events.
Strategy 4.4	4.14	TIME	Revised to include social media and to build on previous accomplishments.
Goal 5	4.13		
Strategy 5.1	4.14		New Strategy to utilize urban design to improve connections between people and places and to create economic vitality.
Strategy 5.2	4.14		New Strategy to ensure multi-modal connectivity throughout the City.
Strategy 5.3	4.14		Revised to focus on enhancing the City connectivity with branded wayfinding and signage.
Strategy 5.4	4.15		Revised to include investigation of funding sources and identification of unique neighborhoods and districts.
Strategy 5.5	4.15		New Strategy to enhance community services as an

Economic Development Element – Summary of Changes

Page 3

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
			important element in resident satisfaction with their community.

NOTES:

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Transportation Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	1	GMA/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor Clarification of Facts Added a list of specific GMA requirements related to the Transportation Element.
Planning Context	1	GMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added list of specific GMA requirements related to the Transportation Element Updated to reflect Vision 2040 and Destination 2040, current Multi-County, and County wide Planning Policies.
Summary of Issues	--	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed for clarity, reprioritization of issues.
Transportation Inventory	6	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated to reflect current City, State and Community and Sound Transit facilities. Removed programs not required for inclusion in the element.
Level of Service Standards	11	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retitled for consistency and minor edits to clarify Level of Service
Concurrency Management /SEPA	12-13	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text related to the administration of concurrency procedures removed for inclusion in a concurrency ordinance to be adopted concurrently with the update.
Travel Demand Forecasts	15	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified land use assumptions used in travel forecasting for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014, Pipeline (pending development) and 2035
Actions Necessary to Meet LOS Standards	17	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section to summarize LOS and transportation improvements needed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014, Pipeline, and 2035 land use conditions.
Non-Motorized Transportation	25	READ	Maintained reference to the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Skeleton Systems.
Strategies for Reducing Travel Demand	26	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded Commute Trip Reduction section Added sections on TOD in the City Center and Alderwood Mall area.

¹ Draft Transportation Element dated 4/14/2015.

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Multi-Year Financing Strategy	27	GMA/READ	Renamed from Transportation Facility Plan for GMA consistency.
Analysis of Future Funding Capability	28	READ	Renamed from Existing Funding Sources for Transportation and updated to reflect current sources of transportation funding.
Funding Shortfall Capability	29	READ	Clarified precedence of actions to address a shortfall.
Intergovernmental Coordination and Impact Assessment	30	READ	Added list of agencies that the city should continue to coordinate with.

NOTES:

PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE

PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	6.1	N/A	No changes
Planning Context	6.1	TIME	Updated to reference City vision
Summary of Issues	6.2-6.3	TIME	Updated to accurately reflect major issues for department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting department mission to create a healthy community • Identifying level of service needs • Resource options to meet level of service needs
Existing Conditions	6.3–6.4	N/A	No substantive changes
Demand and Needs Assessment	6.4-6.6	N/A	No substantive changes
Goal	6.6	TIME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added discussion public safety and security, accessibility and consideration of diverse populations in park development and improvements • Added discussion of funding feasibility
Park Development	6.6-6.7	TIME	Updated to include specific projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowe Park development • Off-Leash Dog Park development • Meadowdale Neighborhood Park improvements • 188th Street SW Mini Park development • Town Center Park (City Center) acquisition and development • Scriber Lake Park improvements • Gold Park improvements • Develop Master Plan for Lund’s Gulch
Activity Centers	6.7	READ	Updated to accurately address the term “Activity Centers”
Municipal Urban Growth Areas	6.7	TIME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed reference to projects not within MUGA (moved to other sections) • Reworded discussion of Doc Hageman Park to more accurately reflect near-term plans at the site.

¹ Draft Parks, Recreation & Open Space Element dated 3/31/2015.

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Open Space System	6.7-6.8	READ/TIME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewording and reordering – No substantive changes. • Removed from Open Space and placed under Park Development as a result of acquisition completion.
Facilities and Programs	6.8	READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reworded with more accurate descriptions • Added discussion of community gardens • Added discussion of maintain staff certifications • Added discussion of Heritage Park programming • Moved section to Historical section of the Community Character chapter
Trail System	6.8-6.9	TIME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reworded with more accurate descriptions • Added discussion of a “walkable” Lynnwood • Added discussion of Scriber Creek Trail improvements • Added discussion of Interurban Trail master plan and updated missing link segment left to be completed • Added discussion of Wilcox Park, Scriber Lake Park and adjoining School District property and connections for pedestrian access • Added discussion of the BikeLink project in coordination with Public Works
Interjurisdictional Coordination	6.9-6.10	TIME	Updated to accurately reflect current projects
Facilities Management	—	READ	Moved to Park Development section higher in document
Monitoring and Evaluation	6.10	READ	No substantive changes

NOTES:

HOUSING ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Housing Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction		READ	Section added for consistency with other Elements.
Housing Findings		READ LAW	Section renamed and reorganized for consistency, merged with “Summary of Housing Issues”. Reference added to reports fulfilling GMA housing inventory requirements. Additional revisions for clarity, readability, and technical accuracy.
Summary of Housing Issues		READ	Merged with “Housing Findings” section, heading removed.
Housing Conditions and Context		READ	Section renamed. Added text from “Assisted Housing” section. Updated and expanded information throughout. Other revisions for clarity, readability, and technical accuracy.
Assisted Housing		READ	Section renamed and revised to specifically address subsidized housing. Text related to general housing conditions moved to “Inventory and Existing Conditions”. Updated and expanded information throughout.
Future Needs		TIME READ	Removed references to outdated Fair Share housing policies, added references to County HO-5 Report. Text related to mobile homes revised for clarity. Other text updated with current information.
Land Use Plan Description		READ	Statements of policy moved to “Policy” section of Element. Descriptions of land use designations moved to “Policy” section and reformatted as tables for clarity.
Housing Goals, Policies and Strategies		READ	“Subgoals”, “Objectives” and “Policies” reorganized/integrated as “Policies”. Edits made in addition to those to improve brevity, accuracy, and readability include the following:
Policy H-4		READ	Revised for clarity, added detail for specificity.
Policy H-16		READ	Revised for clarity. Removed references to specific housing tools.
Policy H-6		TIME READ	Deleted as population growth targets are addressed in Land Use Element and Fair Share policies have been repealed.
Policy H-19		LAW TIME	Revised for alignment with Countywide Planning Policy HO-4

¹ Draft Housing Element dated __/__/2015.

ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Environment Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	8.1	READ	Minor Clarification of Facts
Goal	8.1	READ	Updated the wording of the goal to better reflect the broad nature of this chapter.
Planning Context	8.1	READ	No substantive changes
Summary of Issues	8.2	READ	Minor word changes to better reflect the broad nature of this chapter.
Environmental Protection and Enhancement	8.2	TIME	Updated wording to reflect regulation updates since last Comprehensive Plan amendments.
Conservation and Recycling	8.3	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated wording to reflect current City programs. Shifted focus from internal City administrative efforts, to City-wide efforts.
Natural Landscape and Vegetation	8.4	READ	Added information on Low Impact Development.
Geologic Hazard Areas	8.4	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated with current information on City’s soil conditions. Updated wording to reflect current regulations. Minor clarification of facts. Moved discussion of “Frequently Flooded Areas” to Water Resources section.
Water Resources	8.5	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated with more accurate information. Updated wording to reflect current regulations. Added discussion of Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas Removed separate section discussing “Wetland Mitigation,” incorporated it into other discussion areas. Added discussion of “Frequently Flooded Areas”
Fish and Wildlife	8.8	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated wording to reflect current regulations. Removed separate discussion of “Threatened and Endangered Species” as it was just a restatement of law. Other sections already address compliance.
Tree Preservation	8.9	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated wording to reflect current regulations. Added discussion of Tree Voucher Program.
Air Quality	8.10	TIME/READ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated with more accurate, current regional air quality information.

¹ Draft Environment Element dated 3/9/2015.

CAPITAL FACILITIES & UTILITIES

CAPITAL FACILITIES & UTILITIES ELEMENT - SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The table below provides a summary of the primary (i.e., more substantive) edits made to the Capital Facilities & Utilities Element¹ for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update:

SECTION	PAGE	PURPOSE	DESCRIPTION
Introduction	9.1	READ	Revised and summarized for brevity and readability.
Planning Context	--	READ	Removed since this information is summarized in goals and policies.
Objective	9.1	READ	Rewritten for brevity, clarity and readability.
Table listing facilities and inventory	9.2	READ	New table includes an inventory of all existing capital facilities owned by public entities. Related document section refers to other facility and utility elements that are adopted by reference.
Planning by Service Providers	--	READ	Removed since this information is summarized in table noted above and details for each area is available in the referenced documents.
Sewer; Water; Stormwater Runoff Management; Electricity; Natural Gas; Schools; Public Library; Telecommunications Services	--	READ	Each of these sections removed as they are noted in the table.
Capital Facilities Plan	--	READ	Description of each element deleted. However, explanation of the organization of Elements added to help clarify the layout.
Goals and Policies	--	READ	Revised with updated information.

NOTES:

¹ Draft Capital Facilities and Utilities Element dated 3/6/2015.

This page intentionally blank.

This page intentionally blank.

March 27, 2015

Corbitt Loch, Deputy Director
City of Lynnwood
4114 198th St SW, Suite 7
Lynnwood, WA 98046

Subject: PSRC comments on draft Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan update

Dear Mr. Loch,

Thank you for providing an opportunity for the Puget Sound Regional Council to review a draft of the City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan periodic update. We recognize the substantial amount of time and effort invested in this plan and appreciate the chance to review it while in draft form. This timely collaboration helps to ensure certification requirements are adequately addressed and certification action can be taken by PSRC boards upon adoption.

We would like to note the many outstanding aspects of the draft, which represents a thorough review, update, and streamlining of these elements. Several particularly noteworthy aspects include:

- Planning for compact growth in central places, including focusing a great majority of the city's growth within the designated Regional Growth Center and also around transit nodes along SR-99 through transit-oriented development.
- Inclusion of an optional community character element. This element addresses a number of policy areas in VISION 2040, including urban design, sustainability, climate change, and healthy communities.
- Inclusion of an optional environmental resources element. Consistent with the policy emphasis in VISION 2040 on actions that support a sustainable environment, this element addresses conservation and enhancement of a broad range of natural resources.
- A focus on implementation, including the Implementation element of the plan and throughout other elements where goals, policies, and implementation strategies are clearly identified.

The draft Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan update advances regional policy in many important ways. There are a few items, however, that the city should address before the plan is finalized:

- VISION 2040 calls for local plans to include a context statement that describes how the plan addresses regional policies and provisions adopted in VISION 2040. While individual plan elements reference VISION 2040 and multicounty planning policies, an overarching statement on the relationship of the comprehensive plan with regional plans and policies would add value. Examples of context statements are provided in Part 2 of PSRC's Plan Review Manual (<http://www.psrc.org/growth/planreview/pr-manual/>).
- Findings LU-6 and LU-7 address at a high level the relationship between anticipated growth needs and development capacity to accommodate that growth. Additional detail would greatly improve the transparency of the plan and more fully describe the impact of steps (highlighted very well in Table LU-4) the city has taken to meet growth needs through 2035. Specifically, current estimates of development capacity should be included in the plan alongside data for the growth targets.

- There appear to be a number of provisional or placeholder provisions in the draft Land Use element that should be finalized. For one, please include in the adopted plan a final version of Figure LU-1: Future Land Use Map and a final version of Table LU-7: Land Area by Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation, in Acres. As a more general observation, several important policies, such as LU-5, LU-6, and LU-7, are written in the form of principles for preparing the plan (e.g., “land use policies...should”) rather than the plan itself. Simple declarative policy language (e.g., “the Future Land Use Map implements”) would be much stronger statements of the city’s intent and commitment to key land use approaches.
- PSRC has recognized the City Center Sub-Area Plan (2007) as addressing a comprehensive set of policies and implementation approaches that support compact mixed-use development within the designated regional growth center through regulatory approaches, economic development, and infrastructure investments. This plan can be the cornerstone of the subarea plan for the full regional growth center that is called for in VISION 2040 (DP-Action-17). The current draft comprehensive plan has relatively few policies that pertain to the regional growth center. The center has an important role in the city’s overall growth plans over the next 20 years, and this component should be strengthened in the draft plan. Center-related policies should include:
 - The draft plan refers to the high importance of the regional growth as a preferred location for accommodating growth in Lynnwood. The plan would be stronger if it included more, and more explicit, policy language, ideally in a dedicated sub-section of the Land Use Element, guiding efforts to attract that growth while achieving a range of goals the city has established for that sub-area. Where appropriate, make explicit references to the City Center Sub-Area Plan.
 - In the final Future Land Use Map, clearly display the boundaries of the regional growth center as well as the City Center.
 - As called for in MPP-DP-3, please include housing and employment targets for the regional growth center. PSRC recently produced [additional guidance](#) about setting center targets that the city may find helpful in this work.
 - As called for in VISION 2040 (DP-Action-18), please include mode split goals for the regional growth center. PSRC recently produced [additional guidance](#) about setting mode split goals that the city may find helpful in this work.
- The city is commended for highlighting the importance of transit-oriented development in both the City Center and along the BRT line along SR-99, and for calling in LU-24 for additional subarea plans to be developed for TOD nodes. Identifying specific transit stop areas as preferred locations for future growth, perhaps showing these on a map, would be helpful.
- VISION 2040 contains policies to prioritize infrastructure funding within the regional growth centers (MPP-DP-7, MPP-T-12). Policy T-9 broaches the topic, but puts off stronger or more detailed commitments for future work. The plan would be more effective in supporting growth and development in the Regional Growth Center with clear statements included in the land use, transportation, and capital facilities elements regarding prioritization of investment in a broad range of public infrastructure improvements.
- The city is commended for including in the plan a full 20-year list of transportation projects, along with general discussion of a multi-year financing strategy. However, the plan should include, in either the transportation or capital facilities element, a more detailed analysis of its funding capability relative to probable funding sources for transportation improvements, including estimated cost of the transportation plan improvements compared with estimated

revenues. Further guidance on how to address the financial analysis in your plan can be found in RCW 36.70A.070, WAC 365-196-430, and the Department of Commerce [guidebook](#).

- The regional bicycle network identified in the region’s [Active Transportation Plan](#) includes a Tier 1 link along or parallel to SR-99 through Lynnwood which is not reflected in the city’s bicycle skeleton system. The city should work to address this important regional corridor in its transportation planning.
- GMA requires local comprehensive plans to include an inventory of existing transportation infrastructure. In light of this requirement, please include maps showing the existing inventory of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, perhaps as an additional map element on the maps currently on pages 40 and 41 that show the “skeleton” networks that the city is working toward.
- The city should consider additional policies and provisions, in coordination with transit agencies, that support efficient and effective transit service in Lynnwood. For example, the city could develop a transit streets category in the street classification system and adopt supportive design standards, prioritize facilities that connect people to transit (e.g. sidewalks, crosswalks, wayfinding signs, bicycle parking), and strategically manage parking in transit-oriented areas. See the [Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit](#) for more information and examples.
- It does not appear that transportation for those with special needs is addressed in the draft plan. Please add applicable discussion and policy language (see MPP-T-25).
- Both VISION 2040 and the GMA call for approaches to concurrency that address mobility by multiple modes of travel. Please consider adding policy language or further explanation of mechanisms in the city’s concurrency program that foster mobility options, such as transit, walking, and biking. As one option, the city could adopt policies to incorporate its LOS standards for nonmotorized facilities and integrate them into its concurrency assessment. Another approach would clarify alternatives for mitigation that could satisfy concurrency standards tailored to locations with access to transit and other alternative modes. The PSRC concurrency resources [webpage](#) provide information that should be helpful to you.
- PSRC appreciates the inclusion of a demographic profile of current Lynnwood residents. Too often housing policy and assessments fail to recognize who we are working to house. We have two concerns regarding the housing needs assessments:
 - We recommend an assessment of affordability of the *full* rental housing stock, both market rate and subsidized units, with data available through the U.S. Census.
 - Please clarify which AMI you reference throughout the housing element and use a consistent benchmark for prioritizing housing policies.
- The housing element references the future development of Link light rail in Lynnwood, but does not have any policies that specifically address the need to provide affordable housing choices in the transit station area or generally in close proximity to high frequency transit services. PSRC commends the city of Lynnwood’s commitment to exploring an incentive zoning policy. Focusing the use of this and other tools to encourage affordable housing transit rich locations will strengthen Lynnwood’s role in reaching countywide affordability goals while providing equitable access to all residents.

We note, as well, several minor edits that correct or clarify aspects of the plan:

- On page 1.3, please change “Urban Centers” to “Metropolitan Cities” as the correct term in the Regional Growth Strategy. Also, please note that there are 28 Regional Growth Centers, not 20, as currently stated.
- On page 1 of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element, the reference to “Destination 2040” should be changed to “VISION 2040.”

PSRC has resources available to assist the city in addressing these comments. We have provided links to online documents in this letter, and additional resources related to the plan review process can also be found at <http://www.psrc.org/growth/planreview/resources/>.

Thank you again for working with us through the plan review process. There is a lot of strong work in the draft and we are available to continue to provide assistance and additional reviews as the plan moves through the development process. If you have questions or need additional information regarding the review of local plans or the certification process, please contact me at 206-971-3289 or mhubner@psrc.org.

Sincerely,



Michael Hubner
Principal Planner
Growth Management Planning