

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

**City of Lake Forest Park  
Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting Summary  
17425 Ballinger Way NE—The Forest Room  
August 8, 2006**

**Commissioners present:** Judy Herring, Chair, Don Shaffer, Shary Van, Tom Lerner, Aron Golden, Sang-Won Cho “Sancho”, Linda Owens,

**Commissioners absent:** Jeff Foster, Vice-Chair, Chuck Paulsen

**Staff present:** Steve Bennett, Planning & Building Director, Shana Restall, Associate Planner, Anita Goddard, Clerk

**Others present:** Don Udhus, Tom Heffernan

**Call to order:** Judy Herring, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Approval of meeting notes:**

Cmr. Lerner moved to approve July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006 minutes as amended, page 3 line 16, ~~transient~~ transit, and page 3 line 45, ... ~~could be compliance~~, could be in compliance... Cmr. Golden seconded the motion. Motion carried. Cmr. Owens and Cmr. Sang-Won Cho “Sancho” abstained.

**Public comments:**

**Topic:** Pam Schriener’s, storage shed 18245 47<sup>th</sup> PI NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155  
**Tom Heffernan, 18265 47<sup>th</sup> PI NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155**

Heffernan questioned Pam Schriener’s omission of homes in her neighborhood that are in non-compliance with regards to the shed ordinance. Heffernan stated that perhaps Schriener didn’t want to draw attention to these homes as they were in support of her non-conforming shed. Heffernan also stated that he felt that Schriener had not fairly or accurately represented their situation nor had they fairly or accurately used the system. Heffernan believes in abiding by the law and believes that the codes should not be bent or construed to meet the needs of Pam Schriener.

**Topic:** Planning Commission meeting dates  
**Don Udhus, 19755 35<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155**

Don Udhus questioned if the commissioners would be going back to the two meetings a month schedule. Chair Herring confirmed that the meeting dates beginning in September would go back to the second and fourth Tuesday of each month unless it was decided otherwise at tonight’s meeting.

**Unfinished business:**

Home Occupation Regulations – Proposed changes:

Planning Director Steve Bennett distributed a combined version of the regulations; this included the EDC proposed changes and the changes recommended by the planning commissioners. The first recommendation was to expand the maximum allowable occupation space from 300 to 500 square feet, in addition to the 500 square feet a garage or one accessory structure may be used for reasonable storage associated with home occupation. Other recommendations include that all activities of the occupation must be conducted indoors with the exception of those occupations that are related to plants; not more than two persons other than members of the immediate family

1 residing on the premises may operate or be employed, there must be one parking space per  
2 employee but not more than a maximum of four parking spaces, any home occupation use which  
3 would change the residential character of the home, including modifications of the site would not be  
4 permitted and there must not be more than 2 deliveries per day.

5  
6 Cmr. Sang-Won Cho “Sancho” stated that if those that are enforcing these regulations can work  
7 with the changes and then it has his support. Cmr. Sang-Won Cho “Sancho” also commented that  
8 he didn’t quite understand as to why the changes.

9  
10 Dir. Bennett explained that the changes were to relax the current regulations so as to encourage  
11 more growth in home businesses. Dir. Bennett also stated that while work is being within a  
12 regulatory framework to relax what appears to be over restrictive but when the changes are  
13 submitted to the public as a change in the application it would be more user friendly and inviting.  
14 Cmr. Lerner stated that with lesser constraints, it provides the existing home occupations with a  
15 little more breathing room and that the city is sending out a policy that would promote home  
16 occupation as an industry.

17  
18 Dir. Bennett stated that if the commissioners were comfortable with the amended language to bring  
19 their resolutions to the next planning commission meeting, their recommendations would be  
20 summed up and submitted to the City Council. Dir Bennett will email the latest draft to Rick  
21 Bungay, EDC chair, to advise him where the commissioners are on this matter and extend an  
22 invitation for him to join the commissioners at the next meeting.

23  
24  
25 **Cottage Housing Demonstration Project Ordinance:**

26 Associate Planner, Shana Restall distributed an Interim Zoning Ordinance to Regulate Cottage  
27 Housing Demonstration Projects and Establish a Selection Process for such Projects draft. Planner  
28 Restall commented that per previous discussions the following changes have been made to the  
29 draft, page 2 line 45, all applications must be determined to be complete within 180 days not 120  
30 days of the adoption of this interim ordinance to be considered for selection, page 2, line 39, a base  
31 application fee will be charged not an application fee for the initial review of the proposed project.  
32 Once the applicant gets approval or to a certain stage in the project then full application fees can be  
33 charged, page 3 lines 16 thru line 29 is language that states that the Planning Director can override  
34 the existing zoning, sensitive area and subdivision regulations if necessary, these choices would be  
35 made by the Planning Director, page 3, item e, the proposal must adhere to the design guidelines  
36 delineated by the January 2005 “Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget  
37 Sound, page 5 thru the beginning of page 6 which includes a section of what documents will  
38 needed to be turned in once the application has been accepted. Plr. Restall also explained that  
39 sewer availability, water availability and fire district receipt were not included in the requirements for  
40 Kirkland or Redmond and they have not been included in our requirements but can be added if it is  
41 decided by the commissioners to require them.

42  
43 Cmr. Van questioned if the requirements for alternative sewer, i.e.; storm water would be included.  
44 Plr. Restall stated that the requirements for storm water and drainage were covered on page 3, line  
45 25 thru 29, “Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound.”

46  
47 Cmr. Owens questioned paragraph “d” on page 2 lines 39 how would the valuation of construction  
48 fees be determined? Cmr. Golden commented that the fees would be referenced using the 1997  
49 IBC code.

50  
51 Cmr. Van asked for an example of how a sensitive area ordinance could be overridden, Plr. Restall  
52 explained that if a piece of property had a wetland and a steep slope and in order to preserve the  
53 wetland you might have to go into the steep slope buffer. Cmr. Van was uncomfortable  
54 encompassing density in an already designated sensitive area. Planning Director Bennett

1 explained that the density would depend on the type of sensitive area and that the hearing  
2 examiner would take all factors into consideration once the planning commission has selected the  
3 project.

4  
5 Dir. Bennett suggested to establish criteria's to be met if there was sensitive area requirements  
6 waived, this would also provide findings for the City Council to base their decision on, that the  
7 positives out weigh the negatives on the encroachment of a sensitive area for project approval.

8  
9 Cmr. Van questioned as to who would make this determination. Dir. Bennett explained that the  
10 Planning Commission would have the first level of determination. Depending on the degree of  
11 encroachment would also have a factor on approval of the application or there could be another  
12 application that had less or no encroachment on sensitive areas that might be more favorable. The  
13 next level would be the Hearing Examiner and then his recommendation would go to the City  
14 Council.

15  
16 Chair Herring stated that perhaps some projects might impact the sensitive area but there could be  
17 some requirements in the mitigation for enhancement of the sensitive area.

18  
19 It was suggested that the language of page 3, to line 20, item I, be changed from in order to meet  
20 the goals of the innovative housing demonstration program there will be flexibility.... to the City may  
21 allow some flexibility... and if the phase " if the overall benefits outweigh the impact could be added  
22 "Chair Herring suggested that the overall environmental benefits be defined.

23  
24 Cmr. Sang Won-Cho "Sancho" suggested the following corrections to Page 6, section 3, Target  
25 Population and Affordability, bullet 2, to be changed from young families..... to families... also  
26 bullet 3, Cottage housing developments should provide a more affordable option to the average  
27 middle-income citizen... to Cottage housing developments should provide a more affordable option.

28  
29 Cmr. Owens expressed her concern on the development size that is being targeted. She felt that  
30 the minimum size of 6 cottage houses was appropriate, but was greatly concerned about the  
31 maximum size of 24 cottage houses. It was suggested by Cmr. Lerner that the decision of how  
32 many units that would be allowable be determined during the application review. Plr. Restall stated  
33 that at the current zoning the number of cottage housing is 12 units at RS 7,200, 8 units at RS 9,  
34 600, 8 units at RS10, 000, 5 units at RS 15,000 and 4 units at RS 20,000. Discussion ensued.

35  
36 Cmr. Golden asked if the zoning was a straight density calculation, in which Plr. Restall stated that  
37 the zoning is based solely on density without the deductions of sensitive areas.

38  
39 Cmr. Owens questioned the use of a parcel if a portion of that parcel had been designated as  
40 sensitive area. Dir. Bennett responded that a portion of the parcel could be used or the housing  
41 could be bunched on the portion of the parcel that has not been designated as sensitive area. Dir.  
42 Bennett also stated that this initiative is in the Comprehensive Plan to consider cluster sub-divisions  
43 and cottage housing as a means of giving people a way to redistribute their density in a way that  
44 the City can live with and a form of higher density that would be appropriate and a way to protect  
45 the sensitive area.

46  
47 Chair Herring questioned that if an applicant has 4 acres, and only 2 acres are usable for cottage  
48 housing would the other 2 acres that are sensitive become common ownership with the  
49 homeowners. Dir. Bennett responded that the 2 acres that had been designated as sensitive would  
50 perhaps become a sensitive area tract. Chair Herring questioned if protection would be provided for  
51 this tract, Dir. Bennett stated that once the tract has been designated as a sensitive area tract that  
52 all sensitive area regulations would apply.

1 Chair Herring closing comment on cottage housing was regarding the meeting with EQC and what  
2 the planning commissioners would want to present and what information would they request from  
3 EQC.

4

5 **Reports/Communications/Announcements**

6

7 **Adjournment: 9:00 PM**

8

9 Anita Goddard, Clerk

10

11

12

APPROVED:

13

14

15

16

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy Herring, Chair