

1
2
3
4 **City of Lake Forest Park**
5 **Planning Commission**
6 **Regular Meeting Summary**
7 **17425 Ballinger Way NE—The Forest Room**
8 **May 23, 2006**
9

10 **Commissioners present:** Judy Herring, Chair, Jeff Foster, Vice Chair, Linda Owens,
11 Don Shaffer, Shary Van, Sang-Won Cho “Sancho”, Chuck Paulsen, Aron Golden
12

13 **Commissioners absent:** Tom Lerner
14

15 **Staff present:** Steve Bennett, Planning & Building Director; Shana Restall, Associate
16 Planner; Edward Spilker, Planning Technician
17

18 **Others present:** Dawn Nelson, Rick Bungay, Don Udhus, Ted Udhus
19

20 **Call to order:** Judy Herring, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.
21

22 **Approval of meeting notes**

23 Chair Herring entertained the motion to approve the minutes for April 25, 2006 with
24 revisions, Cmr. Golden moved to approve, Cmr. Cho seconded the motion, motion
25 carried; Cmr. Van abstained.
26

27 **Public comments—10 minutes**

28 None
29

30 **New business**

31 **Home Occupation Regulations**

32 Steve Bennett introduced the proposed changes to the City of Lake Forest Park’s Home
33 Occupation Regulations as recommended by the Economic Development Commission
34 (EDC). Chair Herring wanted clarification on what is meant by “unfinished attached
35 garage” under Section A. Bennett explained that an unfinished garage is one that is not
36 used as living space, but he recommended that the Planning Commission and staff look
37 more closely at the intent/ consequences of using such spaces for storage purposes; for
38 instance the proposed regulations can allow home occupations up to 1500 square feet of
39 usable space. Cmr. Van wanted to know whether Section B included daycares. Staff
40 explained that daycares and adult family homes were covered elsewhere in the code.
41 Bennett asked Planning Commissioners if they felt the changes under Section F stating
42 it were ambiguous and unclear. It was assumed, however, that the regulation required
43 one parking space for each employee and one parking space for those occupations
44 rendering services on site.
45

46 Cmr. Owens wanted clarification on the size of a vehicle with a weight capacity of 10,000
47 lbs as specified under proposed Section G(3). Bennett explained that the regulation is
48 most likely referring to the gross vehicle weight rather than the carrying weight capacity
49 of the vehicle; however there was agreement that, as written, the proposed regulation is
50 unclear in this regard. Inquiring into the intent of the proposed changes, Cmr. Golden
51 inquired into the Economic Development Commission who proposed the changes; staff
52 explained that they are a lay board of citizens appointed by the mayor, with most
53 members representing home-based businesses. Cmr. Cho noted conflicts in the

1 proposed regulations particularly between Section E and the other regulations regarding
2 parking and animals. Cmr. Owens asked whether or not kennels or “doggie day cares”
3 are allowed in the City; staff noted that they were only allowed in commercial zones.
4 Cmr. Paulsen remarked that 3 deliveries per day could negatively impact the residential
5 quality of neighborhoods. Further, Cmr. Cho suggested keeping such regulations
6 simple, and that these regulations must relate substantially to Section E: *Home*
7 *occupations shall not create traffic, noise, smoke, dust, vapor, odors, vibration, glare,*
8 *electrical interference, fire hazard or any other hazard or nuisance which is greater or*
9 *more frequent than that commonly associated with permitted uses within the zoning*
10 *district.*

11
12 Rick Bungay, Chair of the Economical Development Commission, was invited to speak
13 to the Planning Commission about the proposed changes to the home occupation
14 regulations. He stated that the changes originated at the request of the Mayor, and a
15 survey was sent to home-based businesses in the City, with approximately 60 percent of
16 the surveys being returned. It was learned from the survey that 90 percent of the home-
17 based businesses did not intend to grow the business outside of the home. Most
18 respondents were not troubled by the regulations as they stand. In terms of square
19 footage, 85 percent of respondents reported that the area of their homes used for the
20 occupation was adequate, but when they reported the actual square footage of the area
21 used for their business, it was often more than what was allowed in the code. Some
22 respondents had no idea how much space was devoted to the occupation.

23
24 Bungay stated that the EDC decided to expand the home occupation area requirement
25 to 500 square feet, which is the size of a typical garage and can accommodate 1 to 2
26 employees from off-site. Bungay explained that the EDC believed it was unfair to certain
27 businesses to calculate storage as a part of the 300 square foot area used for their
28 home occupation; however, he was unclear if the accessory building or unfinished
29 garage could be used to house the working space of the home occupation, and it should
30 be considered further. The intent of including animals in the proposed changes is in
31 response to the new business of “dog-sitting.” Cmr. Shaffer claimed that home
32 businesses should not create nuisances, such as noise, and this would preclude
33 businesses that house animals; Cmr. Van and Cmr. Cho concurred. In response to Cmr.
34 Golden, Bungay claimed that approximately 150 home-based businesses are in the City
35 of Lake Forest Park, and they include a full spectrum of different occupation. Bungay
36 reinforced the notion that home businesses are positive for the community by reducing
37 traffic, encouraging greater community involvement and security, and various other
38 benefits. In response to earlier questions, Bungay explained that one parking space is
39 required for occupations that conduct services by appointment; this is in addition to
40 parking spaces being required for each off-site employee. He also explained that the
41 vehicle weight regulation refers to gross vehicle weight. Cmr. Foster responded to
42 proposed change Section J, citing that the prohibition of certain uses is covered
43 elsewhere in the code, and by only prohibiting a few uses it is assumed all other uses
44 are permitted. Bungay also brought up the point that there are approximately the same
45 number of people working out of their home for other employers as there are home-
46 based businesses in the City, and these workers are not regulated by the City.

47 **Unfinished Business**

48 **Cottage Housing Demonstration Project Ordinance**

49 Dawn Nelson, Planning Supervisor for the City of Kirkland, was invited to speak to the
50 Planning Commission concerning the City of Kirkland’s innovative housing
51 demonstration ordinance. She explained that Kirkland’s innovative housing ordinance
52 included a two-step process. The first step, referred to as the “beauty pageant”, had a
53 turn around time of approximately 2 ½ months, where applicants submitted a brief
54

1 application. But she noted that the timeframe for the initial application was too brief,
2 since many developers had to purchase land, produce a survey and develop an initial
3 site design. In addition they had to show what they would have designed if no zoning
4 change was made. Nelson recommended a four-month timeframe. Six applicants
5 applied. Staff then made its recommendations to Kirkland's Planning Commission. The
6 Planning Commission had the option to approve up to five projects, but with no more
7 than two such projects per neighborhood. In the end the City of Kirkland's Planning
8 Commission chose only two project proposals. One project was a 15 unit compact
9 single-family, and the other was 16 unit mixed compact single-family/ cottage housing
10 development. The chosen projects had 6 months to submit their land use applications
11 which were subject to Kirkland's most rigorous land use process, Process 2B: staff
12 makes its recommendations to the hearing examiner, a public hearing is held, and the
13 Hearing Examiner then makes his/her recommendation to the City Council for their final
14 decision. A neighborhood meeting was required of the developers before submitting their
15 applications, but no minutes were required. Further the public noticing area was
16 expanded from 300 feet to 500 feet. The intent of the regulation was to demonstrate
17 three different housing types: cottages limited to 1000 square feet or less; compact
18 single family homes between 1000 and 1500 square feet; and duplexes and triplexes
19 that were made to look like single-family homes. Density bonuses were 2-1 for cottages,
20 and 1 ½ -1 for compact single-family. Kirkland's focus was more related to the intensity
21 of the land use rather than just the density.

22
23 Nelson stated that the underlying zoning for both projects in place before the adopted
24 ordinances was RS-7200. Kirkland is now in the process of evaluating the two
25 demonstration projects. Once the evaluation is done it will be presented to Kirkland's
26 Planning Commission and City Council to see if permanent or another interim regulation
27 should be adopted. With the evaluation, Nelson noted much interest is focused on the
28 traffic impacts of the two projects. Cmr. Schaffer inquired if any homes were demolished
29 to accommodate the development: Nelson stated that one single-family residence and
30 one outbuilding were demolished. Each property was 2.2 acres in size. In response to
31 Cmr. Schaffer, Nelson explained that the two projects were in a less developed "outlying"
32 area of Kirkland. The design criteria for Kirkland's ordinance were borrowed, with
33 changes, from the City of Shoreline. Innovation and diversity of housing choices were
34 encouraged. Cmr. Van wanted further information about public participation; Nelson
35 stated that early in the process a community forum about innovative housing was held
36 as an "educational event." The final density for the two projects was calculated to be 7.5
37 units per acre. Both developments have CC&R's and homeowner associations, but the
38 City of Kirkland did not specify ownership methods. The final cost for the units were
39 between \$400,000 and \$500,000 as compared to \$700,000 to \$800,000 for a typical an
40 average single-family home in the same neighborhood. Nelson claimed that Kirkland
41 wanted to take a more cautious approach to innovative housing, and that is why they
42 chose to adopt a temporary demonstration ordinance. The total process took
43 approximately 2 years, and the demonstration ordinance was designed to be a one-time
44 process without recurrence. Cmr. Foster brought up the idea to open up the proposed
45 Lake Forest Park demonstration ordinance to more innovative housing types other than
46 cottages. Cmr. Van commented that the City of Lake Forest Park should encourage
47 public participation early on in the process.

48 49 **Reports/Communications/Announcements**

50 Cmr. Schaffer proposed that the Planning Commission move to the summer schedule.
51 The other Commissioners agreed. The Planning Commission will meet every second
52 Tuesday of June, July and August.

53

1 **Adjournment: 9:00 PM**
2 Edward Spilker, Planning Technician/Clerk

3
4
5
6
7
8

APPROVED:

Judy Herring, Chair