

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

City of Lake Forest Park - Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes: October 8, 2019
17425 Ballinger Way NE—EOC Room

Planning Commissioners present: Vice Chair Maddy Larson, Richard Saunders, Ira Gross, Steve Morris, Jon Lebo, Mark Withers, TJ Fudge, and Cmr. Rachael Katz

Staff and others present: Mayor Jeff Johnson, Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Nick Holland, Senior Planner; Kim Pratt, City Attorney, Dan Nickel, Watershed Company, Christina Haworth, Otak.

Members of the Public: Mike Dee; Julian Andersen, Walter Hicks, Lori Bodi, Vicki Scuri,

Planning Commissioners absent: Chair Paisner

Call to order: 6:04 PM

Cmr. Saunders asked Director Bennett if there could be discussion regarding the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) after the scheduled public hearing. Director Bennett clarified that discussion on the hearing content could occur after the public hearing.

Approval of Agenda:

Vice Chair Larson asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Cmr. Gross moved to approve the agenda. Cmr. Fudge seconded agenda and it was approved unanimously.

Shoreline Master Program Public Hearing: Presentation by Senior Planner, Nick Holland

Mr. Holland said that this was the City of Lake Forest Park and Department of Ecology joint public hearing for the City's periodic update to the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). He went onto say that the SMP is a set of policies and regulations with three principles: protect the environmental resources of state shorelines, promote public access and enjoyment opportunities, and to give priority to uses that require a shoreline location. He said that the City comprehensively updated its SMP in 2013 and that the SMP is referenced in Lake Forest Park Municipal Code LFPMC 16.18. He also said the SMP regulates shorelines of the state, which in LFP is represented by Lake Washington. The shoreline jurisdiction also includes areas within 200 feet of the water body, as well as, wetlands and associated floodplains. Mr. Holland showed a slide that graphically depicted the shoreline jurisdiction. Mr. Holland said that the State requires all SMPs to be periodically updated every eight years. He also said that the proposed update is intended to keep the SMP current with amendments to State law, changes in local plans and regulations, and new and improved data or science. Mr. Holland said that the SMP update will not re-evaluate the ecological baseline that was established in 2013.

Cmr. Saunders asked Mr. Holland when the science was going to be looked at, and when the baseline ecological information would be re-evaluated. Mr. Holland replied that subject was not a part of this update and that Ecology hasn't provided guidance on when that analysis would be required. Director Bennett clarified when the ecological baseline was established. Vice Chair Larson asked for a clarification on the graphic for one of the slides. Dan Nickel from the Watershed Company offered clarification indicating that graphic represented the baseline condition and that the regulations dictate that the shoreline condition not have any net losses. He also said that the City isn't mandated to restore the shoreline, but restoration projects are encouraged for a net benefit to the shoreline condition. Director Bennett followed up on Cmr. Saunder's question and asked Dan Nickel to clarify when the baseline science would be evaluated. Dan Nickel responded that Ecology is not planning to look at shoreline inventories or science for re-evaluation, but that

1 tribes and other groups would welcome such a study. He added that, at some point, Cities will have to
2 document the fact that no net loss is occurring. Cmr. Gross asked if the SMP applies to private property.
3 Dan Nickel confirmed that it does. He went on to explain how shoreline degradation can occur. Mr.
4 Holland continued his presentation explaining the purpose and scope of the code gap analysis done by the
5 Watershed Company. He also outlined the proposed amendments that would occur as a part of the periodic
6 update. He said that definitions, types of exemptions, critical areas, wetland buffers, and the elimination of
7 the green roof provision would be the subject of proposed updates. Mr. Holland outlined the timeline
8 associated with the update and said, with the conclusion of the public hearing, the amendments can be
9 submitted to Ecology for review, and then ultimately adopted by the Council, which is scheduled for early
10 2020. Director Bennett indicated that Maria Sandercock from Ecology was in attendance that she had
11 indicated to him that she was available to respond to questions.
12

13 Vice Chair Larson offered the public a chance to comment on the content of the public hearing. She also
14 asked how the affected property owners were notified. Director Bennett responded that the owners within
15 the shoreline area were mailed a notification of the public hearing. Director Bennett also clarified that the
16 City has not received any written comments so far. Cmr. Withers asked if any shoreline dependent uses were
17 identified on any of the properties. Director Bennett stated his understanding of the shoreline dependent uses
18 present within the City. Cmr. Withers asked if there were any properties that required shoreline uses. Dan
19 Nickel responded that there were not any.
20

21 Public Comment during the SMP Public Hearing:

22 Mike Dee said that the Planning Commission agenda indicated that the public hearing would start at 6pm and
23 that the Planning Commission meeting would start at 7pm, but he said the Planning Commission meeting
24 was made a part of the hearing. He asked if a special meeting was required to start the Planning Commission
25 meeting early. He thanked the staff for the binder with track changes of the SMP information.
26

27 Director Bennett indicated that the public hearing can be closed. Vice Chair Larson asked about the hearing
28 and meeting scheduling times. Director Bennett responded that proper public hearing notice and Planning
29 Commission meeting notice had been conducted.
30

31 **Approval of Minutes:**

32 Director Bennett said that the meeting minutes for September 10, 2019 are not ready for review.
33

34 Cmr. Gross moved to approve the August 13, 2019 minutes and Cmr. Withers seconded the motion. All
35 were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.
36

37 **Meeting Dates:**

38 Vice Chair Larson indicated the next meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2019. She said there has also been
39 several future meeting dates proposed, and the Commission should weigh in on when those can occur. She
40 also said that the subject matter for the meetings would focus on the town center parking garage and
41 development agreement process, unless other topics become paramount. She asked about other
42 commissioners schedules, and if they can accommodate an expanded meeting schedule. Director Bennett
43 indicated he had heard from some about future meeting dates, but that all should email as to their availability.
44 All commissioners present said that they can make the October 22, 2019 meeting. Vice Chair Larson said
45 that the next two meeting dates would be published, but that the topics could be fluid due to the nature of
46 upcoming business.
47

48 **Public Comments:**

49 Mike Dee noted that the time was 6:30pm and that the calendar said that the regular meeting started at 7pm.
50 He said that the October 22, 2019 meeting conflicts with the Parks and Recreation board meeting, which
51 would make it hard for citizens to attend. He said that, on October 11, 2019, the City Council will be talking

1 about the town center vision. He indicated that since this meeting starting early, it may be considered a special
2 meeting and that the agenda may be limited.

3
4 Julian Anderson asked about the no net loss provision in the SMP and what the measures of ecological
5 functions would be. He also asked how the program measures success.

6
7 **Discussion of SMP update**

8 Vice Chair Larson asked Director Bennett how success is measured with the SMP. Director Bennett
9 discussed the permitting process for shoreline properties and indicated that the baseline condition is the
10 comparison by which success is measured. Cmr. Withers said that Ecology has guidance for shoreline
11 development and information on how to measure no net loss standards. Director Bennett said that a
12 specialist would be hired if a study for shoreline health were to be needed. Vice Chair Larson asked how a
13 home owner would know about shoreline regulations. Director Bennett responded that home owners have
14 predictability through the regulations. Cmr. Saunders whether there was a score for shoreline assessment and
15 how shoreline habitat gets assessed. Director Bennett indicated that a scoring system really isn't used. There
16 was continued discussion of how permit records show results of work and mitigation within the shoreline
17 area and how the City regulates shoreline development.

18
19 Vice Chair Larson asked about the conflict between meeting times and the published time for the public
20 hearing. Cmr. Saunders asked if the hearing was supposed to be a part of the Planning Commission meeting,
21 or separate. Director Bennett responded that the hearing was separately noticed. Vice Chair Larson
22 indicated that the website has different times for the hearing and the meeting. She said that the website
23 indicated that the hearing was at 6pm and that the Planning Commission meeting started at 7pm.

24
25 Cmr. Fudge talked about the baseline for the 2007 shoreline study and indicated that information is available
26 on the City's website.

27
28 Vice Chair Larson said she was at the last Council meeting and that the Council was going to wait to adopt a
29 new town center vision.

30
31 City Attorney Kim Pratt suggested that the conflict between the hearing and meeting notices could be
32 remedied by the Planning Commission recessing until 7:00 pm and the restarting the regular Commission
33 meeting.

34
35 Cmr. Withers made a motion that the Planning Commission adjourn for 15 minutes, Cmr. Saunders
36 seconded, and Cmr. Morris broke the tie on the decision to adjourn. The public hearing portion was
37 adjourned at 6:45.

38
39 The regular meeting was called to order at 7:02. Vice Chair Larson commented on the order of the agenda,
40 approval of meeting minutes, and the content of the public hearing. She also clarified that this portion of the
41 meeting would resume at item 6 on the agenda. She offered the opportunity for the public to comment.

42
43 Mike Dee thanked the Planning Commission for restarting the meeting at 7pm.

44
45 Jack Tonkin asked if the Planning Commission has bought off on the parking garage and wanted to know the
46 status. He asked if the Planning Commission can address whether or not they want the parking garage. He
47 said that the location is an important feature. He would like to know how the Planning Commission feels
48 about the garage feature. He said that he thinks that the Planning Commission, Council, and Mayor should
49 talk to Sound Transit about the parking garage.

50
51 Vice Chair Larson indicated that another public comment period would be available at the conclusion of the
52 meeting.

1
2 **Old Business: Implementation of Town Center Vision - Land Use Review and Development**
3 **Agreement Process**
4

5 Director Bennett asked the City Attorney, Kim Pratt, to discuss the moratorium. She said the Council will
6 hold a public hearing on Thursday (10/10/19) regarding moratorium. She discussed the need for the
7 Planning Commission work quickly on garage regulations, and that Sound Transit would consider the garage
8 an essential public facility, so the City cannot stop the placement. She said that a six-month moratorium does
9 not interfere with Sound Transit's timeline.

10
11 Cmr. Gross asked if the City can influence the location of the garage. Ms. Pratt responded that zoning
12 regulations can dictate where the garage goes. Cmr. Gross said that a rezone could prohibit a garage from
13 being in town center. Cmr. Lebo asked if a garage located in town center could have regulations that
14 mandated a retail component. Ms. Pratt responded that the regulations cannot preclude the location of
15 essential public facilities. Cmr. Withers asked Ms. Pratt if changing the zoning could prevent having a garage
16 in town center. Vice Chair Larson asked Ms. Pratt to clarify how zoning changes relate to a parking garage.
17 Cmr. Katz said that the Planning Commission was working on changing zoning regulations, and that the
18 process for that could include discussions on parking structure uses. Ms. Pratt said that she would like the
19 opportunity to provide legal advice to the Planning Commission and Council during an executive session
20 regarding eliminating parking garage uses in the town center.

21
22 Ms. Pratt stated that the Planning Commission is tasked with changing the zoning code language, not the
23 zoning designation. Cmr. Gross said that the Planning Commission should adopt regulations that produce a
24 favorable garage. Vice Chair Larson clarified that the Planning Commission's job is to recommend code
25 changes to the Council. Cmr. Lebo said that the Planning Commission should focus on what the community
26 wants. He also said that the public has expressed that they like a limited amount of housing, with mixed use.
27 He said that the community has said that they want to foster community, character, and a social atmosphere
28 within the town center. Cmr. Lebo said he is in favor of light rail transit and rapid bus lines, but that he
29 believes a 300 car garage is out of character for LFP. He also said that a parking garage will not enhance retail
30 function, will displace it. He said the LFP town center is not a good place to put a parking garage. Ms. Pratt
31 suggested that the Planning Commission could go down both paths when developing regulations. She said
32 the Commission could develop regulations which include one scenario which includes a garage and one
33 scenario for a town center without a parking garage, and present those amendments to the Council. Vice
34 Chair Larson asked Ms. Pratt if she could help her understand what the current code allows in terms of a
35 garage. Ms. Pratt said she doesn't know the code well enough to advice, but thinks that a Conditional Use
36 Permit (CUP) would be the mechanism. Vice Chair Larson asked Ms. Pratt if the Déjà Vu site could be an
37 alternative site for a parking garage. Ms. Pratt said that Sound Transit would likely need to condemn the Déjà
38 Vu site if it was selected for the garage. Director Bennett clarified that the Déjà Vu site is one of the only
39 sites in the City where adult uses are allowed.

40
41 Cmr. Katz asked Ms. Pratt how a garage would fit with the conditional use regulations. Ms. Pratt said she
42 was fuzzy on the regulations for town center. Cmr. Saunders asked Ms. Pratt how the CUP process works.
43 Ms. Pratt talked generally about how the CUP process works. Cmr. Lebo asked Ms. Pratt how the review of
44 essential public facilities occurs with the current code and whether or not a parking garage is allowed. Ms.
45 Pratt clarified that her recollection of the current code does not allow a garage of that size. Vice Chair Larson
46 said that it would be good to know if a garage of 300 stalls could be built in any other places within the city.
47 Director Bennett said that he would need to get back to the Commission with a response to that question.
48 He also said that the town center regulations dictate a 60,000 square foot maximum, where new construction
49 cannot exceed that limit. Cmr. Withers asked for clarification on where adult entertainment uses are allowed
50 within the City. Director Bennett clarified that the commercial corridor allows for adult entertainment uses.
51 He also said that a code amendment to allow parking facilities in the commercial corridor would trigger an
52 environmental review process, and potential EIS.

1
2 Ms. Pratt talked about the current town center code and explained that currently a committee makes
3 decisions regarding a permit or development agreement, and that the particular process is unusual for project
4 permit applications. She also said that most times a hearing examiner makes the decision regarding those
5 types of permit applications. She also explained the role of the hearing examiner. She described how a
6 decision making committee made up of citizens/commissioners could create problems when evidence
7 unrelated to the approval criteria enters into the record during a public proceeding. Cmr. Saunders asked Ms.
8 Pratt the difference between the town center committee process and the examiner process and what is lost by
9 removing the committee based process. Ms. Pratt answered that the creativity that is present during the
10 creation of regulations should be absent during decision making and only decisions that relate to the code
11 criteria should apply. Cmr. Saunders indicated that the current code allows for some trading during the
12 evaluation process. Ms. Pratt clarified that the development agreement process can facilitate some trading
13 between regulators and developers. There was discussion about whether or not design review boards could
14 accommodate a public process. Ms. Pratt added that the development agreement process is voluntary for any
15 applicant and it must be approved by Council. Cmr. Morris asked about the legal implications if the code is
16 left the way it is, and if the committee enters into the record items that are not part of the approval criteria.
17 Ms. Pratt responded that the appeal process can be used for anyone who might disagree with a decision.
18

19 Cmr. Lebo asked Ms. Pratt to talk about the development agreement process. Ms. Pratt responded that the
20 State statute governs the process and elements of any development agreement. Cmr. Lebo and Vice Chair
21 Larson asked Ms. Pratt about how much a development agreement can vary from the development code.
22 Ms. Pratt said that there can be some deviation from the development code when a development agreement
23 is used. Vice Chair Larson asked about how the hearing examiner makes a decision. Ms. Pratt responded that
24 the examiner takes evidence from the City, Developer, and the Public at the hearing and considers all of it
25 when making a decision. She added that John Galt is the current examiner for the City.
26

27 Cmr. Fudge asked Ms. Pratt what they could do to remove the committee process from the code. Ms. Pratt
28 recommended that the Commission consider regulations which explore all alternatives and then present those
29 as options to the Council, so that an informed decision is made.
30

31 Ms. Pratt clarified that the state statutes require one public hearing for development agreements. She also
32 spoke about how the City of Shoreline handled a recent hearing for a development agreement.
33

34 Cmr. Saunders asked Ms. Pratt about a recent statement made by a citizen at a public meeting regarding the
35 town center property owner and the possibility of the owner vesting to regulations in place at the time the
36 property was purchased. He also asked about how a garage vests to code regulations. Ms. Pratt said that her
37 legal opinion differs from that what was expressed at the recent public meeting. She explained how vesting
38 occurs once there is a complete development application.
39

40 Cmr. Lebo asked Ms. Pratt about what constitutes a legal taking. Ms. Pratt offered her opinion on the subject
41 and mentioned that a taking typically involves taking of an entire property. Cmr. Lebo asked Ms. Pratt if a
42 building height that was lowered through a change in regulations, or otherwise, would it be considered a
43 taking. Ms. Pratt responded that she thinks it would not be considered a taking. There was discussion about
44 placement of a parking garage in town center. Ms. Pratt said that essential public facilities are given special
45 dispensation. There was additional discussion about how essential public facilities are treated during the
46 permitting review process. Cmr. Gross inquired about the process for citing a garage on the Déjà Vu site.
47 Cmr. Saunders asked Ms. Pratt to elaborate on the types of arguments Déjà Vu could use to prevent the
48 garage from being located on their site. Ms. Pratt said she would like to offer an attorney client privilege
49 memo regarding the types of issues associated with constructing essential public facilities. Vice Chair Larson
50 asked Ms. Pratt if there is legal footing to require pedestrian access areas along with the construction of a
51 parking garage. Ms. Pratt said that there is legal footing for such requirements. Ms. Pratt suggested that the

1 planning of such a garage should be done with experts who will consider the appropriate types of mitigation
2 for the development of a parking garage.

3
4 Vice Chair Larson asked if there are any infrastructure improvements given in exchange for the construction
5 of Sound Transit's rapid bus transit improvements. Director Bennett said that a sidewalk will be constructed
6 along Bothell Way NE, but that Sound Transit is not responsible for improving all non-conforming
7 infrastructure. Ms. Pratt clarified that required public improvements need to be directly related to the impacts
8 of a certain project.

9
10 Cmr. Withers said that traffic along Ballinger Way is very heavy and will only get worse with a parking garage.

11
12 Vice Chair Larson asked if there were any other questions for Kim Pratt. Commissioners thanked Ms. Pratt
13 for speaking.

14
15 Cmr. Saunders asked if there were any other regulations they could study for research in developing their
16 own. Director Bennett said he would look into it and get back to the Commission with some
17 recommendations.

18
19 Mayor Johnson said that it would have been good to have Ms. Pratt at previous Planning Commission
20 meetings. The Mayor thanked the Commission for all of their work. He indicated his desire for the
21 Commission to keep moving forward. He also mentioned that Sound Transit and the City are in
22 conversation at all times. Cmr. Lebo added that there are several properties that could fit a garage. He also
23 urged the Mayor to go to Sound Transit and tell them that a parking garage is out of character for the City.
24 The Mayor spoke about the logistics of the parking garage locations and acknowledged that he understands
25 the community's viewpoints.

26
27 Parking Structure Standards and Design Guidelines and Update on Sound Transit ST3 Design Process

28
29 Cmr. Saunders said that the Planning Commission should discuss moving the garage location. Cmr. Morris
30 asked Director Bennett if there is any more information regarding the parking garage.

31
32 Director Bennett provided an overview of Sound Transit's 10% design plans and specifically the site plan
33 Sound Transit has drafted for the parking garage location. He indicated that the City told Sound Transit that
34 they did not agree with the design as presented in the 10% plans. He provided clarification that the height
35 limit is 35 feet within town center. He also clarified that Sound Transit did not look at town center
36 regulations when designing the structure. Cmr. Lebo asked if Sound Transit looked at alternative sites.
37 Director Bennett responded that he didn't know if Sound Transit looked at alternative locations for the
38 parking garage. Cmr. Saunders asked Director Bennett if Sound Transit is working on other ways to
39 accommodate the garage. Director Bennett said that agency was only working within Sound Transit
40 standards and have not considered City regulations yet. Cmr. Katz asked about the process and timeline for
41 design. Bennett said that the 30% design should be next and that he would be meeting with Sound Transit to
42 discuss design guidelines in the near future.

43
44 Cmr. Morris left the meeting at 8:37pm

45
46 Director Bennett suggested that a discussion begin on specific design guidelines for parking garages. He
47 presented a document containing general guidelines for the design of parking garages. Director Bennett said
48 that the Commission can include any of the design element suggestions within the draft regulations. He
49 talked about parking garage access design and pedestrian safety within parking garages. He also presented
50 security and lighting schemes and signage examples. Director Bennett suggested that regulating the structural
51 types could be a basis for encouraging a parking garage that is more in line with the unique character of LFP.
52 He also talked about future uses of the structure when different types of transportation evolve.

1
2 Vice Chair Larson said that she could benefit from an example of a development code that provides the types
3 of features LFP wants. She asked who will be writing the code and design guidelines. Director Bennett
4 responded that Otak will be involved and introduced Christina Haworth from Otak who talked about
5 SeaTac's regulations and presented examples from that city's code.
6

7 Vice Chair Larson asked if there are any experts to provide guidance on the types of things to consider when
8 designing the garage. Director Bennett said that the FEIS does some of that and that the Planning
9 Commission should consider spelling out what they want out of a potential garage. Vice Chair Larson asked
10 Director Bennett about how to become educated on regulating garage design. Director Bennett explained
11 that the Seatac code is a good start. Cmr. Gross said some design elements can result in garage products that
12 are not favorable. Cmr. Lebo said that he is interested in getting information on wood construction of a
13 garage, as well as the fenestration of the structure. He also suggested brick as an alternative for exterior
14 construction. Director Bennett suggested some of the design elements that could achieve the Commission's
15 desires and indicated that getting feedback from Commissioners on them would be helpful. Vice Chair
16 Larson said that she would like information on which design elements will drive the design as a whole. Cmr.
17 Katz asked if a Sound Transit representative would come to a Planning Commission meeting. Director
18 Bennett indicated that he thought Sound Transit would send a representative to meeting with them and
19 suggested that the Commission email him with suggestions on which elements are important to the garage
20 design.
21

22 There was discussion about the expense of putting a parking garage entirely underground. Cmr. Withers
23 commented on the work tasks being scattered and not organized and he suggested that the Commission
24 divide the work up amongst themselves and report back to the Commission. Director Bennett said that the
25 Commission only needs to provide what they find appealing in the design guidelines presented.
26

27 Vice Chair Larson asked if staff could summarize resources for review. Director Bennett said that he would
28 and that, if any Commissioner finds other sources of information, he can forward them on.
29

30 **Public Comments**

31 Jack Tonkin said that the Planning Commission could make two proposals to the Council; one with a garage
32 and one without. He said that Merlone Gier is seeking replacement parking for the stalls displaced by the
33 garage. He talked about a lease agreement for the garage. He suggested the City build a garage. He
34 suggested Merlone Gier build the garage and lease it to Sound Transit. He also said that the ownership and
35 leasing issues should be explored prior to design issues. He said he respects the attorney's position, but felt
36 that she does not want to move the garage's location. He talked about his time on the Planning Commission
37 and when Ballinger was proposed to be four lanes. He talked about how the Planning Commission brought a
38 plan to Washington State Department of Transportation and how they influenced the design for Ballinger
39 Way. He talked about the citing of city hall and how it changed due to community input. He said it is not
40 too late to change things related to the garage.
41

42 Lori Bodi asked the Commission to consider the future and don't negotiate with Sound Transit now. She
43 said that the Planning Commission needs to work better on informing the public, because the public doesn't
44 know how to engage and find information. She said that policy leadership should look at alternative locations
45 for the parking garage and that the Planning Commission should make policy recommendations. She also
46 said the Planning Commission should consider a formal recommendation to Council regarding an alternative
47 location for the garage. Ms. Bodi mentioned 1500 new apartments on Lake City way and where traffic will be
48 coming from to get to the parking garage. She urged the Planning Commission not to make changes in the
49 current code.
50

51 Vicki Scurry said her background is in design and public art, and that she specializes in citing infrastructure in
52 communities. She said that the garage design and scale are not appropriate. She also said that the structure

1 will read as Lake Forest parking, not Lake Forest Park, and that the design is very generic, it doesn't belong in
2 the town center. She said that starting over is not a bad idea if you have a bad project.

3
4 Walter Hicks said the location of a garage at town center and design elements should be creative and the
5 Planning Commission should get creative. He also said that negotiation with Sound Transit for shared
6 parking would be beneficial. He said he favors open space as an element.

7
8 Mike Dee said the LFP Planning Commission goal about making documents available before meetings is a
9 good idea and hopes that will return. He also said that the City can renew six-month moratorium and that
10 Merlone Gier is only part of reason for moratorium. Sound Transit is also the reason. He said Sound Transit
11 did do a siting study for the garage and that were no alternatives mentioned in the study. He thanked the
12 Planning Commission for the discussion on the design review board and stated that there are three parking
13 garages proposed by Sound Transit. The others are located at Pop Kennedy Stadium in Bothell and in
14 Kenmore.

15
16 Cmr. Lebo asked if the Commission would entertain a motion that recommends to the Council that they
17 engage with the Mayors of Kenmore and Shoreline to look at alternative locations for parking garage. He
18 also said this parking garage's scale and size doesn't fit the character of LFP and he didn't want to see Vicki's
19 comment about 'lake forest parking' become reality.

20
21 Cmr Lebo proposed that the Planning Commission make a motion that the Council and Mayor engage with
22 the Mayors of Kenmore and Shoreline, and the Sound Transit board to consider an alternative location for
23 the parking garage because the scale of the a parking garage does not fit with the character of LFP. He said
24 that a garage of this type would do a lot of damage to the community and LFP. Cmr. Gross asked Cmr. Lebo
25 to clarify if he is seeking a motion. Cmr. Lebo responded that he is proposing a motion. Vice Chair Larson
26 asked for clarification and wanted to understand whether or not the motion would preclude the Planning
27 Commission from working on regulations for a parking garage. Cmr. Lebo clarified that he envisioned a two
28 track process where amendments to town center code could still be developed despite his proposed motion.
29 Cmr. Saunders said he thinks a motion is pre mature because a discussion hasn't occurred with the
30 Commission on the subject. Cmr. Katz agreed with Cmr. Saunders. Cmr. Gross and Fudge indicated their
31 preference for moving Cmr. Lebo's proposed motion forward. Vice Chair Larson suggested that an
32 alternative location for the parking garage could be discussed at the next meeting. Cmr Lebo asked if
33 Commissioners would weigh in on their opinions regarding his motion and asked for a straw poll. Cmr.
34 Saunders said he didn't understand the purpose of the poll. Cmr. Katz asked if conversations outside the
35 Planning Commission meetings were occurring on the subject. Cmr. Lebo answer by talking about responses
36 from Council on questions he posed. Cmr. Gross said he is in favor of a straw poll. Vice Chair Larson said
37 that discussion on the issue should be continued, so that she can develop a more informed opinion. She also
38 said that she thinks the moratorium is something they should have asked for long before it was actually
39 passed, and added that the Planning Commissions should exhibit leadership with the garage issue. Cmr. Lebo
40 said he is willing to withdraw the motion and expressed his desire that the garage is something that citizens
41 should understand the impacts of. He also said that manager of third place books said that they may not be
42 able to stay in business during construction of a garage facility. He went on to say the size and scale of the
43 garage is the fundamental issue for LFP. Cmr. Fudge said he cannot come up with a way to make a garage
44 work within the town center and that he would support Cmr. Lebo's motion.

45
46 Cmr. Lebo made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that it work with
47 the adjoining mayors and the Sound Transit board to find an alternative location for its proposed parking
48 garage. Cmr. Fudge seconded the motion. Vice Chair Larson asked for discussion on the motion. There was
49 no discussion. Cmr. Katz asked if one could abstain from the vote and Director Bennett clarified that one
50 could. Vice Chair Larson asked for a vote on the proposed motion. Cmr Fudge, Cmr. Lebo, Cmr. Gross
51 and Vice Chair Larson voted aye and Cmr. Saunders, Katz, and Withers abstained. With four votes in favor,
52 the motion passed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

Cmr. Lebo moved to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Katz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda for Next Meeting: Similar to this agenda.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:31

APPROVED:

Joel Paisner, Chair