

**City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
March 4, 2025 @ 7:00 PM**

Planning Commission Members – In Attendance (the meeting was held onsite and virtually using the Zoom online platform)

Tracy Banaszynski, Chair
Dwight Thompson, Vice Chair (virtual)
Mike Vanderlinde
Chris Olson
David Dorrian
Kara Macias

Staff

Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Todd Hall, Principal Planner
Shannon Tipple-Leen, Planning Commission Clerk
Michelle Kang, Co-Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Banaszynski at 7:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Lassalle was excused from the meeting.

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement was read.

4. FLAG SALUTE

The Flag Salute was done.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public comment was made by Caitlin Sullivan and Dakota Rash.

6. CONSENT AGENDA - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from February 18, 2025, were approved by unanimous consent.

7. AGENDA ITEMS

Continued Review of Draft Middle Housing Regulations

Todd Hall presented the changes made to the code by consultants Kimley-Horn.

Questions/Comments:

Discussion for Pg. 116, 18.21.035

Commissioner Olson - 18.21.035.H.3, remove "generally" and "substantially."

Chair Banaszynski - Exterior finishes should have the same look.

Commissioners Olson and Vanderlinde - Discussion on design components of buildings.

Staff response: Refer to 18.77.015 Affordability section, Design. Refer to this section regarding location of units, comparable design, etc.

Vice Chair Thompson - Either refer to section/codes or add a clause regarding energy efficiency standards in 18.21.035.

Commissioner Olson - 50 year restriction, how is that managed or redeveloped.

Staff response: The deed restriction runs with the land. We can work with ARCH to monitor it.

Commissioner Dorrian - Confirm that affordable units only refers to the option in area that is outside the transit area, correct?

Staff response: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson – With regard to enforcement. Once there is a covenant on the deed the escrow will have to reach out to city.

Discussion for Pg. 117, 18.21.035, Neighborhood benefits

Commissioner Vanderlinde - What is really the benefit? Neighborhood benefits are subjective, benefiting the developer; e.g., reducing setbacks has a significant impact on the neighborhood; impervious surfaces good, is the building height

raise a benefit; if we want to absorb density, understand it's better to build up rather than out.

Chair Banaszynski - Can't speak to if what is proposed is a good thing in terms of reductions, but reducing impervious surfaces isn't good for habitat, going up is better.

Commissioner Vanderlind - We have sufficient land capacity, why do we need additional density?

Commissioner Olson - Why are we not decreasing the maximum impervious surface area? Not opposed to 45 feet height. Should decrease base impervious surface area across the board to these numbers and then have incentive for lots that meet lower threshold in max impervious surface instead.

Commissioner Machias - Not comfortable with increasing building height, not consistent with "gentle density" in neighborhoods; the objective to push heights in downtown corridor; don't see 45 feet anywhere in Kenmore, not comfortable going up.

Commissioner Olson - Could see it being useful for having larger development, would rather go up than building out.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Building up is smart, but problem is the density, don't see a trade-off to missing middle to increased height.
Staff response: Not talking about higher density neighborhoods, how to flex to allow housing choice in neighborhoods.

Chair Banaszynski - Who is in favor of decrease in impervious surface for height? Discussion and whether Commission in favor in reduction of impervious surface for greater height.

3 in favor and 3 not of increasing height for the purpose of reducing impervious surfaces. Ask Kimley-Horn to bring back other options and what it means to the community/further explanation of the impacts either way

Commissioner Dorrian - Possibly easier trade off with parking vs. height; explore other parking options other than height.

We want other housing types than townhomes so support reduction in setbacks. If you reduce to 27 feet can have reduced setbacks because you can configure buildings in different way to achieve. Ok with density bonus.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Are there other ways to reduce impact on neighborhood? Concern about redevelopment of existing single-family into four units. Need a visual to describe it.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - 27 feet ok but need to add in landscape buffer or other design requirements.

Commissioner Olson- 27 feet, interested in rear setback down to 5 feet instead of 10 feet, but a landscape buffer; there's already is a 15 foot building separation in building code.

Commissioner Dorrian - Need Kimley-Horn to explain how last one (cottage housing), density bonus of cottage housing, having 4 smaller homes on a lot is a neighborhood benefit (how is this messaged to community?), overall community benefit having more housing options (e.g. seniors) but concern from residents on density.

Commissioner Olson - Kimley-Horn explain what is meant by the density bonus of up to 50%, is that up to the maximum acre density? explain further.

Chair Banaszynski - these neighborhood benefits would not apply to existing but to new development?

Staff response: Yes.

Commissioner Olson - Kimley-Horn, what is the intent of allowances for redevelopment of a single family residence and how relates to DADU?

Assume this would mean you couldn't have two ADUs; why are we limiting DADUs...would like to make code consistent to allow same number of DADUs on lot.

Commissioner Machias - I.2 "Development incentives are applicable only....." and #3 Neighborhood benefit on page 117 seem like they conflict with one another. Need Kimley-Horn to clarify.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Need to have a second look at this from consultants, not sure what is going on here, looks like there is inconsistency; how do you have a 4-unit duplex at 35 feet, e.g. "redevelop existing single family unit with duplex or stacked flat and maintain the base floor footprint of existing home?" Is the existing home being retained, is the existing home being demolished; if trying to create an incentive to maintain existing single family and

turning into Middle Housing, then it's not clear.

Chair Banaszynski - Want to empower people to do the things allowed in code, want to make sure we're allowing and not creating hurdles where we're saying we're allowing it, but then the code creates issues.

18.75.030, Cottage Housing Site Design Standards (OK with these).

18.75.040 Building Design Standards

Commissioner Dorrian - Question for Kimley-Horn - Are any of these more restrictive than single family homes? Make sure we're not being more restrictive (cottage housing section).

Commissioner Olson - have same standards as single-family, change "shall" or can change to detached. Kimley-Horn question - Are the garage requirements more restrictive than requirements for single family residence? Is parking considered as part of the footprint?

Commissioner Olson- Kimley-Horn question - Why is there 'up to four garages', what's the intent, where is this requirement from? Are there issues?

Discussion on Pg. 111, Table B.

Commissioner Dorrian - Kimley-Horn question - 18.21.030 Table B. review this table, looks like something was omitted on based density per acre; base density/max density allowances. How does this relate to ADU allowances?

Commissioner Dorrian - Kimley-Horn question - If exempting R-1, do we still need to have a base of 2 DUs per lot, not exempting ADUs on these lots, correct?

Commissioner Dorrian - pg. 113-14, 18a. (5) "Single family dwellings do not count as units for the purposes of this section." This relates back to Table B, when we're saying this is two DUs per lot, does that not include a single family unit? Statement is confusing as why weren't counting single family DUs as units?

Vice Chair Thompson - If the ADU can be considered a separate housing unit, could that be sold separately, and if they can be then need to find a new term for it. If these are counted toward density (units), then we need to go about ADU code differently, waving impact fees, don't have to be compliant with environmental rules?

Staff response: Kimley/staff need to fact check: Does code waive fees and not

require some permits and other codes. And in terms of being able to sell lots separately, when does it go from a DADU to something else?

Commissioner Vanderlinde - what really is an ADU? The definition over the years has really changed. If ADU is sold separately, and ADU is defined as being ancillary to primary single family unit, what is this ancillary to?

Commissioner Dorrian - Need to facilitate ADUs but not give them carte blanche for developer, need to dig in more into the ADU code.

Commissioner Olson – Let's not make ADU and DADU so restrictive to keep developers away that we make it impossible for single family owners to build. We need to view them as a condo where they don't own the land but own the dwelling.

Chair Banaszynski - Kimley-Horn look at this. Reducing parking to reduce impervious surfaces

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Banaszynski adjourned the meeting at 9:11PM.

Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: _____