

**City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 1, 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
Mike Vanderlinde
Chris Olson
David Dorrian
Kara Macias
Edouard Lasalle

Staff

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement was read.

4. FLAG SALUTE

The Flag Salute was done.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Public Comment

6. CONSENT AGENDA - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

7. AGENDA ITEMS

Continued Review of Draft Middle Housing Regulations

Clay White and Nick Chen from Kimley-Horn presented.

Questions/Comments:

Discussion on Slide Question 1: Allowable Height for Middle Housing Types

- A. 45 feet (max. 4 stories)
- B. 27 (max 2 stories)
- C. Maintain existing regulations applicable to middle housing, no incentives to alter

Chair Banaszynski - Can both option A and B be chosen?

Kimley-Horn reply: Yes, options A & B can be chosen

Chair Banaszynski - Understands benefit of A. Would B encourage a variety of housing types?

Kimley-Horn reply: Yes

Commissioner Lasalle - Prefer A, while also having protection of tree canopy.

Kimley-Horn reply: Tree ordinance would administer protections.

Commissioner Olson - More in favor of option B. Are there elevator requirements for 4 stories for A?

Commissioner Vanderlinde - In favor Option C, maintain existing heights.

Commissioner Machias - Prefer Option C but open to B if 10 feet setback

Commissioner Dorrian - Prefers Option B, struggle with A due to height

Chair Banaszynski - If option B, could have slightly larger footprint?

Kimley-Horn reply: Allowing a larger building footprint and flexibility on where the units could be on the lot. Have same max. for impervious surface.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - How can you increase building footprint but not impervious surface?

Kimley-Horn reply: Impervious surface area wouldn't change just the location of where the building envelope would go on the lot

Consensus with Commission for Option B

Discussion on Slide Question 2: ADUs courting toward unit lot density

- A. Yes, ADUs should count as units for determining unit lot density
- B. No, ADUs should not count as units for determining unit lot density

Commissioner Vanderlinde - A

Commissioner Machias - A

Commissioner Lasalle - A

Commissioner Dorrian - Does Option A mean that a Middle Housing unit could then not have an ADU? Leaning towards B.

Vice Chair Thompson - Max impervious surface still apply?
Kimley-Horn reply: Correct.

Commissioner Dorrian - Pg. 117, A.5 Single family home and two ADU.
Kimley-Horn reply: ADUs not defined as middle housing but does count toward density.

Chair Banaszynski - Is the underlying question on density, single family + 2 or single family + 4?

Commissioner Dorrian - Can you have a single family home plus a duplex?
Kimley-Horn reply: Yes, since single family doesn't count toward unit density.

Commissioner Olson - Option B, or exempting the first unit?
Kimley-Horn reply: You're really increasing the density within those zones without changing the underlying density. Could have a single family home, convert a portion of the home to two, attached ADUs and also build a duplex and end up with 5 units and then subdivide those.

Consensus with Commission for Option A

Discussion on Slide Question 3: Priorities for achieving as part of middle housing?

- A. Maintaining/repurposing existing SF
- B. Promoting smaller units through a corresponding increase in density
- C. Decrease off-street parking space requirements in order to have lower impervious surface max

Commissioner Olson – In favor of all.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – In favor of A & C; regarding B, our goal here is to increase the amount of available housing by allowing a wider range of housing types. Do we want to have development of smaller units or more units total?
Kimley-Horn reply: Option B is focused primarily on cottage housing.

Commissioner Lasalle – In favor of A & C, shouldn't promote B across city.

Commissioner Olson – Favor all 3.

Vice Chair Thompson – In favor of A & C, B if cottage housing.

Commissioner Machias – In favor of all 3; how does this decrease off street parking related to frontage improvements?
Kimley-Horn reply: Same requirements as applicable to single family housing. Might see on-street parking reduction.

Chair Banaszynski – In favor of all 3.

Consensus with Commission for all 3 options.

Commissioner Olson - Is commission open to some other incentive to decrease base impervious surface max for some development incentives besides height, whether parking or other aspect?

Kimley-Horn reply: Reduce the size of unit itself and don't increase height (smaller units) or reduce parking regulations on site, parking available on street.

Chair Banaszynski - Promotes reducing impervious surfaces.

Kimley-Horn reply: More design guidelines - building materials, sidewalks, other materials.

Staff reply: Costs and feasibility may be challenge.

Commissioner Machias - Is parking reduction decided on in last meeting reflected in this code? From 3-18 Minutes = Pg. 137-38, parking table.

Commissioner Olson moved to reduce parking requirement to 1 parking space for 2 DUs for cottage housing and 1 parking space per du as the base minimum for all other types of middle housing.

Commissioner Dorrian - Pg. 114 table - How does base and max density related to unit lot count?

Kimley-Horn staff explained table and footnotes. Said they'll take a closer look on if there can be a better way to explain base density and unit lot.

Kimley-Horn staff will provide table explaining each of the major code changes and provide clear explanations for public.

7. AGENDA ITEMS CONT.

Continued Review of Draft Middle Housing Regulations

Linsday Masters from ARCH presented virtually on Inclusionary Zoning.

Commissioner Lasalle - Can a forecast of the impact of Kenmore be done? Could we model the impact that all R4/6 would have max density thru new projects compared to today. How would that translate from impact.

Staff reply: Don't have the data readily available. Can't do lot by lot. This model shows where generally it's feasible. And put it in if that's direction and generating units.

ARCH reply: Best example is Kirkland, over time will see code being taken advantage of.

Vice Chair Thompson - if we don't put automatic CPI in regulation, it becomes difficult to raise the rate. It should be an easy rate to live with. Comfortable with vesting date. Leaning toward 1,000 sf exemption.

Commissioner Olson - Importance of inclusionary; Ok with vesting, OK with CPI and reevaluate.

Commissioner Dorrian - need to go back to questions from last time first; only get money for affordable housing if the market continues to build housing at market rate. Feasibility analysis, wouldn't be feasible to build single family homes, needs further understanding.

Staff reply: There is still a choice, analysis is on middle housing.

Commissioner Dorrian - need to have good sense of feasibility because we don't want to cool the market because nobody benefits.

ARCH reply: Feasibility based on prototypical development, but will be a variety of types; in draft code, 1-3 are exempt, directly tied to results from study, would only apply to 4 or more units, there would be positive value, the proposed fee in lieu of \$6/sf is modest compared to other ARCH cities (i.e. Redmond/Samm).

Commissioner Olson - OK with exempt smaller units, vesting date ok, fee in lieu fee reset OK.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - No exemptions, everyone contributes, rate based on sales price, use in lieu of only, don't require units.

Commissioner Machias - Are the exemptions too broad? Inclusionary zoning should address much lower, 50-60% AMI, the lower fee won't go far.

Commissioner Olson - Like opening fee in lieu to other types, but has concerns around not building types throughout the city. Don't want to put all inclusionary in one part of cities (i.e. downtown). Exempting unit size - try to improve attainability.

Staff reply: This is not for deeply affordable housing, it's for more attainable housing, this is only one tool.

Commissioner Lasalle - Don't support exemptions, vest OK, reevaluate has it made progress and reviewed on ad hoc perspective, rates 2-3 years.

Chair Banaszynski - Including zoning might not get units now, but over time it will, this is one tool, won't solve affordability crisis, support for inclusionary.

The Commission is unanimously in support of inclusionary housing with details to be determined.

Vice Chair Thompson - When should the fee be paid, does vesting mean that those homes are vested at that time would not pay that fee? Not when the house closes, it's when it's vested (timing of payment).

ARCH Reply: Vesting should be time of building permit.

Staff clarified vesting at time of complete application.

Discussion on the December 31st cut off date.

Consensus with Commission for Q2- Dec. 31 vesting date.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting to 10:30pm. Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Commissioner Dorrian moved to accept what is proposed by ARCH in draft code amendments for Chapter 18.77.043 for resetting the in lieu rate, which is no more frequently than two years, based on updated analysis of market-rate and affordable housing expenses. Commissioner Lasalle seconded. **VOTE:** 7 For,

0 Against, 0 Abstain. Motion carried.

Chair Banaszynski - what are the intended/unintended incentives being created with these exemptions?

ARCH reply: Anytime you create an exemption you'll create an incentive.

Reviewed Options 1 and 2 from 3/18 meeting.

Staff Comment: Trying to combine 2 ideas; can either have exemption for 4 or fewer units and not size, could exempt just based on size, or a hybrid model combining the two.

MOTION: Commissioner Olson moved proceed with ARCH's recommendation to exempt 3 and fewer units and exempting 1,200 sf units and smaller. Commissioner Lasalle seconded.

AMENDED: Vice Chair Thompson amended the main motion for Pioneer Policy. As explained by Linsday, Pioneer Policy is a way to preserve option in future, adopt a policy more generally for all kinds of residential development but not enable the effective date to begin until some future conditions are met, either within a specific time period or after a certain number of units have been permitted.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting to 11pm. Passed unanimously.

Discussion on the Pioneer Policy.

Commissioner Dorrian – Think we need legal advice on the Pioneer Policy and what we are allowed to do.

VOTE for Motion with Amendment: 1 For, 6 Against, 0 Abstain. Motion fails.

Discussion on original motion.

VOTE for Original Motion: For 3, Abstain 4. Motion fails.

MOTION: Commissioner Dorrian moved proceed with ARCH's recommendation to exempt projects less than 4 units but remove size exemption. Commissioner Olson seconded. 4 For, 3 Against, 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting to 11:05pm.

Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Vice Chair Thompson moved to send Code Amendments to Public Hearing on April 15th. Commissioner Dorrian seconded. 4 For, 3 Against, 0 Abstain. Motion passes.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Banaszynski adjourned the meeting at 11:01PM.

Shannon Tipple-Leen

Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: 4/15/25