

**City of Kenmore  
Joint Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
June 4, 2024 @ 7:00 PM**

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

Dwight Thompson, Chair  
Mike Vanderlinde, Vice Chair  
Tracy Banaszynski  
David Dorrian  
Saad Qadri  
Chris Olson  
Derek Wyckoff

**Staff**

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

**Guests**

Clay White, Kimley-Horn (Middle Housing consultant)

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement was read.

**3. FLAG SALUTE**

The Flag Salute was done.

**4. CONSENT AGENDA**

The minutes from May 7th were unanimously approved.  
There were no Commissioner excusals.

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Banaszynski moved to accept the consent agenda.  
Vice Chair Vanderlinde seconded the motion.  
**VOTE:** 7 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstain. Motion Carried.

## 5. AGENDA

Todd Hall introduced Clay White from consultant group Kimley Horn to introduce the Middle Housing discussion.

Clay's presentation began with a reminder of the HB110 requirements.

### Questions/Comments:

Will anyone look over our ordinance?

Answer: No, it doesn't have to go to Commerce for approval. Just like any other ordinance.

Is a 4 plex, 1 unit or 4 units?

Answer: 4 units; cottage housing will be less likely because you'd have to aggregate. More likely additional unit on a lot.

What is the definition of a lot, 2-unit density, is that irrespective of a lot?

Answer: Can't regulate under 1,000 sf; could still have some density built in; should make it easy for reader difference is footnotes could be one way.

Across the city there's a lot of variation of sizes; don't have a minimum lot density.

Answer: Certain amount of units/acre; will see smaller lots.

Typical higher density is R-6; would see this doubling if adding additional units.

Answer: Development regulations will dictate what you can/can't do. Could do some lot mock-ups.

Concerned if we limit density.

Answer: Density would have to increase on its own; easier to have it in the base zoning.

It will be necessary to have several examples of how this can work on a variety of lots so that citizens can understand.

When you start looking at crossover from middle housing and ADUs; need to have a set of rules that are easy to understand.

Answer: We will provide some examples.

Are there examples of middle housing that exist in Kenmore that are working;

Answer: There are not too many out there; covenants and zoning restricted these types of units.

Quarter mile to transit; study seen is half mile it starts to really drop off (walkability); quarter mile is conservative; keep at 1/4 mile but considering other corridors;

Answer: Maybe consider other roads (61st/73rd/Juanita) or maybe consider this as a Phase 2 option.

Like having transition from higher to lower density; have heard repeatedly we don't have the infrastructure to support.

Transit is not reliable at regular or late hours on some of these routes.

There's been some discussion about concurrency; this is incremental and about broader housing needs.

Answer: Middle Housing is one piece of larger puzzle; more housing, denser, more income bands.

The denser we get, the tree canopy will be reduced, impacts on streams and wetlands.

Answer: In response to trees, it's a balance between housing and environment. The city has adopted new tree regulations. Some compromises will need to be made.

This whole project doesn't have anything to do with implementation of neighborhood businesses;

Answer: No, it's not part of this code mandate.

How much of this housing is affordable housing?

Answer: Under regulations there are some provisions for affordable units. This is one of those choices; but only one small piece of the puzzle. Legislation isn't solely focused on under 80% AMI housing.

The presentation recapped the joint Middle Housing meeting with Council.

What are the plans for more community engagement?

Answer: Look for more broad ways for outreach, Farmers Markets, Survey, Planning Commission.

There needs to be further explanation of the overall process; we (Kenmore) don't really have a choice about this. It is state mandated.

Most of R-1 lots are larger; do those lots have the most potential to be split?

Answer: If 1 acre now, would be half-acre later, subject to critical area restriction. Could do a buildable lands type exercise to determine where Middle Housing would be more likely.

Interested in permit-ready program with development incentives vs. static and preservation of existing housing.

Is there a way to incentivize HOAs to allow these?

Answer: Not thinking of density bonus incentives, but parking or height or setbacks, etc.; provide some flexibility.

The developer should take on the responsibility for sidewalks or donate to existing city fund for infrastructure.

TB - incentivizing MMH, the market should take care of this and we shouldn't subsidize housing; disincentivize impervious; allowing for diversity is very important; makes sense to have density in Kenmore; what the UGA boundary hasn't gotten right is the protection of critical areas within the boundary; don't want to neglect rivers and streams; should be very intentional on where density is allowed; would love to have more robust environmental protection for R-1 zones and not allow more density; Clay - to clarify, are there tangible efforts that would like to see that's already being used; TB - would rather see us build up than out, less impervious surface areas; would like to keep low density areas low as it will be hard to go backward

Hear trade-off vs incentivize; parking, tree ordinance trade-off (i.e. allow for taller building trees preserved); poorly drained sites could have greater green spaces where development doesn't make sense.

More for the public good type of trade-offs; the exception would be to allow that everywhere, not just corridors; interested in unit form over the number of units.

Is it correct there isn't required parking within 1/2 mile.

Answer: Yes

I don't have a sense of what our goal is; how far do we need to bend to incentivize, or do we incentivize it at all? How do we do all this without an overall goal; affordability, building up/not out, building along 522 corridor near transit; Can we achieve a lot of this without disrupting our residential zones? Is the goal to apply to all SF zones and that's it or to tailor it? Do minimal based on state law or design code around it?

In favor of preserving single family zones with least disruption as possible, more density in areas that make sense.

Concerned if we don't take opportunity to tailor to the Kenmore vision and apply only the state version, we're missing a chance to get out of climate crisis.

Should be able to provide additional units, incremental and not disrupt current standards, higher density concentrated in key areas.

Don't want to see the same type of development that has been seen for decades, don't perpetuate.

With regards to the PSRC numbers, we can make an impact with higher densities, correct?

Answer: Yes, to an extent

Concern with sprawl, but don't want all density in one place, should have some transitional areas; allow for infill development while meeting things we already want to see; make areas more livable, more pedestrian connections; out of 24,000 people, most don't live in high density areas, if it makes sense for homeowners to allow for additional units to age in place, better for environment.

Next meeting:

June 18<sup>th</sup>, 7pm – Natural Environment and Surface Water

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 9:16 PM.

*Shannon Tipple-Leen*

---

Planning Commission

Approved by Planning Commission on: June 18, 2024