

City of Kenmore



City of Kenmore - 18120 68th Avenue NE - Kenmore, WA 98028
Phone: 425-398-8900 - E-mail: cityhall@kenmorewa.gov

City of Kenmore Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, August 4, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m. via Zoom

Log-in Information for the Commission Meeting:

Please click the link below or copy and put this link into your address bar in your web browser to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89089570832>

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: +13126266799,,89089570832# or +16465588656,,89089570832#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 890 8957 0832

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89089570832>

If you have any questions or to confirm agenda items prior to the meeting, or if you require special accommodations, please email Tela Gardner at tgardner@kenmorewa.gov.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

This is an opportunity to express your views on issues that are important to you and to the community. Please email comments to Tela Gardner at tgardner@kenmorewa.gov by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 4, 2020. All comments received will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration. You can also use the "raise hand" feature in Zoom during the Citizen Comment portion of the meeting or by calling in. The 3-minute limit still applies.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[July 7, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

[July 21, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

4. AGENDA ITEMS

[Planning Commission Memo](#)
[Attachment 1- Policy Questions](#)

5. ADJOURNMENT

6. UPCOMING MEETINGS:
August 18, 2020, 7:00 p.m. - via Zoom

**City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting
July 7, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m.**

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

Mark Ohrenschall, Chair
Carol Baker
Suzanne Greathouse
Nathan Loutsis
Mike Mulcare
Dennis Olson
Mike Vanderlinde

Consultants & Staff

Lauri Anderson, Principal Planner
Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Maura Query, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ohrenschall at 7:00 p.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments at this meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There was a motion made by Commissioner Greathouse to adopt the March 3, 2020 meeting minutes as written. Commissioner Vanderlinde seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes as written passed unanimously.

4. AGENDA ITEMS

A status update on the docket was provided. There were two items from the Housing Strategy Plan on the docket. One was for a review process for affordable housing projects that would look at expedited ways to handle public and non-profit affordable housing projects. The City Council also added consideration of private requests to that program as a result of a private citizen request that came in last fall. The hope is to bring this project forward to the Planning Commission next.

The other item from the Housing Strategy Plan was the Missing Middle. There was a meeting that was to be held in March with City Council. This meeting will now likely

be held in the fall and will set the framework for this project. This project will continue into 2021.

The last item was the economic development incentives for office development. It is recommended to defer this until next year or beyond.

It is anticipated that City Council will move forward with these docket changes on July 13. A series of questions is also being brought to City Council at the July 13 meeting about the affordable housing review process to get feedback that will help the Planning Commission begin the process of considering various possibilities.

An update on the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element (Parks Element) of the Comprehensive Plan was provided. This element is in tandem with the Capital Facilities Element. The basics of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS Plan) were kept and put into the format for the Comprehensive Plan Element. At the March 3, 2020 meeting a motion to approve the preliminary draft was approved, and this will be the subject for the upcoming public hearing. The suggestions and changes from the March 3rd meeting have been incorporated. There was a question from the March 3rd meeting regarding the distinctions between paved, hiking, and path trails. In the memo, definitions of these different trails have been provided. The associated table was reviewed and confirmed that it was accurate based on these provided definitions.

There was a second question in the March 3rd meeting about Figure 10 in the PROS Plan regarding the number of people per park being served appearing to decrease. This is due to the addition of new parks decreasing the number of people who will use each park.

The Parks Element will be brought to the Public Hearing on July 21, 2020. If there are changes to the Element based on public comments received at the hearing, then there might be revisions to the Element and the Commission would then review it again. If there are no changes as a result of the public hearing, then the Commission may be ready to vote to recommend the Elements as drafted. The Elements will be held until later in the year when they will be presented to City Council with any other changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

There was a question and conversation about the removal of a statement on page 7-2 regarding 80% of this park land being forested, wetland, or natural systems. The sentence was removed because equivalent information was added to a different paragraph earlier on in the Parks Element. A motion was made by Commissioner Baker to add this sentence back into the Parks Element. The motion was seconded by Dennis Olson. The motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Loutsis a nay. The conversation continued after the motion passed to seek clarification and understanding on the reason for and change based on the motion. The change requested was to add the notion that 120 of 146 (more than 80%) acres of parkland is natural, it is to retain the percentage representation. It was noted that there were

no additional steps needed by the Planning Commission if this change is made to the preliminarily approved version of the Parks Element. Based on this clarification, Commission Loutsis noted that he would change his vote to a yay. Additional explanation on the reason for this requested change was provided. It was felt that this percentage representation has a larger impact in presenting the volume of existing park lands that are natural spaces, and sets a tone for preserving the park system that we have as this seems to be important to the public based on prior survey responses.

There was a brief conversation about the overlay maps on pages 7-11 and 7-12 regarding the walkability to parks. There was a request to present these separate maps as a combined single map. It was determined that a map representing all would be a new addition to the Parks Element that was not in the PROS Plan and would break consistency between the two documents. It was also felt that this would be too much information represented on a single map and would not be readable. There had also been some concern expressed when the PROS Plan was presented to City Council when showing where the gaps in this one measure of service area are. It was decided to leave the maps as they currently are.

Page 7-10 was discussed. Saint Edwards Park is listed as 316 acres, but the number this year is thought to be higher. The Parks Element was put together before the recent acquisition of land. It will likely be added as a footnote as this number rolls through into various tables. It is preferred to use a footnote that indicates that the number does not include the additional 10 acres, rather than having different numbers in the Parks Element and PROS Plan.

A similar question came up regarding the feet of shoreline, as this number likely has changed with recent additions of land. This is likely something found in the Shoreline Element, but City Staff will check to be sure this is not represented in the Parks Element.

Commission Mulcare made a motion to add a footnote to page 7-2 to indicate the current acreage of Saint Edwards State Park is now larger. The motion was seconded by Carol Baker. The motion passed unanimously.

On page 11-2 when talking about the midterm future project budgeting, there is a dog off leash area represented. There was a question on how the amount of creating this off-leash area was calculated. It was likely based on looking at recently added dog parks in surrounding areas. There was a question regarding whether this included the cost of the land. An additional question regarding whether this would then be represented in the section that speaks to land acquisitions was raised. City Staff will confirm how this number was calculated, whether it does or does not consider acquisition, and if acquisition is considered in another category.

The definition of community versus neighborhood parks in Attachment 1 was discussed. The language in the definitions was thought to be subjective or vague,

depending on who is viewing or interpreting the definition. This language was taken from the PROS Plan and to change it now in the Parks Element would cause the two documents to be out of synch. It was decided to keep the definitions as is in order to have consistency between the two documents.

The next meeting will be the Public Hearing on the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element on July 21, 2020. August meetings are anticipated to be held on the regular schedule.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ohrenschall adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

Planning Commission

Approved by Planning Commission on: _____

**City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting
July 21, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m.**

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

Mark Ohrenschall, Chair
Carol Baker
Suzanne Greathouse
Nathan Loutsis
Mike Mulcare
Dennis Olson
Mike Vanderlinde

Consultants & Staff

Lauri Anderson, Principal Planner
Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Maura Query, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ohrenschall at 7:02 p.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments at this meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve at this meeting.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

City Staff introduced the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element (Parks Element) of the Comprehensive Plan. The Parks Element was adopted from the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS Plan). At the July 7, 2020 Planning Commission meeting there were two requests for modifications: 1) updates to wording about natural areas acreage as it relates to total acres and 2) a change acknowledging that the acreage shown for Saint Edwards State Park did not reflect a recent addition of acreage. These two changes were incorporated into the Parks Element. There was also a question from the July 7, 2020 meeting about whether the dollar amount shown in the Parks Element for an off-leash dog park included acquisition. City Staff provided an answer: The amount included an acquisition, development costs, and money for architecture and engineering services.

Chair Ohrenschall opened the Public Hearing for comments. There were no public comments for the hearing.

The public hearing was closed.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

City Staff invited the Planning Commissioners to ask any final questions on the Parks Element.

There was a discussion on the wording of Goal P.4.1.9. It was felt that Goal P.4.1.9 would be better worded as an action rather than a consideration to follow the wording used in other goals. Commissioner Mulcare made a motion to modify the wording of the goal from '*Consider acquiring property to provide community park amenities...*' to '*Provide community park amenities...*'. Commissioner Loutsis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Greathouse made a motion to approve the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element and the Capital Facilities Elements as a final recommendation to the City Council. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for August 4, 2020. The topic for this meeting will be the next item on the docket: an element from the Housing Strategy plan to look at a special review process for affordable housing projects.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ohrenschall adjourned the meeting at 7:36 p.m.

Planning Commission

Approved by Planning Commission on: _____



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

Date: July 28, 2020

To: Planning Commission

From: Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Lauri Anderson, Principal Planner

Regarding: Affordable Housing Review Process

As part of the Planning Commission's 2020 docket, the City Council assigned consideration of the following strategy from the Housing Strategy Plan:

"Allow flexible reuse of tax-exempt or publicly-owned sites through a special process to increase housing supply and enable more diverse forms of housing, if linked to providing some affordable housing. Consider possible opportunity at Park-and-Ride."

As part of the docket assignment, the Council added consideration of a special review process for private affordable housing developments--specifically a senior housing proposal--to this project. The original request for consideration of the senior housing proposal came from a citizen as part of the annual docket application process in fall 2019. The applicant hoped for a Land Use Map/Zoning Map change to allow greater densities; however, the Council supported consideration of an expedited review process rather than the rezone.

The overall goal of the special review process is to make it easier and faster to permit affordable housing projects, particularly those projects on tax-exempt properties, such as churches, and on parcels owned by public agencies, such as the Park-and-Ride property. Allowing flexibility through an adjustment or waiver of development standards, including density, height and setbacks, also was anticipated.

At the 7/13/20 City Council meeting, staff asked for preliminary feedback on several policy questions (see below and the summary in Attachment 1) to provide a broad framework for the Commission's consideration. Council feedback centered on the need for a quicker permit review process, with less focus on the waiver of development standards. They also asked that housing for those with disabilities be included as part of the review process discussion. Beyond that, they left development of an approach to the Planning Commission.

On August 4, the Planning Commission should consider these same policy questions and provide feedback to staff. Commission direction will be used to develop preliminary staff recommendations on the process and implementing code amendments.

18120 68th Ave NE, Kenmore, WA 98028

Office: (425) 398-8900 · Fax: (425) 481-3236 · cityhall@kenmorewa.gov · www.kenmorewa.gov

Policy Questions: Affordable Housing Review Process

1. At what level of affordability should a special review process be available?
 - The City Council previously has expressed interest in projects at the 50-60% AMI threshold.
2. What percentage of units in the development should be affordable?
 - In the past, ARCH has concluded that 10% of units is an appropriate/financially feasible level of affordability for development projects in the TOD. However, a higher percentage of units for those wishing to use the special review process could be considered.
 - Restricting the process to those projects that provide only affordable housing (100%) is another alternative.
3. Should senior housing projects be eligible for the special process, regardless of level of affordability?
 - For federal Community Development Block Grant proposals, senior housing is always grouped with "low-moderate income" housing, regardless of residents' incomes.
4. What size of project should be able to take advantage of the special review process? Is this for significant large projects or could even a small project including affordable housing units be considered?
5. If the goal of this project is an expedited process with the opportunity to waive some development standards, likely including density, what level of project decisionmaking is appropriate?
 - The process affects how long it takes to get a permit, but the process also determines the degree of public notice and involvement.
 - At the low end of public notice/involvement spectrum, decisions could be made at the review staff or Department Director level.
 - Alternatively, decisionmaking by the Hearing Examiner or in front of the City Council would involve a formal public hearing.
6. Should limitations on project appeals be considered as a way to expedite the process?
 - Permit applicants and others always have the option to appeal a permit action to Court.
 - In many cases, the City also allows administrative appeals, either through the State Environmental Policy Act or through the permit process itself.
 - Limiting administrative appeals is one way to expedite projects.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Policy Questions

AFFORDABLE HOUSING REVIEW PROCESS QUESTIONS

At what level of affordability should a special review process be available?

What percentage of units in the development should be affordable?

Should senior housing projects be eligible, regardless of level of affordability?

What size of project should be able to take advantage of the process?

What level of project decisionmaking is appropriate?

Should limitations on project appeals be considered?