

MOUNTLAKE TERRACE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

November 13, 2017
7:00 pm

Mountlake Terrace City Hall
Mountlake Terrace, WA

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Wicklander
Commissioner Bautista
Commissioner Galyan
Commissioner Sood
Commissioner Sandoval

Excused Absence

Chair Kier
Commissioner Robertson

Administrative Staff Present

Edith Duttlinger, Acting Community and Economic Development Director
Nick Holland, Associate Planner
Mitchelle Harvey, Planning Commission Secretary

Call to Order – Roll Call

Vice Chair Wicklander called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:01 pm.
Chair Kier and Commissioner Robertson requested excused absences. Commissioner Bautista had not arrived. Commissioner arrived at 7:13 pm.

MOTION

Commissioner Galyan Move to excuse Chair Kier and Commissioner Robertson from the
Commissioner Sandoval meeting.
Carries 4-0

Minutes of October 9, 2017 Meetings

Vice Chair Wicklander asked the Commission if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes for the October 23, 2017, Meeting. Hearing no comments, the minutes were approved as presented.

MOTION

Commissioner Sood Move to accept the minutes as written.
Commissioner Galyan
Carries 4-0

Submitted Applications Update

There were no new application submitted in the period between October 24 and November 8, 2017, which was deemed complete:

Public Comments (For Items Not Part of a Public Hearing)

No public comments.

Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Director Duttlinger introduced the topic by summarizing work on Comprehensive Plan Amendments since the beginning of the year. She then provided some background regarding the final docket for 2017 Comprehensive Plan Amendments:

Land Use Element

1. Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to designate certain publicly owned properties as “Parks and Open Space” (POS) – The properties that have been acquired are in residential zoning and comprehensive plan designations. The recommendation has been to re-designate those on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use map for parks and open space (POS) and to concurrently designate them on the zoning map as Recreation and Parks district.

There was no comments from the Planning Commission.

2. Amend the Town Center Subarea Plan and Land Use Element to facilitate development – The Planning Commission discussed amending the Town Center Subarea Plan and the Land Use Element to facilitate development. After reviewing the discussion in the Land Use Element regarding the Town Center Plan Vision, the Commission affirmed the vision. There was no need to make any changes to the vision itself or the basic foundation laid out in the plan. The specific means of implementing the current Town Center Plan was discussed several times. Some of the ideas discussed included: Additional heights in some areas of the Town Center; expanding the core area to the north and to the south; the boundaries of the expanded Town Center core area; graduation of heights; and design standards regarding heights/density in the Town Center. Action on this topic has been deferred to 2018.

Therefore, staff only recommends changes to the goals and policies of the Land Use Element at this time, text changes. In addition, an addition of the following:

- LU-6.10 Create a multi-modal town center that provides gathering and mobility for pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, and public transportation.
- LU-6.11 Improve town center accessibility while planning for traffic growth and making traffic flow more smoothly.
- LU-6.12 Seek opportunities to implement the Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program (LCLIP) or other programs to provide funding for infrastructure in strategic locations.
- LU-6.13 Ensure that park-and-ride facilities, whether temporary or permanent, are within a five- to ten-minute walk from the transit station they serve. (This would be to support walkability and the Town Center development efforts and provide complementary uses.)

The comments from the Planning Commission included:

- Clarification regarding Policy #LU-1.11 “Design the town center so that, generally, height and density increase approaching the core of the town center.”

- *This does not mean that the heights would be increased. However, it would be considering a gradual change in heights (some variation). Outright increase in heights would be part of another discussion.*
 - *How would be the process to review the topic of heights? This would be part of the Town Center Design Standards and revisions to the BC/D District. Revision to the Town Center Buildings Prototypes Map will depend on the direction the Planning Commission and the City Council go.*
 - Policy LU-5.9 – “Concentrate major transportation funding in the Mountlake Terrace Subregional Growth Center and the North Melody Hill Activity Hub.” What are the boundaries of the North Melody Hill Activity Hub?
 - *The boundaries are the general commercial zoning district boundaries and some of the LIOP. It is an irregular boundary concentrated around 220th and 64th and 66th. It goes north to 212th.*
 - *The Subregional growth center is concentrated around 236th. That includes the BC/D District, the Freeway Tourist District and the residential nod that is between them. This was shown on the Zoning Map. This is detailed more in the Land Use Element – Planning for the Future, Smart Growth and Growth Management section (Regional Vision).*
 - *Director Duttlinger explained that some of the key policies the Commission wanted to include in the Land Use Element were: Tree protection, creating gathering spaces, encourage lot consolidation, emphasis on multi-modal means of transportation, and financing.*
 - What would the major transportation funding provide (LU-5.9)?
 - *This would include projects like the Main Street Project. Other ideas, although not called out in the policy, were discussed.*
 - Would anything be done to reduce existing traffic congestions in the Melody Hill area?
 - *LU-5.9 could address it by focusing on the transportation issues in the old Melody Hill school site and Town Center area. Also, some City resources could be used and we could seek regional funding for these areas also.*
3. Amend the Land Use (LU) Element goals and policies and “Actions to Take” consistent with existing and changed conditions and any amendments to Town Center
 4. Amend the Recreation, Parks and Open Space (RPOS) Element to provide for special use park and financial goals and policies
 5. Review the Economic Vitality Element “Actions to Take” timeline
 6. Land Use Map – Director Duttlinger shared that the Land Use Element includes a map that calculates acreages for the different land use districts within the City. The RS 4800 became a new district. So there is a separate calculation for the RS 4800 district, zoning acreage calculation table.

Recreation, Parks and Open Space (RPOS) Element

The initial focus was to provide for a special use park and financial goals and policies. Director Duttlinger referred the Commission to the RPOS Element handout and explained that this excerpt adds

specific policies that deal with pursuing funding options to achieve the goals and objectives in the Recreation, Parks and Open Space Element.

Goal RPOS-1 – Ensure that all parks and recreation facilities in Mountlake Terrace are safe, clean and green, new policy added:

- **Policy RPOS-1.4** – Seek funding through all available resources for projects that will help ensure recreation and parks facilities can be safe, clean, and green.

Goal RPOS-2 – Provide fun and diverse recreational opportunities that support the health, wellness and engagement of all community members, new policies added:

- **Policy RPOS-2.4** – Acquire park land as opportunities arise, that will meet a diversity of recreational needs and interests.
- **Policy RPOS-2.5** – Use impact fees to help fund recreation opportunities

Goal RPOS-3 – Promote connections between parks, schools and other key community destinations, new policies added:

- **Policy RPOS-3.4** – Identify opportunities for connections between local and regional destinations, such as the Town Center and the Transit Center through Veterans Park.
- **Policy RPOS-3.5** – Seek partnerships and funding with local jurisdictions, and public and private agencies and organizations, to achieve connections between local and regional destinations.

Goal RPOS-4 – Strengthen the local communities of Mountlake Terrace by providing places and opportunities for people and local businesses to connect with one another and thrive, new policy added:

- **Policy RPOS-4.6** – Support development of multi-modal connections between parks and other community destinations such as the Town Center business district, City Hall, Library, Transit Center, and the Pavilion with sidewalks, trails and other improvements.

Economic Vitality Element – Originally, the focus was on the “Actions to Take” timeline. The Commission discussed what actions to take and to consolidate them, make them less detailed and give direction on what activities to focus on for implementing the Economic Vitality Element. The amendments also include some text changes to update statistical information and several policies were moved from the Land Use Element.

- **Policy EV-1.6** Revised to read, “Encourage a shopping/dining/entertainment environment in the City’s Town Center and Gateway Place/Freeway Tourist districts that attracts customers, using techniques such as architectural appeal, pedestrian amenities, art features, cultural opportunities, specialty uses and interesting activities.” *Was originally discussed and was to be included in the Land Use Element – moved to Economic Vitality.*
- **Policy EV-2.18** – Provide opportunities for medical-related services in proximity to the Town Center.
- **Policy EV-2.19** – Promote business in the Town Center that offer goods and services targeted to current and future Mountlake Terrace residents.
- **Policy EV-2.20** – Provide incentives for local businesses in the Town Center, as opposed to retail chains.

Comments from the Planning Commission included:

- Similarity and possible duplication of Policies EV-2.16 and EV-2.18 related to medical services. Should these two be combined? One specifically mentions Town Center and the other the City proper.
 - One is targeting recruitment, which is proactive (i.e., Economic Development Director recruiting medical-related services). The other has a broader focus related to code or other incentives.
- Page EV-3 – Updates on the census survey from 2012-2014, the text being stricken is related to youth population in our City and being replaced with population below the poverty level. Does the current survey not include youth population? Or is that considered not relevant for this section?
 - Staff will investigate this issue.
- Page EV-6 regarding major employer is referring to employee numbers in 2015. Is there more current information regarding the number of employees?
 - There is a lag of about two years. These are the most current numbers we have.
- Page EV-7 regarding retail sales. There is a 20 percent increase for us between 2011 and 2013. Do we know the reason for this dramatic jump in retail sales? There was also a huge increase for unincorporated Snohomish County also.
 - This is data that was reported in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. Staff will investigate this issue.
- Page EV-8 regarding taxable units. Why is this information being stricken?
 - This information was difficult to track and it was unclear what was being taxed.
- Page EV-10, Map of jobs distribution in commercial districts. The numbers are from 2013. Is there any updated data?
 - The job numbers just came out last week. Yes, these numbers can be updated.
- Page EV-11, Regarding the Gateway project. It states that the City has completed 30 percent of the design work on the connector street. We have completed a lot more since then. Would it be possible to update this information?
 - Actually, the City did not do the finish work on that. The connector street is on private property. There is no update available.
- Page EV-12, Business names are called out. The types of businesses still exist but some of the business names have changed. Would it make more sense to list the types of businesses instead of the specific names?
 - That is a good suggestion. It is more appropriate to use categories.
- Page EV-12, Regarding the 300-unit development near Albertson's. That development is completed, but is not in the City. Do we still want to include it since it is part of Lynnwood?
 - This should be removed.
- Page EV-13, Businesses and vacant spaces. Some of the spaces are no longer vacant, but this could change. Also, the 2008 market study is mentioned. Is this the most current market study we have?
 - The 2008 market study is the most recent.
- Page EV-14, 1999 Market Study. This study was referenced about 10 years ago. This is the most recent market study for economic development strategies.
 - That is the last study done. This issue is addressed in the "Actions to Take."
- Page EV-15, The statement, "*The findings in these past market studies are still relevant in 2014.*"
 - This needs to be revised, without a date.

- Page EV-16, Regarding potential land for light rail. Considering progress toward light rail, should this language be updated?
 - The statement is still true, it will not hurt to leave it. It can always be removed later.
- Actions to Take, Several categories at the end of the “Actions to Take” are stricken. During our discussions we added dates to increase accountability. However, they are now being removed altogether. What is the reason for taking these out?
 - Many of the actions being removed is because of the frequency mentioned. The fact that the actions are being removed from the “Actions to Take,” does not mean that the actions will not happen – they just do not need to be mentioned here. The Commission will have the opportunity to have a work program with more detail.
- EV-21, Regarding, “*By the end of 2018, determine what is yet to be done to address challenges and opportunities identified in Economic Profile Study done in 2008 for Mountlake Terrace.*” Would it be better to do a new study instead of using such an old study?
 - Yes. A new or updated study will feed the process going forward.

Transportation Element – Proposed update include:

Insert the following text at the end of the section entitled “Park and Ride Facilities,” page TR-37.

“The Mountlake Terrace Transit Center is a key transportation facility, connecting people to a variety of destinations via high-speed transit. The existing Transit Center site has commuter parking for about 900 vehicles, some in a multi-level garage, some on a surface lot. Although the current transit system is based on buses, a regional light rail system is under construction that will add more capacity and reduce travel times. A Sound Transit light rail station is planned to open in 2024 as part of the Transit Center site.

One of the challenges in building the station is providing a place for staging the construction. The most efficient staging place is on-site where the current surface parking lot is located. However, using the parking lot for construction staging means temporarily displacing the commuter parking that now occurs there.

Ideally, the temporary parking lot should be as close as possible. That minimizes disruption to commuter travel routes, keeps total travel times low for local riders, and ensures the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center will continue to be a useful point for entering and existing the transit system, even during construction of the light rail station.”

Amend Policy TR-5.4 – “Encourage parking facilities, including park-and-ride facilities, to provide for mixed uses and multiple purposes *and ensure that park-and-ride facilities are within a five- to ten-minute walk from the transit station they serve.*”

Comments from the Planning Commission included:

- Does the City have any land available within 5-10 minutes walking distance from the Transit Center for additional parking?
 - *The City does not own land within 5-10 minutes of the Transit Center that would be available for a four to six years period, for additional parking.*

Director Duttlinger recommends that if the Planning Commission agrees with these amendments, concur to proceed with preparing the final revisions to the Comprehensive Plan (adjustments, tables, maps, etc.) and come back for a review or to proceed to a public hearing once all the materials are assembled.

There was concurrence to proceed.

Introduction to RS 4800 SFR and Transitional Zoning Code Updates

Shane Hope introduced the topic and explained that she there are some difficulties with the existing code. She said she would be discussing some of the options for addressing the challenges.

1. Overview – Reason for updating the RS Zoning Code is that the current RS 4800 zoning has resulted in redevelopment, additional housing. Some of the RS 4800 standards are unclear and have caused unintended consequences making it difficult to develop (such as townhomes). Ms. Hope referred the Commission to the Official Zoning Map and a map of the Transitional Uses Area. The overarching focus is to ensure that the RS districts are effective. We want to provide opportunities for market-rate, affordable housing and reflect interest of many homeowners in having smaller lots. We also want to provide transition between Town Center and single-household districts (townhomes and parking lots for BD/D overflow).
2. RS 4800 District Issues – Following are the challenges:
 - a. Current Height Limits. In all RS Zones, except RS 4800, the height is 3-stories, not to exceed 35 feet. RS 4800 is 2-stories, not to exceed 30 feet. Some residential building types are difficult to build at 2-stories or less on 4800 square feet.
 - b. Alternatives to Current Height. Suggested changes to the code would incorporate some alternatives such as: 1) Allow height to be 3-stories, not to exceed 35 feet for the “Transitional Uses” area; 2) Allow height to be 3-stories, not to exceed 35 feet for all RS 4800 district.
 - c. Lot Coverage. Current dimensional requirements table has standards for three types of lot coverages in all RS districts, which include: Structures, impervious surfaces, and hard surfaces. The current code does not consist of a definition for hard surfaces. Suggested changes to the code would eliminate impervious surfaces or elimination hard surfaces or to eliminate both surface types. The stormwater provisions do not need to be included in the residential code.
 - d. Lot Area. The current dimensional requirements table lists three districts:
 - 8,400 square feet in the RS 8400 District
 - 7,200 square feet in the RS 7200 District
 - 4,800 square feet in the RS 4800 District (replaced the previous smaller lot overlay zone)
 - e. RS 4800 Intent. The intent of the RS 4800 Zone was to provide opportunities for market-rate affordable housing and reflects the interest of many homeowners in having smaller lots to maintain (MTMC 19.30.010). Although not specified in the code, additional intents may include: To encourage redevelopment in key locations, provide diversity of housing choices, and to provide more housing for more people close to the Town Center and the Transit Station.
 - f. Why Are There Not More 4800 Lots? Most of the RS 4800 district comprised of 7200 square feet lots have existing houses and individual ownerships. Generally, it takes two

- standard lots to make three smaller lots. It is difficult to acquire two contiguous lots near the Town Center for this purpose.
- g. Alternatives to 4800 square foot minimum. Several alternatives were discussed in detail. The recommendation was to consider alternatives and specialized design standards in the next phase of code updates. This would include more time and public input.
 - h. Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The FAR in the existing RS Code, requires an FAR of 0.6 for the 4800 square foot lot. The total building size could be 2880 square feet maximum (house, ADU, Townhome, garage). The RS 4800 is the only lot size that requires an FAR. Several alternatives were discussed.
 - i. Design Standards. Some of the design standards were dropped from the RS code and others were moved into the text of the code. Several options were discussed to address the design standards.
3. Transitional Uses Applicability. Per 2015 code amendment the transitional uses are identified as: Townhomes, overflow parking from BC/D district. The area defined as parcels that: Directly front on streets abutting BC/D district and are directly accessed off streets abutting BC/D district. The Commission was referred to the Transitional Uses Area (TU) map. The Transitional Uses area has the effect of an overlay zone, mainly for certain RS 4800 and for some RS 7200 parcels. Various options for code revisions were discussed regarding lot area/lot coverage, setback and frontage improvement issues. Also discussed was corner lots in the TU area, building design standards, site design standards, open space, bicycle storage, access for corner lots and access issues regarding residential and parking lots. A recommendation was made to eliminate the target net densities from the code.

Comments from the Planning Commission included:

- The Commission has had discussion about where the transitional boundaries start. The understanding was that this would be revisited next year. There was concern about changing the zoning district before the decision has been made about where the transitional zone begins is a conflict.
 - *If the transitional uses area would be smaller, we would want less lots in it. That could be a conflict because it would allow some things to occur that you don't want to occur. But if you want townhomes to be a possibility for that area (and other areas), it does not hurt to move forward sooner. Also, you may come back later and add provisions. If we want to subtract things, it may not be a good idea to move forward.*
- Part of the concern is that the transitional development might be hemming in the current Town Center where we could potentially see more intensive development. We want the development, but we may not want it to occur in these areas. We need to do the review next year and define the boundaries of the transitional zone.
 - *This is a dilemma because the understanding from the City Council is that they would like to move forward addressing this issue sooner.*
 - *We have properties on the market. We are unable to adequately the inquiries about these properties because the standards are unclear.*
 - *Suggested options include: 1) Move forward with code amendments; 2) At the end of the process let the Council know that this could be done – we do not recommend it; 3) At the end of the process let the Council know that here is what*

we recommend, but we want you to hold for a while; 4) Tell the Council that you do not want to recommend moving forward.

- Would it be possible to make a recommendation to change the RS 4800 zone and simultaneously redraw the lines (for the transitional zone) temporarily or have a temporary exclusion zone? This would allow us to revisit the Town Center issue next year.
 - *It is possible if we're really careful about it. One of the challenges is that there are people who have purchased properties [with the intent to build townhomes]. So it becomes problematic to wait too long. There is also the problem of the perception of 'down zoning' someone over someone else – particularly with limited public input. An exclusion area could be problematic. We would need to consider how large of an area would be excluded and is that practical.*
- Restatement of the concern of hemming in the Town Center and the kind of intensive growth we want.
 - *That would be true of all the transitional uses area.*
- This may be a good example of how continuing to put something off has caused a major issue (due to lack of resources and staff time).
- Request to look at the dates [What's next].
 - *Currently the RS 4800 District allows two-story structures. Previously it allowed three-story structures, up to 35 feet. The overlay (over a 7200 zoning district) gave people an option. Now it is not an option. If a resident want to do something with their homes, they are limited to two-stories. This is not what the historical zoning standards were for that district.*
 - *The RS 4800 zone has been in effect since 2008, no one has applied to build under that standard – until the last two months. This made the shortcomings quite apparent.*
 - *There was discussion of using an “interim code.”*
- If we use the interim code approach, would the Planning Commission have the ability to include the Town Center in the work program as soon as 2018?
 - *Staff will investigate how soon it could be added to the work program.*
 - *Director Duttlinger reviewed the language in the code (MTMC 19.030), page nine. RS Single-household district – The underlying zoning district language, with the proposed changes: Go back to the smaller lot residential design standards to apply to development on lots less than 6000 square feet (not just on the 4800 square foot lots). It is clear that the sidewalk and pedestrian amenity areas is required (5 foot landscaping area followed by a five foot sidewalk) instead of a sidewalk abutting the curb. It would also apply to an existing single lot with a home on it with no current frontage improvements. If a significant investment were to be made in the property, the pedestrian frontage improvements would be required. The rest of the language would be removed because they are already included in the smaller lot design standards. These standards would also allow a three-story building.*

On page 10 is the Transitional Use District Standards – not referring to the BC/D, it lays out that it would be townhome standards would require conformance with the multi-family design standards for both the site and building design.

On page 11 is the parking lot standards. This would also require that the multi-family design standards for site and building designs apply. While screening would be required, some of the dense vegetation requirements would be removed. However, lighting and street frontage improvements would be required.

- Clarification about a basement counting in the height limits.
 - *This would depend on how much of the ‘basement’ was above the ground. There was a short discussion about split-level (ish) building designs. Three stories, not to exceed 35 feet.*

4. Housekeeping items – omitted from the presentation included:

- a. Cottage Homes. Only a five foot side-yard requirement exists. Sometimes the side-yard is the rear yard. The recommendation is for a ten foot side-yard requirement. There was a brief discussion on whether there would be more cottage home developments. The original focus of the Commission was for affordable housing (not above market rental).
- b. Roof Pitch. The question was raised if we need to decide the roof pitch. There was a brief discussion and it was decided that the Commission wants the code to allow for variety regarding the roof (materials, design and pitch). The suggestion was made to allow a sloped roof height bonus, if the roof pitch requirement is eliminated.
- c. Driveway Access. The code references single-family residential lots not having more than one driveway access from the street. It is proposed that – provided that corner lots and through lots that are at least 28000 square feet, a second driveway would be allowed if it is not on the same street as the first. Also, a residential driveway serving one or more single-household dwelling units, include townhomes, shall comprise no more than 24 feet of width, and serving any lots of 4800 square feet or less shall comprise no more than 20 feet in width in the right-of-way. The code also refers to newly created lots having to share driveways. Staff suggests that lots less than 5000 square feet share a driveway with an adjacent lot (with exceptions). Various examples were shared with discussion.
- d. Dimensional Table. Ms. Hope referred the Commission to the draft code for Chapter 12.23 MTMC. She explained the revisions to the Dimensional Requirements Table, incorporating proposed changes regarding RS 4800. The table renames the zone RS-1 through RS-5. The Transitional Uses Area (RS-5) dimensional requirements include changing the height to be consistent with other residential zones [3 stories, not to exceed 35 feet]; different lot width; different lot coverage [55-60 percent]; eliminate impervious and hard surfaces for all the zoning categories; and the mean lot depth [60 feet]; lot area [4800 feet]; with one exception for those lots that are already zoned RS-7200 would remain RS-7200.

Comments from the Commission included:

- *Keeping the square feet as part of the name (i.e. RS 4800) makes it clear exactly what is being discussed. RS-3 would not be as clear.*
- *Clarification on how the elimination of impervious and hard surfaces and how it affects stormwater requirements.*
 - *The stormwater requirements must be met. However, it does not belong in the dimensional table.*
- *Suggestion on the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) – Include an additional amount (5-8 percent) for units that include an ADU in RS-4800 districts, as an incentive. Then*

the ADU will not be subtracting from the size of the primary unit for the purposes of FAR.

- *Staff and consultant agreed that this is a good point.*
 - *If the ADU is attached, are they still required to provide driveway access to the detached unit?*
 - *Under current code, this is not required.*
5. LID Requirement (19.10.110). Removing this section regarding Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. Since Chapter 16.22 was not adopted and is not applicable.
 6. Revision to the Street Design and Access Standards. Adding clarification (Chapter 19.95.030) which currently lists the requirements and a list of exceptions. The revision focuses on new construction and with less exceptions regarding new street design and sidewalk standards. Additions to existing single-family homes (including one attached ADU) would be exempt from the requirements (must not exceed 75 percent of the FAR).
 7. Revisions of Table (19.23.030). The table will list the transitional uses and then show which residential zones, each use will be allowed.
 - *Clarification on the column defining the RS zones [1, 2, 3, 5]. Why does it skip RS-4?*
 - *RS-4 is a reserve. Therefore, nothing is called out as a requirement.*
 8. Finalizing Actions (based on discussions of the Commission):
 - a. Naming convention. There was concurrence among the Commission and staff about retaining the existing labels for the residential zones (RS-4800, RS-7200, etc.) and the Transitional Uses areas (no matter what the lot size) will simply be called Transitional Uses Zone.
 - b. Public Hearing. Get public input and then schedule a public hearing, perhaps in December.

Review and Recommendation on Terrace at Park West Preliminary Fee Simple Unit Lot Subdivision
Nick Holland, Current Planner introduced the topic and stated that he was seeking the Commission's review and recommendation on the subdivision portion of the project. The project is located at 21309 48th Avenue West. The proposal is to construct five buildings with a total of 27 townhome units. Access to the project will be taken from an access easement from the property to the west (48th), which is a phase two condominium development. He referred the Commission to the vicinity map showing the layout of the project.

1. Site improvements and access. The associated site improvements for the project have already been performed under separate administrative approval. The vicinity map demonstrates that the parcel was land-locked. However, the easement through the access condominiums to the west provides access to the site. The site plans in the later slides will show how the access works on the interior of the site.
2. Existing Conditions (Prior to Construction). The site was a stormwater area for the phase one condominiums to the west.

3. Proposed Site Plan. Mr. Holland then referred to the Site Plan to show the pedestrian connection areas. He pointed out the pedestrian connections from the proposed site to the easement and onto 48th Avenue West. The configuration of the buildings on the site was also shown.
4. Preliminary Fee Simple Unit Lot Subdivision. Mr. Holland explained that this application is to divide the units into individual townhomes with utility and access. He then shared several slide showing sample building elevation – façade modulation, front entrances, window placement, roof pitch, color schemes and parking.
5. Review Considerations. The review considerations were summarized from
 - a. MTMC Section 18.05.560 *Applicable to all development applications*:
 - Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan
 - Consistency with the Zoning Codes and Design Standards
 - Adequate provisions for open space, transportation and utilities
 - Consistency with adopted level of service standards
 - Public benefit, and interest will be served
 - b. MTMC 17.04.050(B) *Applicable to all Fee Simple Unit Lot Subdivisions*:
 - Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCR's) – Outlines common responsibilities, maintenance, use restrictions, and easements
 - Consistency with intent of applicable codes, specifically zoning regulations – Setbacks, lot coverage, minimum open space/landscaping, pedestrian circulation areas, and parking & circulation
 - Consistency with codes (codes in place when the application was deemed complete) – previous construction performed under site plan approval and subdivision action creates ownership of townhome units
 - c. MTMC 17.04.050(B) *Applicable to all preliminary plats*:
 - Provisions for public health, safety and general welfare are provided
 - No flood, inundation or swamp conditions
 - Application agrees to install improvements unless a separate security is executed
6. Key Conditions – Analysis of the project resulted in the following conditions:
 - a. Conditions for recording documents, and correct formatting
 - b. Final review of the Home Owner's Association Documents; and Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs)
 - c. Establishment of maintenance easements, if required for common areas
 - d. Screening of site service elements (i.e., dumpster enclosures)
7. Next Steps.
 - a. City Council review of the proposal at the November 16 work session.
 - b. City Council public hearing and adoption of a resolution to approve the proposal at the November 20 meeting

Mr. Holland then stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the project as conditioned and took questions.

Comments of the Commission included:

- Is the requirement that the garages not used for storage?
 - *The garage is used to satisfy the required parking numbers. Therefore, they will not be used for storage.*
- Clarification – this is the second development that is providing more guest parking than the code requires.
 - *Yes, the code requires three and the applicant is providing five. There was a brief discussion about the guest parking ratio.*
- Since this was originally the stormwater facility for the condominiums to the west, how are they addressing stormwater requirements now?
 - *Public Comment (to respond to the question): Mark Kausagen of Park West 27, the developer, responded to this question. He stated that there is a rock vault that is constructed in the middle of the roadway that will provide flow control and addresses the pass-through.*
- Regarding the existing condominiums, there is a gate. Now that these townhomes are being added, will the gate remain with the occupants of the townhomes having access or will the gate be removed?
 - *Since two HOAs may be using the same facility (gate), the decision on how that would work and how it will be maintained will be between the two HOAs.*
 - *This will something for staff to check during the review on the CC&Rs before the final is recorded.*
- Traffic Study done?
 - *Fell below the threshold to require a full-blown traffic study. At the subdivision level, it fell below the threshold. However, a traffic study was done at the site planning lever when it was administratively approved for the multi-family development. Each unit will be subject to impact fees.*
- Is this going to be affordable housing
 - *Not an affordable.*

MOTION

Commissioner Sood
Commissioner Galyan
Carries 5-0

Move to recommend to the City Council that review the proposed plat and fee simple unit lot subdivision and ask clarifying questions.

Director's Report

1. Prop 1 (City Hall) Passed. The proposition passed with over 4,000 votes cast (exceeding the required 40 percent). The yes vote was over 69 percent.
2. New Public Works Director. Eric LaFrance started work today.
3. CED Director. – Follow up conversation. No decision made
4. New Staff Person Approved. A Public Records Specialist will be hired in 2018 to help respond to the requests for public records. These are increasing in volume and scope and are burdensome for staff. There was a short discussion on this issue.

Miscellaneous Business by Call of Planning Commissioners

1. None.

Adjournment

Vice Chair Wicklander adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

CED/mh