



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Regular Meeting Date: June 4, 2014

Planning Commission
Meeting:

First Wednesday of every
Month @ 7:00pm

Community Center
1808 Main Street
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
www.lakestevenswa.gov

Planning & Community
Development Department

1812 Main Street
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
(425) 377-3235
www.lakestevenswa.gov

Municipal Code

Available online:

www.codepublishing.com/WA/LakeStevens/

- A. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00pm**
Pledge of Allegiance
- B. ROLL CALL**
- C. GUEST BUSINESS**
- D. ACTION ITEMS**
 - 1. Approval of May 21, 2014 Meeting Minutes**
- E. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - 1. Comprehensive Plan Outline - Wright/Ableman**
 - 2. Current Vision Statement - Wright/Ableman**
- F. COMMISSIONER REPORTS**
- G. STAFF REPORTS**
- H. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
 - 1. 2014 Docket**
 - 2. 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update**
 - 3. Lake Stevens Housing Profile**
 - 4. Lake Stevens Development and Market Trends**
- I. ADJOURN**

SPECIAL NEEDS

The City of Lake Stevens strives to provide accessible opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Please contact Steve Edin, City of Lake Stevens ADA Coordinator, at (425) 377-3227 at least five business days prior to any City meeting or event if any accommodations are needed. For TDD users, please use the state's toll-free relay service, at (800) 833-6388, and ask the operator to dial the City of Lake Stevens City Hall number.

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Community Center
1808 Main Street, Lake Stevens
Wednesday, May 21, 2014

CALL TO ORDER: 7: 00 pm by Chair Petershagen

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Petershagen, Vice-Chair Janice Huxford, Linda Hoult, and Tom Matlack

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jennifer Davis, Sammie Thurber, Pam Barnet

STAFF PRESENT: Planning & Community Development Director Rebecca Ableman, Senior Planner Russ Wright and Planning/Public Works Coordinator Georgine Rosson

OTHERS PRESENT: Chair Petershagen welcomed the following members of the public:

Grant Elsworth
Dave Huber

Excused Absence: Commissioner Hoult motioned to excuse Commissioners Davis, Thurber and Barnet, Vice-Chair Huxford second, motion passed 4-0-0-3.

Guest Business: Mr. Elsworth asked if members of the audience would be able to discuss the Soper Hill rezone during the public hearing. Chair Petershagen confirmed there would be opportunity for the public to comment.

Action Items:

Approval of April 2, 2014 Minutes: Chair Petershagen made a correction to the spelling of a guest name (Kyle Mose). Vice-Chair Huxford made a motion to approve the corrected minutes, Commissioner Hoult second, motion passed 4-0-0-3.

Approval of May 7, 2014 Open House Minutes: Commissioner Hoult made a motion to approve minutes, Commissioner Matlack second, motion passed 4-0-0-3. Vice-Chair Huxford asked about minutes from the April 14th joint meeting with council. Director Ableman responded she would provide minutes from this meeting.

Public Hearing:

Chair Petershagen read the public hearing procedures and officially opened the Public Hearing.

Staff Presentation: 2014 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification - Senior Planner Russ Wright:

Senior Planner Russ Wright introduced the items for consideration under the 2014 docket. He stated that tonight's public hearing was the first step in the docket ratification process. Planning Commissioners must consider the specific review criteria set out in

Section H of Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan. The action taken is a procedural step to set the 2014 Docket. Planning Commission action is not a recommendation of approval or denial of any amendments. If Council decides to docket the amendments, staff will conduct further analysis and Planning Commission will consider the merits of the proposed amendments and make a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Wright summarized each of the amendments, including two citizen-initiated amendments to the land use map and two substantive city-initiated text amendments summarized below.

1. RM-1 – Change land use designation on two parcels totaling approximately 3.7 acres located at 1113 SR-204, from Medium Density Residential to Local Commercial. Access to the site would be through existing commercial development off 10th Street SE.
 2. RM-2 - Change land use designation on seven parcels, totaling approximately 9 acres, from High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential to Commercial, and change the land use designation on a single parcel from Mixed Use to Local Commercial. City staff recommends the planning commission extend the Local Commercial land use designation (and Local Business zoning designation) to the adjacent parcel to the east. Combined, these two parcels total approximately two acres. All of the described properties are located near the eastern intersection of SR-9 and Soper Hill Road.
-
1. RT-1 – Text amendment to Chapter 5 – the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element, which would add and describe the City Boat Launch Improvement as a project on the Capital Project List of the Parks Element.
 2. RT-2 – Text amendment to Chapter 8 – the Capital Facilities Element, which would add the City Boat Launch Improvement as a capital project and add a pedestrian safety improvement project to the Capital Project List.

Additionally, the city is proposing RT-3 and RT-4 incorporating SEPA documents and updating the dates on the cover, footnotes and the Table of Contents, as standard administrative amendments.

Staff recommended acceptance of the city and citizen-initiated amendments on the 2014 Docket.

Commission's questions for Staff:

- Vice-Chair Huxford asked about RT-2 and lack of specificity for the pedestrian safety improvement project. Mr. Wright responded that the staff report was completed before Public Works staff identified a specific pedestrian safety project. Public Works has since chosen 91st Avenue to concentrate on pedestrian improvements.
- Chair Petershagen asked about the scope of work for the boat launch. Mr. Wright responded the scope will include much more than a new boat launch, it will also include permanent restrooms. The full scope of work is still being developed.

- Commissioner Hoult had several questions that focused on the proposed RM-2 amendment. She asked the difference between Commercial and Local Commercial zoning, and why should there be a higher density commercial zoning in the Soper Hill area? She also mentioned the Soper Hill area is not a designated commercial center area. Mr. Wright responded the Commercial zoning allows for big box stores, while Local Commercial zoning is smaller scale, serving a local population; Mr. Wright also stated the proximity of the Soper Hill location to Highway 9 does lend itself to a larger commercial development. Director Ableman stated the city does have existing commercial to the south and industrial zoning directly to the north of this site. Mr. Wright discussed the zoning on the west side of Highway 9, inside Marysville city limits, which is zoned Community Business and Mixed-Use.
- Commissioner Hoult does not want to see the Highway 9 corridor become like Aurora Avenue.
- Chair Petershagen mentioned development space [along SR-9] might be limited due to overhead power line utility easements that run through this area.
- Commissioner Hoult asked what is considered a minor amendment. Mr. Wright responded that major/minor amendments are based on acreage, RM-2 is considered a minor amendment.
- Commissioner Thurber's written comments were distributed to the commissioners.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Dave Huber, 7304 10th Street SE, B201, Lake Stevens. Mr. Huber is the proponent for the RM-1 proposed amendment. Mr. Huber believes this site is a "natural" for a commercial rezone. The property is land locked and has site distance issues for any type of access off SR-204. The only access is from the commercial property to the northeast off 10th Street SE. Due to the slopes, even if this property were developed to its fullest potential, the views of neighboring properties would not be obstructed. Mr. Huber stated it makes sense to develop commercial properties on busy highways due to exposure. No critical areas are located on this property except at the south end where there is a ravine.
- Mr. Grant Elsworth, 2628 Soper Hill Road, Lake Stevens. Mr. Elsworth lives near the proposed RM-2 rezone area. His primary concern is safety. The posted speed limit for Soper Hill Road is 25 mph. According to Mr. Elsworth, the average speed traveled on this road is 37 mph, there are no sidewalks and no shoulders, and is used as a main arterial for Crosswater and other developments to get to the lake. It is also used as a shortcut to Highway 9. If the land use designation of this area is going to be changed, Mr. Elsworth would like to see Local Commercial as opposed to Commercial; he feels Local Commercial would be a better fit for the neighborhood. Mr. Elsworth would like to see "higher quality" businesses go into this area, not fast food or convenience stores, but something more like Mill Creek Town Center. He also mentioned traffic calming devices for Soper Hill as well as making this road a dead end.

Close Public Comment portion of Hearing for 2014 Comprehensive Plan Docket

Ratification: Commissioner Hoult made a motion to close the public comment portion

of the hearing, Vice Chair Huxford second, motion passed 4-0-0-3.

Close Public Hearing for 2014 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification: Commissioner Hoult made a motion to close the public hearing portion of the meeting, Commissioner Matlack second, motion passed 4-0-0-3.

Discussion by Planning Commission:

- Chair Petershagen asked what type of development can be done on 9 acres, referring to the Soper Hill property. Planning Director Ableman responded, as an example, Fred Meyer has stated in the past they need a minimum of 15 acres to develop.
- Vice-Chair Huxford asked what type of character or “flavor” would be developed for the Soper Hill change. She mentioned the subareas and the thought and care that went into that process.
- Commissioner Matlack expressed concern over both RM-1 and RM-2 creating strips of commercial zoning, or “leap-frog” commercial development, which would be inconsistent with Goal 4.22 listed on page 19 of the Planning Commission packet. Mr. Wright responded the zoning amendments would not create a spot zoning; the amendments would create cohesive areas of commercial activity.
- Vice-Chair Huxford asked if the Planning Commission can make a conditional recommendation.
- Chair Petershagen stated that at this point the Commission’s role is only passing along a recommendation to docket based on the amendments meeting the specific criteria. If Council does docket the amendments, the Planning Commission will have another opportunity to analyze the amendments.
- Commissioner Hoult asked, if the amendments are docketed, can the Commission or staff recommend a different zoning, Director Ableman responded that yes, this recommendation could be made.

Commission Action by Motion - Recommendation to Council:

- Commissioner Matlack made a motion that the Planning Commission forward the docket proposals RM-1, RM-2, RT-1 – RT-4 together with the public comments and commissioner concerns expressed in the May 21st public hearing addressed in the forwarding recommendation letter to City Council. Vice-Chair Huxford seconded the motion.
- Chair Petershagen opposed the motion based on the understanding that tonight’s meeting is just to recommend placing items on the docket, not to make site-specific recommendations.
- Staff reviewed the primary public and Commissioner concerns to include safety, access, scale, design, character, and Commercial vs. Local Commercial zoning.
- Director Ableman suggested making the recommendation, but also adding a statement that Planning Commission and staff conduct further analysis of these areas if the amendments are docketed. The motion was not revised.
- Original motion passed 3-1-0-3.

Discussion Items:

Community Open House Review – Planning & Community Development Director Ableman and Senior Planner Russ Wright:

Director Ableman congratulated the Planning Commission for a great job on the open house. She thanked them for taking ownership and engaging the public in the process.

Mr. Wright went over the survey results and public comments that came out of the open house. The survey results and comments were consistent with the results of the parks survey taken last year. At the time of the meeting, there were 17 responses to the online survey. Commissioner Matlack asked, what is the next step on the update? Mr. Wright responded that right now the active part is the survey. Staff will then go through individual chapters reviewing items that are required in each element. Also delving into the vision question so we have an idea of what entire chapters should look like. Staff will revisit the overall vision, and look at individual visions for each element. Vice-Chair Huxford asked if the survey could be highlighted during Aquafest? Mr. Wright responded the public will have the opportunity to take the survey during Aquafest, either a paper copy or the interactive touch pads will be available.

Commissioner Reports:

Commissioner Matlack mentioned the motor cross track just outside of Granite Falls was approved.

Staff Reports:

Director Ableman informed the Planning Commission that Council is scheduled to approve their work program next Tuesday night. She also noted that she should have some economic development information to share at the next meeting. Chair Petershagen asked if there has been any commercial permit activity, Director Ableman responded that a developer is working on replacing the La Hacienda restaurant building at Frontier Village with a new, three-tenant building.

Adjourn. Commissioner Hoult made a motion to adjourn at 8:17 p.m., Commissioner Matlack second, motion passed 4-0-0-3.

Gary Petershagen, Chair

Georgine Rosson, Planning/Public
Works Coordinator



Staff Report City of Lake Stevens Planning Commission

Planning Commission Briefing
Date: **June 4, 2014**

Subject: **2015 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update / Vision Statement**

Contact Person/Department: **Russ Wright**, Senior Planner / **Rebecca Ableman**, Planning & Community Development Director

SUMMARY: Document Outline and Vision Statement

ACTION REQUESTED OF PLANNING COMMISSION: No action requested at this time.

Discussion Item A

Staff has prepared a inclusive outline for the *2015 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update* that includes mandatory & optional Growth Management elements, Countywide planning policies and Puget Sound Regional Council multicounty provisions (attached). The outline is based on a review of the GMA, agency compliance checklists, Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and current city of Lake Stevens Comprehensive Plan. Each element will include descriptive text, tables/charts, figures and related goals and policies.

Discussion Item B

Staff and Planning Commissioners have discussed the city's primary vision statement, secondary vision statements and the process for developing a vision. Some initial Planning Commission comments suggested the staff might re-categorize how it describes the city in the Comprehensive Plan i.e., is it appropriate to still define Lake Stevens as "small town." The Commissioners felt strongly that the unique features of the city should be expressed, especially the lake. The Commissioners agreed the vision should put a greater emphasis on employment growth along with population growth. Planning Commissioners also suggested staff revisit the subarea plan vision statements and incorporate portions of these into the new city vision. The new vision statement should highlight past successes and accomplishments. It should also define future growth positively to the city and its residents.

Tonight, staff is seeking specific guidance from the Planning Commission on the adequacy of the proposed vision statements. The overall vision statement should set the tone and establish a policy framework for the entire comprehensive plan. The secondary vision statements should define the purpose of each subsequent element (chapter) in the plan. Please be prepared to discuss the city's vision statements and make specific recommendations for any revisions as necessary. Revised vision statements will be provided separately, but before the meeting.

Attached:

1. Comprehensive plan outline
2. Current vision statement and provisions

2015 comprehensive Plan Update Outline

I. Introduction

A. Purpose & Planning Horizon

B. Planning Context

1. GMA goals and requirements
2. Countywide and multicounty planning

C. Vision for the community (derived from the visioning and other citizen participation processes)

1. Overall Vision
2. Element Visions

D. Growth Framework

1. Annexation Plan
2. UGA Expansion

E. Revision Process

F. Public Participation (WAC 365-196-600)

II. Natural Environment

A. Introduction

B. Description of Planning Area

C. Natural Resource Lands of long-term commercial significance

1. Retain open space; conserve fish and wildlife habitat; protect the environment and enhance the quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water
2. Identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas
3. Protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies

D. Critical Areas

1. Polices based on best available science
2. Include non-regulatory measures as well as regulatory approaches to protect critical areas

E. Integration with the Shoreline Management Act (365-196-580)

1. Goals and policies of the shoreline master program adopted by the county or city, either directly in the comprehensive plan, or through incorporation by reference

F. Sustainability and Climate Change

III. Land Use Element

A. Future land use map / Graphic display of how & where development is expected to occur

1. Land use designations and implementing zoning

B. Describe distribution and general location / extent of land uses, e.g., housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, public utilities, public facilities

1. Describe population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth
2. Include table showing the acreage in each land use designation, the acreage in each implementing zone, the approximate densities assumed, and how this meets the twenty-year population projection.
3. Identify general location and estimated quantity of land needed for public purposes (e.g., utility corridors, landfills or solid waste transfer stations, sewage treatment facilities, storm water management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses)
 - Include descriptions and map
 - Identify and describe essential public facilities
4. Urban planning approaches to promote physical activity
 - Higher intensity residential or mixed-use land use designations
 - Transit-oriented districts around public transportation transfer facilities
 - Co-locating public facilities within walking or cycling distance of their users
 - Linear parks and shared-use paths, interconnected street networks or other urban forms supporting bicycle and pedestrian transportation
 - Multimodal approaches to concurrency

C. Recommendations for meeting requirements – land use assumptions form the basis for growth-related planning of transportation, housing, capital facilities

1. Integrate relevant countywide planning policies and multicounty planning policies
2. Identify the existing general distribution and location of various land uses
3. Estimate the extent to which existing buildings and housing, together with development or redevelopment of vacant, partially used and underutilized land, can support anticipated growth over the planning period
4. Implementation strategy describing the steps needed to accomplish the vision and the densities and distributions identified in the land use element

D. Identify special characteristics and uses of the land which may influence land use or regulation

1. Resource lands & Critical areas
2. Existing or potential open space corridors within and between urban growth areas
3. Sites that are particularly well suited for industry
4. View corridors, brownfield sites, national scenic areas, historic districts, or other opportunity sites
5. Historic preservation – encourage the preservation of lands, sites and structures that have historical or archaeological significance, herein referred to as "cultural resources."

E. Counties and cities must review drainage, flooding, and storm water runoff in the area or nearby jurisdictions

1. Regulatory requirements of municipal storm water general permits
2. Local waters listed under Washington State’s water quality assessment
3. Inter-jurisdictional plans,
4. Protection of the quality and quantity of ground water used for public water supplies
5. Review of drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff in the area covered by the plan

IV. Housing Element

A. An inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs

1. Housing inventory – gauge the availability of existing housing for all economic segments of the community and ensure the vitality of established residential neighborhoods.
2. Amount of various types of housing that exist in a community
 - *Variety of housing types & densities*
 - *Affordability of different housing types*
 - *Median sales prices of homes and average rental prices*
 - *Number of beds available in group homes, nursing homes and/or assisted living facilities*
 - *Number of dwelling units available specifically for senior citizens*
 - *Number of government-assisted housing units for lower-income households*
3. Needs analysis based on the most recent 20-year population allocation
 - *Estimate the type and densities of future housing needs*
 - *Define housing need in a regional context*
 - *Analyze consistency with countywide / multicounty planning policies*
4. Housing targets or capacity
5. Affordable housing
6. Implementation plan

B. A statement of the goals, policies, and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences

1. Housing goals and policies

C. Identify sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes and foster care facilities.

D. Adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

V. Parks and Recreation – DONE

VI. Capital Facilities Element

A. An inventory of existing capital facilities

1. Inventory of existing capital facilities showing locations and capacities, including the capacity available for future growth of existing facilities dictated by the land use element over the 20-year life of the comprehensive plan
2. Include water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water facilities, reclaimed water facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection facilities
3. Capital facilities needed to support other comprehensive plan elements, such as transportation, the parks and recreation or the utilities elements, may be addressed in the capital facility element or in the specific element.

B. Essential Public Facilities (365-196-550)

C. Forecast of the future needs

1. Forecast needs for capital facilities during the planning period, based on the levels of service or planning assumptions selected and consistent with the growth, densities and distribution of growth anticipated in the land use element system management or demand management approaches to preserve capacity
2. Identify all capital facilities that are planned to be provided, including proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities

D. Financing Plan

1. Six-year capital facilities plan for financing capital facilities based on available revenues
2. Where the services and capital facilities are provided by other entities, these other providers should provide financial information as well
3. The six-year plan should be updated at least biennially so financial planning remains sufficiently ahead of the present for concurrency to be evaluated

E. Re-assessment

1. A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short
2. Identify a mechanism to evaluate the adequacy of public facilities periodically, based on adopted levels of service or other standards – at a minimum the evaluation must occur as part of the periodic review or as major changes to the capital facilities element occur
3. If public facilities are inadequate, local governments must address this inadequacy
 - *Demand management strategies*
 - *Reducing levels of service standards*
 - *Increasing revenue*
 - *Reducing the cost of the needed facilities*
 - *Reallocating or redirecting planned population and employment growth within the jurisdiction or among jurisdictions within the urban growth area to make better use of existing facilities*
 - *Phasing growth or adopting other measures to adjust the timing of development*
 - *Revising county-wide population forecasts within the allowable range, or revising the county-wide employment forecast*

VII. Utilities Element

- A. General location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines**
- B. Compliance with special purpose districts – prepare an analysis of the capacity needs for various utilities over the planning period, to serve the growth anticipated at the locations and densities proposed within the jurisdiction's planning area.**
- C. Evaluate whether any utilities should be identified and classified as essential public facilities**
- D. Evaluate whether any utility facilities within their planning area are subject to countywide planning policies**
- E. Local criteria for siting utilities over the planning period**
- F. Counties and cities should adopt policies that call for:**
 - 1. Joint use of transportation rights of way and utility corridors, where possible.
 - 2. Timely and effective notification of interested utilities about road construction, and of maintenance and upgrades of existing roads to facilitate coordination of public and private utility trenching activities.
 - 3. Consideration of utility permits simultaneously with permit applications for proposals requesting service and, when possible, approval of utility permits when the permit application is approved.
 - 4. Cooperation and collaboration between the county or city and the utility provider to develop vegetation management policies and plans for utility corridors.

VIII. Transportation Element

- A. Land use assumptions used in estimating travel**
- B. Estimated traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions to assist the department of transportation in monitoring the performance of state facilities**
- C. Facilities and services needs**
 - 1. Inventory of transportation facilities
 - 2. Level of Service Standards and requirements for bringing facilities into compliance
 - 3. Level of Service for highways and
 - 4. Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years
 - 5. Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands
- D. Finance**
 - 1. An analysis of funding capability
 - 2. A multiyear financing plan, which shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program
 - 3. Re-assessment of finance plan if funding shortfalls are encountered
 - 4. Transportation finance including strategies for addressing impacts of development through concurrency, impact fees, and other mitigation

E. Intergovernmental Coordination

1. Consistency with statewide multimodal transportation plan, regional transportation planning, countywide planning policies and regional transit authorities

F. Goals and policies should address the following

1. Demand Management Strategies
2. Pedestrian and bicycle component
3. Incorporate commute trip reduction plans and multimodal access
4. Roadways and roadway design that provides safe access and travel for all users, including motorists, freight mobility, transit vehicles and riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians

IX. Economic Development

A. Establish provisions for economic growth, vitality and a high quality of life

B. Summarize elements of the local economy such as population, employment, payroll, sectors, businesses, sales and other information

C. Summarize strengths and weaknesses of the local economy defined as the commercial and industrial sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, education, workforce, housing, and natural/cultural resources

1. Share analysis of industrial sectors that have a relatively greater proportion of the local area's employment than nationally
2. Identification of industry clusters
3. Asset mapping

D. Foster economic growth and development and to address future needs.

Attachment 2 will be provided separately.