



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

7:30 PM November 21, 2019
City Hall Annex

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Tim Faber, Diane Veltkamp, Gerald Veltkamp, Bryan Korthuis, Blair Scott, Lynn Templeton. Brett Kok absent with notice.

Absent with notice:

Staff Present: Martin, City Administrator, Gudde, Planning Director, Timmer, City Planner and Samec, City Planner.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 24, 2019

Templeton motioned to approve the **October 24, 2019, Planning Commission Minutes as submitted. Seconded by Scott and the motion passed 5-0.**

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Pepin Creek Sub-Area Plan

Veltkamp opened the public hearing.

Planning Director Gudde gives a presentation to provide background information and get up to speed with progress that has occurred since the Planning Commission reviewed the draft plan in late 2018. These include revising and adopting zoning categories, slight adjustment of the zoning plan and a revised circulation plan. These are reflected in the Subarea Plan Draft.

Tonight, Staff is seeking a Planning Commission recommendation on the plan. A second public hearing will be held with the City Council with the Commission's recommendations.

Mike Martin expresses gratitude for the many hours spent by planning commission, public and staff to get the plan to this point. The City expects growth to occur at around the same rate (~100 units/year) with this growth in Pepin Creek to happen rationally over the next couple decades.

Public Hearing:

Khris Kantu: 942 Hemlock Loop: Concern over large scale multi-family close to their property. Gudde describes the requirement in RM-PC to have a 100 ft transition area between existing single-family development.

Jake Jarvis: Westview Circle: Ask why the City is pushing for rapid growth in the area, especially near their large single-family zone. Is concerned about the impact of the higher density residential development in Pepin Creek on existing property values.

Steven Kantu: 942 Hemlock Loop: Ask about the impact of raising the land north of them for roads and houses. Gudde responds that this is a ground water elevation question which requires appropriate separation between housing and groundwater.

James Squires: 855 Hemlock Court: Expresses some concern that the eventual increase traffic on Double Ditch will impact their development. They will hear the traffic. How is Double Ditch going to be improved? Gudde responds that improving the substandard road this requires the relocation of Pepin Creek. Double Ditch is considered an arterial.

What about water rights? Does the City have enough water to allow this residential growth? Mike Martin answers that the City is continually working to secure water rights and has made significant progress in doing so (COW water, acquiring water association rights, and discussion on storage). Right now the City has enough water and will continue to make investment in securing appropriate water for the future.

Bob Johnson, Lynden Parks and Rec Commission: The parks district, in a formal letter, asks that the Pepin Creek Parkway not bisect the park property and that the entire 40 acre property be park land.

Diane reads the letter and states her concern that the wishes of the previous owner are not being met with this design.

Mike Martin understands the concern but also says that the mayor, and council are keenly aware of the wishes of the previous property owner and are interested in the best course of action for this property.

Henry Bierlink, Hemlock Loop and Ag Representative: Both lives in the neighborhood and is also a representative of the Ag community. First expressed gratitude in the high level of deliberation and transparency that has occurred in this process. As an Ag representative, understands that growth in Lynden means less farmland in the County. While this growth should be focused in those UGAs such as here, it also means that over time additional growth will then threaten more farmland. As such the City needs to increase density even more than this plan allows to ease the pressure on farmland conversion.

Also ask that the City continue to partner with the Ag boards in order to meet both needs.

Water supply and drainage. The City is the plug at the bottom of the drain for farmland water.

Mike Martin talked about the culvert improvements that will occur at Badger Rd in 2023. This may compound the City concerns about water movement in the ditch. This project is even important in light of that.

Corwyn McKay, 1813 Emerald Way: Public access to that the Park property, including multi-modal pathway on west side of new creek location, is going to be important as this moves forward. The proposed parkway, while safety issues should be paramount, does provide great public access for people across the City. Especially if it is connected to broader trail connections.

Planning Commission Discussion:

Tim Faber: This draft removes the senior overlay from the RMPC zoning. Can the senior overlay ideals be accommodated in the RMPC?

Gudde answers that the changes to the zoning standards for RMPC would allow that type of development without needing to activate the Overlay. In analyzing those changes, it became apparent that the overlay is likely not necessary. One adjustment that may be required in order to allow assisted living type of developments, would be changing the RMPC outright permit Assisted Living Use in that zone.

Blair Scott: Any thoughts about alternative locations for Pepin Parkway if it doesn't go through the City property as shown?

Gudde answers that there may be options for connecting more directly to Benson but those need to be reviewed carefully as they may then require additional improvement demands on Benson which is a difficult street to improve because of the existing ditch. Cost savings as well the City already owns that property (won't need to acquire the ROW required).

Diane Veltkamp: Knew Herm Huesinkveld and concern that his wishes are not being met by plans for developing housing on the property or putting an arterial road through it. Not the best idea to put a major arterial through a high pedestrian area. What are the other alternatives?

Mike Martin: Was involved with the transaction with Herm, the Council has expressed desire to add to and improve the City's Parks system. City leaders are very supportive of the park idea and would want to do it in the best way possible, not damage the park property. Demonstrated commitment to the park property and how it is used.

Blair Scott: Ask about the runway buffer, Can that be used to the new roadway?

Gudde: The safety buffer for the airport runway should not be used as a road location.

Bryan Korthuis: Asked about use of the park property for things other than park. Stormwater, quasi-public, higher density. Is the E-W roadway even necessary?

Gudde: With the relocation project, should be phased the City cannot pay for the full relocation up front.

Martin: Expensive development here, need to phase.

D. Veltkamp: Has there been serious considerations of flip flopping this land out of the UGA?

Martin: Land west of the Guide is allotted for industrial/commercial.

Faber: Echos concerns about having the Parkway bisect the park land. Benson road will need to be upgraded. Can the Parkway go straight to Benson rather than cut north through the Park? Perhaps the cost savings for that (shortening the length of Pepin Parkway) might be used to rather make Benson Rd improvements?

G Veltkamp: Also concern about the Parkway bisecting the park. But also think access to the park would be better without having to come directly off of Benson.

Lynn Templeton: A school shouldn't take up all the greenspace in the park property. Sees this as a plan required by the State. But really wonders: How viable is this? Will this actually happen. He is skeptical that it will. Is also concerned that the cost of development here will only compound our affordability issues.

Scott: Expressed concern that this may not be the right direction for the City.

Mike Martin: Expressed a belief in the importance of considering all these issues and to recognize that this plan is subject to change and adjustment as time goes on. But, the Council should see this and would ask that the Planning Commission make a recommendation and then move it on.

Korthuis: Being in the construction industry, yes, this is not easy development land but he has seen development occur around the County in much more difficult conditions. He also recognizes the reality of housing pressure in the area and thinks that, Yes, it will happen. So it is good to have the thought and deliberation that this plan has entailed but then we should move it on. He expects to see a lot of creativity by the development industry as it occurs. In this, he is supportive of the plan.

G Veltkamp: This project is for the benefit of the whole city. Yes, the plan is specific to this area but the results will have impacts on the entire City. There is a cost to not doing this. Affordability is tied to what happens or doesn't happen here. As a City wide benefit, perhaps there are ways that the whole City can participate in the cost of this project. It should be considered.

Faber motioned to recommend, to City Council, the approval of the Pepin Creek Sub-Area Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) An alternate location and layout for Pepin Parkway should be considered to minimize negative impacts to the Benson Park property and to allocate those savings for needed Benson Rd improvements.**
- 2) As the project benefits the City as a whole, the Council should consider funding options that might involve the entire City.**
- 3) With the high cost of development in this location, there is concern that the cost of housing here will only compound the affordability crisis. Housing affordability issues need to continue to be discussed.**

Seconded by Templeton, and the motion passed 5-0.

B. CPA #19-01, Futures Land Use Map

Veltkamp opened the public hearing.

The proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is meant to rearrange the Future Land Use designations in the Pepin Creek Subarea to correspond with revisions to the plan that have occurred since late 2018. It proposes a rearrangement of the

Faber pointed out that the zoning map included in the application shows the Senior Overlay. Timmer stated that map is for reference to show how the Future Land Use designation lines up with the underlying zoning. The zoning map in the application was an older map that didn't have the Senior Overlay designation removed. That mistake does not impact the Future Land Use designation proposal.

Faber motioned to recommend, to City Council, the approval of the Future Land Use Map. Seconded by Scott, and the motion passed 5-0.

5. COMMISSIONERS CORNER

The Commission asked about the City Council overturning the recent Bouma rezone application.

The December 12th meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting will be held on January 9, 2019.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Templeton / Second by G. Veltkamp. Meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm

