



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

7:30 PM January 24, 2019  
City Hall Annex

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

### 2. ROLL CALL

Present: Gerald Veltkamp, Blair Scott, Diane Veltkamp, Lynn Templeton and Tim Faber.

Absent with notice: Brett Kok.

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

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### A. January 10, 2019

**Minutes approved as presented. Veltkamp motion/ Templeton 2<sup>nd</sup>. Approved unanimously.**

### 4. Declaration of Conflict

Chairwoman Veltkamp described the process of the public hearing.

Commissioners stated they had no conflict of interest, no ex parte communication and that they can hear and make a decision on this matter fairly.

### 5. PUBLIC HEARING – Pepin Creek Zoning and Zoning Code Update

Gudde addressed the Commission and stated that the Pepin Creek Sub-area represents a significant planning project. This meeting does not set the locations of these zones within the Pepin Creek Subarea. Although the sub-area will utilize some zoning categories with already exist, the planning effort has also included the creation of new categories and overlays which take into account the City's growth priorities, housing density goals, infrastructure requirements, and community character.

The change is not considered lightly. The proposed zoning text amendment comes forward after careful review that has included public surveys, input from local real estate agents and builders, as well as six workshops with the Planning Commission, four joint

meetings with the Community Development Committee, and one joint workshop with the City Council. A number of these meetings have included opportunities for public input.

This evening Staff would like to review the three proposed amendments separately and as follows:

**A. Addition of LMC Chapter 19.18, Pepin Creek, Residential Multi-Family-Pepin Creek (RM-PC)**

This multi-family zoning category resembles the existing RM-2 zoning as it permits up to 4 units per building and, in larger developments up to 8 units per building. It differs from RM-2 in that it allows for smaller lots, smaller setbacks, and encourages fee simple attached single-family housing. The most familiar form of this housing type is the row house or townhome. Other creative housing arrangements could be accommodated in this zoning including clusters of cottages and shared garage layouts. The permitted density of the RM-PC is higher than the RM-2 zoning. The goal of this housing type is to create attached product that promotes home ownership at more affordable rates than detached single family homes.

Public Comment: Veltkamp opened the meeting to the audience.

Faber question: Residential Design Requirements. They are in there. Should they be included here as they are still being discussed?

Gudde stated that these are the City's current design standards that are currently included in the code. She left them in there while the discussion is occurring so they are in there. If changes occur, they would be updated at that point.

Number of vehicles allowed: Veltkamp asked if we should maintain the 5 vehicles per lot rule. Some discussion occurred on whether that should be limited.

Detached / attached question:

Daryl Roosenda, property owner within Pepin Creek Subarea, asked when the zoning locations would be determined. Gudde described that those locations have been proposed but it is still up for workshopping details and additional discussions with public, Public Works Dept and the Airport Board. The upcoming scheduled meetings – workshop the zoning locations as part of the overall subarea plan.

G. Veltkamp: Why the March 1, 2019 date highlighted in the document as a “grandfathered-in”?

Gudde responded that it is highlighted because it is tentative at this point. It depends on when it gets final approval from PC and City Council.

## **B. Updates to LMC Chapter 19.16, Residential Mixed Density Zone**

D. Veltkamp gave a quick introduction on the RMD as it has been used in the past and described that the Pepin Creek Subarea work has been an opportunity to look at this zone as well.

This zoning category is one that already exists within the City of Lynden. It is meant to blend detached single-family housing with attached single-family homes (also known as paired housing) and duplex units. Some amendments have been proposed to the existing development standards of RMD which would eliminate the opportunity to construct triplex units but allows for smaller minimum lot sizes.

“Desirous” in the subdivision section – page 8. Is that a strong enough word? Is there another way to state that to make it stronger. Use the word “recommended”.

Public Comment: Veltkamp opened the meeting to the audience. No comment

## **C. Proposed overlays: Senior and Commercial.**

These are overlays that a developer, property owner could activate within the Pepin Creek Subarea.

## **D. Revisions to Title 17, Title 18 and Title 19 of the LMC**

The zoning addition of Chapter 19.18 as proposed also warranted changes and improvements to other existing sections of code including sections in Chapters 17 and 18, and other sections of Chapter 19. The most significant change may be the revision to measure setbacks from property line to foundation. Also duplexes would go to the Design Review Board for review. Adjustments have been noted in each affected section to accommodate this change but with little to no change in the currently permitted building envelope.

Public Comment: Veltkamp opened the meeting to the audience.

Commission to go through the related Code Sections document.

Gudde described how we got to the Maximum Impervious Coverage percentages. Compared to other jurisdictions, some discussion on the current allowance for building envelope, and enforcement.

G. Veltkamp asked for a definition of Impervious Surface to be included in the definition section. Staff will add that.

Faber: Add the description “cantilevered” to bay windows on page 15. E.

Landscaping bed. Faber asked about the averaging. Required minimum of 4 ft but allowed to average as long as the overall square footage requirement is met.

Pg 22 Scribner's error on “Notice requirements”

Design Review – some clarification on application process, certified mailings, allowance for variances.

Templeton asked about “carports” at last meeting. Where did that go?

Gudde explained that the Design Standards are generally

Darryl Roosendaal, Shoreline, WA – Asked if we could clarify what “additional fire protection” means? Gudde described that we deferred to the Building Code requirements for fire protection – no vents, wall protection. Faber described that we have set up the code to prevent buildings from being within 10 ft so they wouldn't be required. Detached buildings can be within 6 ft of each other as is currently allowed and building code would be in effect.

Scott motioned to close the public portion of the meeting and take a quick recess. Second by Templeton.

### **3 Separate Motions:**

**RM-PC:** Faber Motion to recommend approval of Chapt 19.18 Pepin Creek Subareas zones as present with one clarification on “cantilevered” bay windows. Second by Scott and passed unanimously.

**RMD:** Faber Motion to recommend approval of amendments to RMD with following changes: “Cantilevered” bay windows. 19.16.5 a the word desirous to be changed to “recommended”.

Templeton second and pass unanimously.

**Other Related Code Sections:** Faber motion to recommend approval of proposed changes of Chapt 17, 18, 19 with the following: Cantilvered windows and add the definition of Impervious Surface to definition section. Second by Templeton and passed unanimously.

## **6. COMMISSIONERS CORNER**

Gudde described upcoming schedule:

CDC with Planning Commission members – February 20 to discuss design standards.

No February meetings. Next meeting March 14.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn by Scott / Second by Faber. Meeting adjourned at 9:07 pm.

DRAFT