

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA



City of Lake Stevens Vision Statement

*By 2030, we are a sustainable community around the lake with a vibrant economy,
unsurpassed infrastructure and exceptional quality of life.*

June 1, 2022 - 6:00 PM

HYBRID MEETING - TWO WAYS TO PARTICIPATE:

In Person: Public Works Building, 2306 131st Ave NE, Lake Stevens

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89183357859>

or call in at (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID 89183357859

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Guest Business**
- 4. Action Items**
 - A. Meeting Minutes of 5-18-2022 Jennie Fenrich
- 5. Discussion Items**
 - A. "Code Clean-Up" Code Amendment Introduction Nico Faz
(LUA2022-0082)
 - B. Storage Facility Code Amendment Introduction Jill Needham
(LUA2022-0079)
- 6. Commissioner Report**
- 7. Planning Director's Report**
- 8. Adjourn**

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND

Special Needs: *The City of Lake Stevens strives to provide accessible opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Please contact Human Resources, City of Lake Stevens ADA Coordinator, (425) 622-9400, 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, (800) 833-6384, and ask the operator to dial the City of Lake Stevens City Hall number.*

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES



REMOTE PARTICIPATION

5-18-2022

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM by Chair Welch

MEMBERS PRESENT: Todd Welch, John Cronin, Mike Duerr, Janice Huxford, Todd Welch, Linda Hoult

MEMBERS ABSENT: Conner Davis

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Wright and Planning Manager Levitan

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember Gary Petershagen

Chair Welch called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call: Commissioner C. Davis was excused for absence

Guest business: None

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 4-20-2022. Chair Welch identified needed corrections to the Short-Term Rentals public hearing item. Motion by Commissioner Huxford to approve minutes with corrections, seconded by Commissioner Hoult (6-0-0-1).

Discussion Items:

2022 Comprehensive Plan Docket: Land Use Element

Planning Manager Levitan introduced an initial list of proposed changes to the Land Use Element as part of the city's annual Comprehensive Plan docket. Similar to prior years, the text amendments will focus on updated demographic information and regional planning efforts, as well as updates to account for updated buildable lands and growth targets data. Staff intends to introduce proposed amendments to the Parks Element at the Commission's June 15 meeting, while the Land Use Element is scheduled be brought back to Planning Commission on July 15 along with an initial analysis of map amendments M-1 (citizen-initiated proposal for two properties on 20th St SE) and M-3 (city-initiated proposal to reassess land use and zoning with the 20th St SE Corridor subarea).

Housing Action Plan Introduction

Planning Manager Levitan provided an update on the city's Housing Action Plan, which kicked off in May 2022 and is being funded by a grant from the Washington State Department of Commerce. Planning Manager Levitan shared the preliminary scope of work for the project, which will help the city to identify

its current and future housing needs, develop strategies and actions to meet those needs, and solicit feedback and input from a wide variety of community stakeholders. It will also serve as an important foundation for work on the Housing Element as part of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan periodic update. Staff intends to provide an update on the action plan during the second Planning Commission meeting of each month.

Commissioner Reports: Commissioner Hoult asked about the schedule for the summer meetings. She also asked if staff was aware of the meeting at Monroe Fairgrounds regarding extra funds available from ARPA. Commissioner Huxford asked for a recount on how materials were presented to Council on the Short-Term rental work the Planning Commission has done. Chair Welch will not be able to be in person on July 15th and requested Vice Chair Duerr run the meeting, in which Duerr agreed.

Director's Report:

Community Director Wright asked the Commission for feedback on the summer meeting schedule. Staff anticipates the work plan will require two meetings a month. The state has provided direction that public agencies must resume in-person meetings for boards and commissions, while the City Council has requested that the city offer a hybrid option to maximize opportunities for public participation. Holding Planning Commission meetings at the Mill during the summer is not a viable option due to the Farmer's Market being held at the same time, so staff is proposing to use the Public Works shop (2306 131st Ave NE) to hold these meetings. The Commission opted not to hold the July 6th meeting due to the holiday.

In response to a question about an upcoming county meeting on funding from the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA), Director Wright shared information on city ARPA funding. The city has received approximately \$9 million in ARPA funding, which have been used for streets and roads, local business relief, and social services such as the food bank. The city has set aside a reserve fund for future needs that are identified.

Director Wright provided Council feedback received on the Short-Term Rentals Code Amendment at their May 3 workshop meeting. The Council directed staff to postpone the public hearing to consider the Planning Commission's recommendation so that it could gather additional community feedback (including from current short-term rental operators) and further assess proposed regulations such as the owner-occupancy requirement. Commissioner Huxford asked that all the letters from the community be included in the staff report to the Council. The Council will be holding an additional work session at their June 7 workshop meeting.

Adjourn: Moved by Commissioner Hoult, seconded by Commissioner Duerr to adjourn the meeting at 6:56 p.m. On vote the motion carried (6-0-0-1).

Jennie Fenrich, Planning Commission Clerk

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT



Agenda Date: 6/1/2022

Subject: "Code Clean-Up" Code Amendment Introduction (LUA2022-0082)

Contact Person/Department: Nico Faz, Community Development

Budget Impact:

Legal Review: No

RECOMMENDATION(S)/ACTION REQUESTED:

This is an informational briefing and no action is requested at this time. Staff will introduce a city-initiated land use code amendment that aims to fix inconsistencies and ambiguous language throughout Title 14 that staff has identified over the last several years. Commissioners are asked to listen to staff's presentation and provide general feedback on the project scope and approach.

SUMMARY/BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this briefing is to introduce potential updates to inconsistent, ambiguous, or outdated language within LSMC Title 14. It has been several years since the city has undertaken a "clean-up" or "housekeeping" code amendment for code sections that may not have warranted a standalone code amendment, but which still need to be updated. Although the list of code updates is not finalized, it will focus on sections of code previously identified by staff as creating unclear or conflicting code language that have been difficult to interpret and administer, or which have been unintentionally modified by previous code amendments.

This project is not intended to change city policy or code intent, but instead provide additional clarity or address inconsistencies. Examples include:

- Removing [LSMC 14.16C.070](#) (Home Occupations), which was inadvertently left in place when Home Occupations were moved to [LSMC 14.44.015](#) as part

of Ordinance 1124 and has resulted in conflicting code sections for the same topic area.

- Amending [LSMC 14.48.035](#) and [Table 14.48-I](#) to more clearly reference and illustrate “street side setbacks” and the applicable setback distance of 10 feet.
- Amending [LSMC 14.48.045](#) to reinstate an exemption for small accessory structures (those exempt from needing a building permit) to be located within five feet of rear and side yard property lines, which was unintentionally removed by Ordinance 1080 when trying to provide more clarity on another topic.
- Harmonizing and clarifying the language in [LSMC 14.56](#) and Section 2-106 of the [Engineering Design and Development Standards](#) (EDDS) as it relates to access tracts and access easements, which can result in projects being required to make improvements that approach public street standards.
- Resolving discrepancies in landscape screening requirements that exist between [LSMC Table 14.76-I](#) and [Table 14.48-II](#), Footnote 3.
- Clarifying what constitutes “native species” in [LSMC 14.76](#) (Screening and Trees) and [LSMC 14.08](#) (Definitions)
- Updating [LSMC 14.50.125\(d\)](#) to be consistent with the city’s SEPA categorical exemption thresholds for grading, which exempts up to 1,000 cubic yards (instead of 100) from SEPA review.
- Addressing a procedural discrepancy between [LSMC 14.16C.025](#) (Administrative Modifications) and [LSMC 14.18.060](#) (Alterations of Subdivisions), for which a Code Interpretation was issued in May 2021 but the clarification of which needs to be codified.
- Providing additional clarity in [LSMC 14.68](#) (Signs) for certain types of permitted signs, such as temporary subdivision signs (which may exceed the 4 sf maximum in residential zones)

Staff intends to hold at least one additional work session with Planning Commission to review the entirety of the proposed code amendment before moving on to public hearings. Staff welcomes any feedback on the scope and intent of the project as well as any code sections that commissioners believe should be included and which fall within the parameters of a “code clean-up”, as opposed to a change in city policy.

APPLICABLE CITY POLICIES:

ATTACHMENTS:

None

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT



Agenda Date: 6/1/2022

Subject: Storage Facility Code Amendment Introduction (LUA2022-0079)

Contact Person/Department: Jill Needham, Community Development

Budget Impact:

Legal Review: No

RECOMMENDATION(S)/ACTION REQUESTED:

This is an informational briefing and no action is requested at this time. Staff will introduce a city-initiated land use code amendment to the City's storage facility regulations (LSMC 14.44.044), which is included on the 2022 Long-Range Planning Work Program.

SUMMARY/BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this briefing is to introduce and discuss the scope of potential amendments to the city's supplementary use regulations for storage facilities ([Chapter 14.44.044 LSMC](#)). Updated regulations were explored and recommended by the Planning Commission as part of last year's permissible use code amendment (LUA2021-0136). However, following their public hearing to consider the Commission's recommendation, the City Council opted to remove the updated regulations for storage facilities from Ordinance 1124 and instead requested that staff bring back potential updates as a separate code amendment in 2022.

The city currently has nine existing storage facilities and one pending land use application for a new facility. Storage facilities are typically quite land consumptive in nature, occupying large swaths of land while generating very few jobs. The [Land Use Element](#) of the Comprehensive Plan acknowledges this (page LU-22) and also calls for uses with higher employment densities (Policy 2.6), especially in industrial areas, where storage facilities can economically outcompete more traditional industrial uses. The lack of job generation from such uses is an issue for cities such as Lake Stevens,

which is projected to face a deficit of approximately 1,100 jobs when comparing recently adopted 2044 employment growth targets to its estimated supply of employment land (derived from the 2021 Buildable Lands Report).

In an effort to address the low employment density of these uses, last year's code amendment included language that would have required the preparation of an economic analysis for any storage facility application. However, the City Council felt such a requirement was too subjective in nature and did not have clearly defined standards or metrics. Instead, councilmembers requested that staff address employment density through clear and objective development standards (such as requiring multiple stories, a mix of uses, a commercial storefront, or even a citywide cap on facility square footage) or into the different zoning districts where storage facilities should be permitted, either outright or conditionally. Staff has examined codes from several nearby jurisdictions and found that cities such as [Lynnwood](#) and [Marysville](#) have adopted several of these code provisions.

The city's current supplementary use regulations are shown in Attachment 1 and were adopted in 2017 (Ordinance 1016). Currently, storage facilities are permitted through a Type II Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP) in the Local Business (LB), Light Industrial (LI), and General Industrial (GI) zones according to Table 14.40-II. They also require an ACUP in the Commercial District (CD) zone outside of the three subareas (they are prohibited within the subareas), although the only parcels currently affected are part of the existing Clocktower Self Storage site. Staff is recommending that a footnote be added to distinguish between self-storage and warehousing, storage and distribution, which is a permitted secondary use in several zoning districts within the city's subareas.

LSMC 14.44.044 outlines the regulations for new facilities within the LB zoning district, which includes a mix of special restrictions and design standards. Most notably, the site must (c)(1) of this section intends to limit the storage use to 25% of the site while reserving the rest for other uses. However, the use of "*may*" in (c)(1)(ii) does not make this a firm requirement.

As the city considers potential amendments to LSMC 14.44.044, staff would like early Commission feedback on several topics, including:

1. Should storage facilities continue to be permitted within the LB zoning district?
2. Should the 25% maximum development coverage be reinstated as intended by removing ambiguous language?
3. Should storage facilities continue to be allowed within the CD zoning district outside of subareas?

4. Are there additional zoning districts where storage facilities would be appropriate with adequate design and development standards?
5. Should there be development standards for lot size, maximum building size, or minimum number of stories?

As staff continues its work, we anticipate holding two work sessions with the Planning Commission in upcoming months to keep commissioners apprised of the project's status and to gather commission feedback. Staff will also be holding a work session with City Council to solicit their input.

APPLICABLE CITY POLICIES:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Attachment 1 - Existing Storage Facility Regulations

14.44.044 Storage Facilities.

(a) Intent. Storage facilities include characteristics common to commercial and industrial uses. This section provides regulations to help guide appropriate siting of storage facilities in the Local Business zoning district, while maintaining the desired character and function of that district. If designed appropriately, storage facilities can emulate the exterior architecture and site design of commercial or mixed-use developments, reducing inconsistencies with Comprehensive Plan goals or zoning district intent and limiting impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. Storage facilities in the Local Business zoning district shall adhere to the additional special restrictions and development standards of this section.

(b) Applicable Location of Section [14.44.044](#) Regulations. Storage facilities shall be allowed in the Local Business zoning districts on roads designated as State routes or State highways.

(c) Special Restrictions.

(1) The storage use shall be limited in size to 25 percent coverage or less per development.

(i) Each development is defined as the area of contiguous Local Business parcels.

(ii) The use coverage is defined as the amount of space solely devoted to supporting the storage use on each development. This may include building footprints, drive aisles between storage facilities, loading bays, parking, landscape screening, offices and associated appurtenances. The use coverage percentage may exclude critical areas and features shared within a development like pedestrian facilities, internal access and circulation roads, and shared parking.

(d) Design Standards.

(1) Storage facilities shall have an outward appearance that more closely resembles a commercial or mixed-use development than a warehouse or single-story linear shed design, and shall be subject to the design review requirements of Section [14.16C.050](#).

(2) Storage facilities shall include architectural and design features that promote visual compatibility with commercial or mixed-use developments. Examples of these features may include providing facade modulation; using varied or contrasting exterior building materials and detailing; screening blank walls; incorporating varied roof-lines among other features.

(3) Storage facilities shall shield exterior lighting so as not to directly illuminate or create visible glare from adjacent residential properties subject to the requirements of Section [14.38.080](#).

(4) Storage facilities are subject to the screening requirements of a Type A screen, as described in Chapter [14.76](#), when abutting residential zoning districts.

(i) Open storage facilities must provide an additional Type C screen that includes trees, shrubs and ground cover or similar vegetation to screen the exterior of the open storage facility's enclosure. (Ord. 1016, Sec. 2, 2018)