

**MINUTES
CITY OF LANGLEY
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD
February 24, 2010**

Jim Sundberg opened the meeting at 4:05 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Julie Buktenica, Roger Gage, Fred Geisler, Melanie Shafaat and Jim Sundberg
Members Absent: G. Raymond McCullough
Staff Present: Fred Evander and Larry Cort
Council Present: Robert Gilman and Rene Neff

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes of the January 27, 2010 meeting. Roger Gage moved to approve the minutes. Melanie Shafaat seconded. Jim Sundberg requested that Sandra Stipe's name be included in the portion of the minutes regarding the discussion of affordable housing. The Board approved the January 27, 2010 minutes with this suggested change.

The Board reviewed the minutes of the February 10, 2010 meeting. Melanie Shafaat moved to approve the minutes as written. Roger Gage seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT/BOARD COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Larry Cort said that the next meeting for the Planning Advisory Board was scheduled for the night on March 10th, 2010. Larry said that staff was interested in having the meeting in a larger room, but said that both the Methodist and the Catholic Churches were booked that night. Larry suggested having the meeting either on March 11th at one of the churches or having the meeting on the 10th at City Hall. The Board discussed the issue and determined that having the meeting on March 10th at City Hall was preferable. The Board scheduled the next meeting for March 10th at 6:30.

PUBLIC HEARING: RE-CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS TO THE LANGLEY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Jim Sundberg opened the Public Hearing at 4:15 and presented a series of facilitation rules for the meeting. Jim also explained the basis for the code in state law and why the Planning Advisory Board had been working on the update. Jim introduced Director of Community Planning Larry Cort to provide a staff report for the hearing.

Larry Cort explained the timeline for the public outreach effort and where the City and Planning Advisory Board was at in the process. Larry said that the City had talked with several landowners and that four major concerns with the proposed regulations had arisen:

1. The required open space percentage within the Conservation Design Zone;
2. The mixed density approach;
3. The square footage allocation for certain properties and
4. The Conservation Design Zone name.

Larry explained that staff had tried to summarize each of these comments, as well as a number other issues, on the sheets distributed prior to the meeting.

Jim Sundberg said that to he felt that the Planning Advisory Board should try to hold an additional meeting to synthesize these comments into the recommendation to the City Council. Jim suggested that a meeting sometime next week would be best to schedule a meeting. The Board said that they would email each other with the best dates for the meeting next week.

Jim Sundberg opened the meeting to public comment.

Carolyn Cliff, who owns five acres west of Al Anderson Road in the proposed RVD Zone, said she had a number of concerns about the proposal. Ms. Cliff said that she did not like the distinction between the Historically Built and Historically Rural areas on the map and explained that she was troubled by the line. Ms. Cliff also said that she had trouble with the common wall requirement, especially because she felt that her property was not close enough to downtown to walk. Ms. Cliff lastly said that she felt that the proposed code contained a number of unrealistic requirements that could be burdensome on her financially. Ms. Cliff said that she wanted to be treated the same way as her neighbors, the Izetts.

Craig Carty, who lives on Second Street, said that he had a number of questions about the code. Mr. Carty read these questions and passed out the sheet of the questions to the Board. His questions included: what is driving the changes; what is the criteria for changes; and was a matrix implemented for internal review?

Cary Peterson, who co-owns 10 acres of property on the south end of Al Anderson, said that she was delighted with the changes. Ms. Peterson said that she felt the proposed code promoted flexibility and promoted additional possibilities of how to develop her land.

Tiny Tillman, who co-owns the Fossek Farm with her brothers, said that a seventy percent open space requirement in the Conservation Design Zone was not right. She said that she recognized that everybody loved the farm, but said that no one loved the farm more than the Fossek family. Ms. Tillman said that her brother Fred Fossek suggested that the allocation for the zone be raised to 4,000 square feet.

Ron Kasprisin said that he helped include the conservation design concept in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan and he explained the conservation design concept. Mr. Kasprisin said that minimum lot sizes were destructive to the landscape and he said that conservation design sought to remedy this through required clustering and a minimum percentage of open space. Mr. Kasprisin went on to say that the seventy percent proposed within the existing draft was too high and should be reduced to sixty percent.

Robin Adams said that he appreciated the work that the Planning Advisory Board had done, but said that he had some troubles with the Sensitive Environment Design Zone boundaries. Mr. Adams said that the zone was designed to follow roads, but he explained that the underlying watershed extended beyond those road boundaries. Robin further said that he thought that the requirements related to living space should be reworked to be based on impervious surface to encourage multistory buildings.

Linda Anderson said that she felt that she should not have annexed her land into the City and said that a Planned Residential Development through the county would have been a better option for development of her land. Ms. Anderson said that her family had owned her land since 1907 and she was now being told how to develop. She also said that under the proposed regulations, there would be condos down Al Anderson Road.

Jim Anderson said that the moratorium was the basis for all the code changes, and that the City was not required to make any changes. Mr. Anderson said that he thought that the seventy percent requirement in the Conservation Design Zone was too high and he questioned if the Board thought that it was a lot. Mr. Anderson said that he thought that the seventy percent was inequitable and arrogant, and said that he felt that it made him a minority stakeholder in his land. Mr. Anderson further said that there was no quantification of the changes by the City and he said that, with the economy, there was no need to change the regulations anymore.

Leanne Finley said that the City needed to consult outside professional opinions about the code. She said that the City should talk outside economic advisors, including people like a Certified Public Accountant that could

verify the code impact. Ms. Finley also said that the code should seek to provide affordable housing and she said that she saw no items within the code that would promote affordability.

Marianne Edain said that the state created the Growth Management Act to promote long-term growth plans. She said that the point of the regulations was to protect critical areas and said that the regulations were not meant to reduce development capacity. Ms. Edain said that a number of the objections to the code were based on misunderstanding. Ms. Edain said that she thought it was an interesting idea to link the allocation basis to impervious surfaces, but she said that she was not sure if the impervious surface approach would meet the community's goals. Ms. Edain said she thought that the PAB had not completed the code yet but said that she felt they were getting close.

Joyce Fossek said that she was uncomfortable with the Historically Built and Historically Rural line and she said that she didn't know how to find the densities associated with her property. She asked if she could get the information on a sheet of paper.

Kathleen Waters-Riehl said that she had trouble with the Village Center Design Zone name and said that it should at least have the word business in the title. Ms. Waters-Riehl suggested the name Village Business.

Leanne Finley said that she supported the idea of impervious surfaces as an approach. Ms. Finley further said the City was not addressing a demand for certain types of housing and said that if there were more, small houses close to downtown they "would sell like hotcakes."

Jim Sundberg asked Larry Cort about Planned Residential Developments (PRDs) within the county. Larry said that he didn't know much about PRDs. Marianne Edain said that the minimum lot size for PRDs was twenty acres and up to twice the density was allowed, which would come to about 8 units on 20 acres. Ms. Edain said there was also an open space requirement associated with PRDs.

Robin Adams said that the City should not second guess the real estate market and should attempt to focus on outcomes within the code. Robin said that he felt there were two main goals that should drive the code: a reasonable belt of open space and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas.

Carl Magnuson asked about how the idea might affect development costs. Fred Geisler said that he had created some numbers to analyze the impact of the proposed code, and he presented some of those numbers. Ivan Neagus said that some of Fred's numbers needed to be more precise and said that there were a lot of unknown variables in development.

Jim Anderson said that one of his greatest disappointments with the proposed code was the inclusion of a required 60 foot right-of-way. Larry acknowledged the right-of-way requirement and said that staff had inserted the flexible road standard from the flexible lot provisions back into the proposed subdivision ordinance. Fred Evander explained that staff had originally envisioned redoing the street standards and as a result linked the requirement to those anticipated standards.

Joyce Fossek questioned who would be responsible for maintaining open spaces.

Cary Peterson said that she appreciated the idea of diversity in housing sizes and said that it gave options for development. Ron Kasprisin explained the idea of farmstead-style development and how the concept integrated different sizes of housing.

Carolyn Cliff said that the proposed rules would limit her ability to develop her land and said that she would like options of what to do with her land. She said that some of the existing requirements should be incentivized, rather than required and said that the proposed regulations constituted a stick rather than a carrot. Ms. Cliff said that the regulations were experimental, not tested, and constituted an economic cost on her. Jim Sundberg explained that the existing zoning also limited Ms. Cliff's ability to develop her land, but said that the current regulations limited her ability to develop a different way.

Robin Adams said that the proposal would not constitute downzoning, especially in areas within the Urban Growth Area. Mr. Adams said that the current county zoning was one house per five acres and he said that the proposal would be more than that in the UGA.

Ron Kasprisin said that research by the American Farmland Trust had found that cities had to subsidize all development that was under six units per acre.

ADJOURN

Melanie Shafaat moved to adjourn. Fred Geisler seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 5:55.

The meeting was held at Langley City Hall. The next regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Board will occur March 10th, 2010 at Langley City Hall. A special meeting of the Planning Advisory Board will occur sometime during the week of March 3rd. Fred Evander recorded the minutes for the meeting.