

**City of Lake Forest Park – Planning Commission**  
**Draft Regular Meeting Minutes: January 09, 2024; 7:00-9:00pm**  
**Hybrid Meeting Held in the Forest Room at City Hall and Virtually via Zoom**

**Planning Commissioners present:** Chair Maddy Larson, Cherie Finazzo, Melissa Cranmer (via zoom), Meredith LaBonte, Janne Kaje, Lois Lee, Vice Chair Ashton McCartney (via zoom)

**Staff and others present:** Nick Holland, Senior Planner; Councilmember Bodi (via zoom); Phillip Hill, City Administrator; Cristina Haworth, SCJ Consulting (via zoom); Mark Hofman, Community Development Director; Councilmember Paula Goode; Sarah Phillips, Climate Action Committee Chair

**Members of the Public present:** Jeff Snedden, (one other attendee who did not sign in)

**Planning Commissioners absent:** Sam Castic

**Call to order:** Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm. She introduced Planning Director Mark Hofman. Director Hofman provided some information on his background and the direction of planning in the city.

**Land Acknowledgement:** Cmr. LaBonte read the land acknowledgement.

**Approval of Agenda:** Cmr. Lee made a motion to approve the agenda, Cmr. Kleweno seconded, and the motion to approve the agenda was carried unanimously.

**Approval of Minutes:** Cmr. Kaje made a motion to approve the December 12, 2023, meeting minutes. Cmr. Lee seconded the motion.

Cmr. Kaje suggested some minor edits. He suggested striking the sentence on page three line 18-19. Cmr. Lee suggested some minor edits. She suggested changing the content of page 2 line 31 to, “working from home is currently not being well tracked” and the content of page 3, line 28 to ‘Cmr. Lee suggested’

All voted to approve the December 12, 2023, minutes as amended, and the motion carried unanimously.

**Meeting Dates:** The next regular meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2024.

**Citizen Comment:**

Jeff Snedden said he was speaking as a representative for his neighborhood along NE 155 ST. He spoke in opposition to a proposed 11-unit town home development along that street. He talked about a landslide hazard and steep slope area that the property has and said the property has an (F) type stream present. Mr. Snedden spoke about the required setbacks from the critical areas. He said that the developer wants the buffers waived. He described the required uses within the zoning designation of southern gateway corridor where the property is located. He said the developer is proposing live work units and that the code doesn’t have a definition for live/work units. He spoke about the details and design of the townhome units. He talked about similar live/work

1 developments in the zone and said that the neighborhood will appeal any decision the planning  
2 department issues. He said that the code needs to better define commercial space.

3  
4 Sarah Phillips spoke about the business of the climate action committee and indicated that a report  
5 from their committee should be along shortly. She said that the focus of the report will be to reduce  
6 greenhouse gas emissions in the city. She talked about ways to mitigate the impacts of fuel use. She  
7 indicated that a graphic novel style report will be produced as well as a figurative character to  
8 represent the committee. She asked how to get involved in the comprehensive plan update. She  
9 suggested a meeting with the planning commission members to deliberate on a possible strategy to  
10 get involved.

11  
12 Chair Larson asked for any questions. She provided Chair Phillips with an update on a possible  
13 strategy to collaborate on the climate action committee report and comprehensive plan update.  
14 Chair Phillips asked what format the climate chapter might take. Chair Larson provided an answer.  
15 Discussion continued on what format the amendments and new chapters of the comprehensive plan  
16 would take.

17  
18 Johnathon Lounds representing the Master Builder's Association spoke about support for middle  
19 housing and increased density in residential zones within LFP. He talked about the written  
20 comments he provided and referenced some of the content of that letter.

21  
22 Chair Larson suggested that the written comments from Mr. Lounds be provided to the consultant  
23 at SCJ.

#### 24 25 **City Council Liaison Report:**

26 Councilmember Bodi said that there are two new councilmembers and a new mayor as well as a new  
27 Community Development Director which are all starting in 2024. She said that the first meeting of  
28 the year is Thursday, and that election of Council officers will occur. She said that she anticipates  
29 remaining the liaison to the Planning Commission. She said that an inauguration ceremony will  
30 occur at the civic club for those who have been newly elected. She talked about the lake front park  
31 property plan which is proceeding. She said that the city will be eligible for some state funding in  
32 association with the park property. She said that the reasonable use code amendments were adopted  
33 by the Council, but that the sign code has been put on hold. Councilmember Bodi said that issues  
34 like Sound Transit, the budget, and speed limits continue to occupy time at the Council level. She  
35 said that she and Councilmember Furutani have petitioned Sound Transit for a board position, to  
36 represent north end cities.

37  
38 Chair Larson asked about the potential for residential parking permits. Councilmember Bodi  
39 responded and said that an ordinance has been developed for parking permits. Cmr. LaBonte asked  
40 where to go if more information was needed, and Councilmember Bodi responded that the  
41 ordinance has been adopted but further information is forthcoming. She said that she can inform  
42 the staff to publish a newsletter article.

#### 43 44 **Old Business:**

##### 45 **2024 Comprehensive Plan Update**

##### 46 **Draft Land Use chapter updates**

47 Ms. Haworth presented a slide show to discuss the various proposed land use element changes to  
48 the comprehensive plan. She spoke about the upcoming schedule for revisions to the various

1 chapters and introduced the next element for revision, environmental quality. She spoke generally  
2 about the schedule for upcoming draft comprehensive plan language revisions.

3  
4 Ms. Haworth presented the general policy framework for comprehensive plan updates. She  
5 explained the differences between goals and policies as a refresher for the Commission and the  
6 public. She spoke about the various objectives for the comprehensive plan update and emphasized  
7 alignment with the community's vision. She presented the redlined version of the land use element  
8 that was provided in the packet and provided a summary of the various language updates for the  
9 land use chapter in the comprehensive plan. She presented the main discussion topics for the land  
10 use chapter. She explained how the term 'low density' is being used within the updates and indicated  
11 it was used to preserve the character in LFP neighborhoods. Cmr. Kaje said he likes some of the  
12 goals in the update, but some of the terms seem a bit contradictory. He suggested making the  
13 density terms a bit more intuitive. Chair Larson asked about the rationale for some of the density  
14 terms that were used, and Ms. Haworth provided a response explaining the intent. Cmr. Kaje  
15 explained the density definitions in the draft. Discussion continued on how density is calculated.  
16 Cmr. Finazzo provided her perspective on how density would be applied using the definitions in the  
17 draft. Director Hofman explained that the actual density is applied at the code level and that the  
18 comprehensive plan, which is what is being discussed currently, needs to contain policy level  
19 guidance for the code so that density can be specified at the regulatory level. Cmr. Kaje said that the  
20 amendments are geared toward getting away from using the term 'family' because that term isn't  
21 specific to each portion of the population in LFP. Cmr. LaBonte said she is sad to see the term  
22 family leave the plan and that the term family should remain because it does represent LFP. She said  
23 that the term 'unit' is cold and inhumane. Cmr. Cranmer said that she agreed with Cmr. LaBonte's  
24 comment. Chair Larson asked for other opinions on the term 'family'. Some of the commissioners  
25 provided their perspective on the term and feel of the chapter's draft. Cmr. Cranmer suggested using  
26 the term 'household'. Cmr. Finazzo suggested leaving the term 'family' in some of the sections and  
27 not in others. Director Hofman said that the use and intensity must be included in the designations  
28 used in the comprehensive plan, but that the focus for the update via state guidance was to eliminate  
29 the word 'single-family.' He said that the definitions must be consistent with the definitions in the  
30 RCWs. Chair Larson suggested checking the RCWs for consistency in the proposed definition and  
31 asked if Ms. Haworth can verify if that can occur.

32  
33 Ms. Haworth suggested moving towards the environmental quality element but that she is  
34 concerned about getting the climate chapter goals included. She presented the findings and  
35 recommendations for the environmental quality element. She said that the current plan is generally  
36 consistent with the state mandated guidance. She discussed a few elements for the Commission to  
37 consider and highlighted some of the requirements from King County and the Puget Sound  
38 Regional Council (PSRC). She said that her team saw some opportunities to combine some sections  
39 of the environmental quality element as it is a substantially sized chapter of the comprehensive plan.  
40 She said that the Commission should consider how to prioritize diversity, equity and inclusion  
41 within the chapter. She asked for any questions or input. Cmr. Kaje said that the parks portion of  
42 the plan should also be amended to consider diversity, equity and public health. He said that the  
43 access to green spaces in urban areas should be considered in both the environmental quality  
44 element and the parks element. He said that the public health value of urban green spaces should  
45 not be overlooked. Chair Larson asked if the group could reflect on the material presented and  
46 provide feedback at the next meeting. Ms. Haworth suggested providing the draft language earlier in  
47 the process, so that the Commissioners can come to the meeting with their ideas.

1 Chair Larson summarized her understanding of how to communicate their comments and receive  
2 feedback from the consultant. Director Hofman suggested sending commissioners' comments to the  
3 Chair for organization. The Commission settled on how to proceed with evaluating the drafts and  
4 providing their comments.

### 5 6 *Comprehensive plan update schedule*

7 Chair Larson presented the schedule as drafted by SCJ consulting. She suggested potential for  
8 additional sessions to work through the draft language and chapter updates. She asked for the  
9 availability of the commissioners to attend additional meetings. Chair Larson asked if the  
10 information for environmental quality is enough to consider for discussion. Cmr. Lee responded and  
11 said that she would prefer time to evaluate prior to meeting with the consulting team. She  
12 emphasized the housing requirements and that work as a priority. Chair Larson suggested meeting  
13 twice a month until June to work through the various draft updates. Director Hofman said that the  
14 resources available to the group can be exhausted to the greatest extent possible and suggested some  
15 ideas on how to proceed. He said that public notice and participation should be considered. Chair  
16 Larson asked how the group would like to use public participation and said that community input  
17 might not be available in time for the Commission to utilize it during their discussions. Cmr. Lee  
18 asked when a draft is due to Council. Director Hofman responded and said that the Commission's  
19 recommendation is needed prior to the Council getting involved. Cmr. Lee emphasized that public  
20 input should be used in making decisions. Chair Larson suggested that the topic of comprehensive  
21 plan updates be included in each month's newsletter for the purpose of informing the public. Senior  
22 Planner Holland replied that he will coordinate that portion of public notification. All of the  
23 Commissioners agreed to meet twice a month for the next six months. Logistics of meeting  
24 schedules, dates and times were discussed, staff agreed to follow up with the Chair of the  
25 Commission about potential future meeting dates.

26  
27 Chair Larson talked about the potential for innovative policies in the comprehensive plan. She asked  
28 if the Commission could talk with some builders to inform some of the deliberations of the  
29 Commission. Cmr. McCartney said that she could benefit from information on different types of  
30 housing. Cmr. Finazzo suggested having the townhome developer that Mr. Snedden spoke about  
31 come to discuss the development.

32  
33 Cmr. Kleweno said that he has identified items within the meeting notes that have been tabled in the  
34 past meetings, which need additional discussion. Chair Larson suggested having the group identify  
35 those items for further discussion. Discussion continued on how to utilize the time from the special  
36 meeting schedule. Chair Larson suggested having the commissioners forward their ideas to her for  
37 organization. Cmr. Lee suggested focusing the discussions on the materials provided by SCJ and  
38 avoiding the code level details and focusing on policies.

### 39 40 *Land Acknowledgement Discussion*

41 Cmr. Lee moved to remove/strike the last line of the land acknowledgment. Chair Larson provided  
42 some background on that portion of the land acknowledgment. Cmr. Finazzo seconded the motion  
43 posed by Cmr. Lee. Cmr. Lee read allowed the acknowledgment language as she suggested in her  
44 motion. Cmr. Kaje said he doesn't have a problem with that edit, but the change doesn't answer his  
45 original question which was that he was not present when the Commission adopted the  
46 acknowledgement, and he wanted to understand how the group is using the acknowledgement  
47 language in their work with the comprehensive plan. Chair Larson provided some background  
48 information and reasons for how the land acknowledgement language was adopted. Cmr. Lee said

1 that she appreciates the acknowledgement and supports the use of it. Cmr. Cranmer said she agreed  
2 with Cmr. Lee's comments and supports the edits proposed in Cmr. Lee's motion. Cmr. McCartney  
3 said that she appreciates the discussion on the topic and supports the edits proposed in Cmr. Lee's  
4 motion.

5  
6 Chair Larson suggested an amendment to Cmr. Lee's motion. She suggested not eliminating the last  
7 sentence but using it as a footnote to inform the reader. She suggested moving the last sentence to  
8 the end as an answer to the question 'why a land acknowledgment?' Cmr. Lee provided a response  
9 and said she did not support the amendment proposed by Chair Larson because the sentence  
10 proposed doesn't acknowledge the other groups outside Euro-Americans.

11  
12 All of the Commissioners voted on Cmr. Lee's motion. Cmr. Cranmer, McCartney, Kaje, Finazzo,  
13 and LaBonte voted in favor of the motion. Chair Larson voted against it. Cmr. Kleweno abstained.  
14 The motion carried.

15  
16 **New Business:**

17 None.

18  
19 **Reports and Announcements:**

20 None.

21  
22 **Citizen Comment:**

23 None.

24  
25 **Agenda for Next Meeting:** Environmental quality discussions.

26  
27 **Adjournment:**

28 Cmr. LaBonte made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Cmr. Lee seconded, and the motion was  
29 carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.

30  
31 APPROVED:

32   
33 Maddy Larson, Planning Commission Chair  
34

