

Development Commission
7-20-16

**CITY OF ISSAQUAH
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 20, 2016**

City Hall South
Council Chambers

135 E. Sunset Way
Issaquah, WA 98027

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Richard Sowa, Chair
Mel Morgan, Jr., Vice Chair
Robert Bakh, Alt.
Michael Brennan
TJ Ginthner, Alt.
Randy Harrison
Ray Leong
Kevin Price

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Tarce, Senior Planner
Lucy Sloman, Land Development Manager
Keith Niven, Development Services Director
Christopher Wright, Project Oversight Manager

APPLICANTS/OTHERS PRESENT

Steve Crawford, Issaquah School District
Paul Mullin, Silverado Care

CALL TO ORDER

SOWA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM. He briefly explained the two items to be discussed at tonight's meeting and how public comment will be taken.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that minutes of the Development Commission meeting on April 6, 2016 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING: Clark Elementary School & Gibson Ek High School Renovations, Site Development Permit SDP-00003

Request approval of SDP-00003 for a proposed redevelopment of the existing Issaquah Middle School site to accommodate the relocation of Clark Elementary School and a new Gibson Ek High School in the existing buildings, and addition of portables for a new "Academy of Community Transition" program and administration offices, located at 400, 420 and 500 First Ave. SE.

Staff Presentation

Amy Tarce made staff's presentation. She presented elements of the quasi-judicial review process that ensure a fair and impartial process for reviewing projects such as SDP16-00003, and explained the types of permit approval requests that trigger Development Commission review. She briefly explained procedural due process and substantive due process. She asked if any Commissioners would need to answer "yes" to a series of questions about their ability to be fair and impartial in a quasi-judicial decision on the project. HARRISON asked what does "near the property in question" mean. Tarce replied there is no specific distance in the City's regulations. Sloman said there is no specific test, but typically if you are within 300 feet and receive notice as part of the notification process, then you are considered "near" the property. She gave other examples. Tarce posed the questions to Commissioners, and all Commissioners answered "no." She then asked if any Commissioners had had ex parte communications or contact with the applicant or anyone with an interest in this project. All Commissioners answered "no."

Tarce proceeded with her presentation on the proposed renovation of Clark Elementary School. She noted that one additional public comment has been received to which both staff and the

Development Commission
7-20-16

applicant have responded. That communication was distributed to Commissioners and entered into the record as Exhibit 1.

She continued with some background information on the project, and said tonight she will focus on the traffic impact analysis and revisions to conditions of approval (as described in detail in the Staff Report). Her presentation included details on the phasing of the project; location and existing land uses; lot size and general site plan; the proposal for Clark Elementary School and Gibson Ek High School; existing conditions; the proposed design of the new buildings, including modulation; proposed color palette and materials; zoning; development standards, including ~~a comparison of what is proposed with standards in application of~~ the SF-SL zoning ~~standards to the CF-F, Community Facilities – Facilities zoning~~ designation; ~~the code provision that allows CF-F uses to expand non-conforming conditions,~~ a recommended condition to reduce the amount of impervious area where reasonable; and how the proposal for building height was analyzed.

She continued with an explanation of site access and circulation, using a color-coded diagram. This was an area of comment by both the Commission and members of the public in previous discussions, she noted. She displayed photos of existing roadways that are the primary access points to the site, the main parent drop-off area, and parking. She continued with an update on the traffic impact analysis and changes being recommended since the proposal was last presented to the Commission, including a new Condition 32 (“The 4-foot wide concrete stair connecting the sidewalk of Gibson Ek to the Rainier Trail shall be eliminated.”) on page 227 of 277. She continued with a description of mitigation measures to address potential impacts to the community and Middle School traffic mitigation contributions to Clark Elementary School.

She explained additional changes that resulted in revisions to and replacement of condition 5, and how combining condition 19 and 29 due to their similarity resulted in a revised condition 21 and deletion of condition 29. She continued her presentation on existing conditions. She noted concerns had been raised about noise and visual impact from onsite parking, exhaust from buses, and the need for additional screening. Staff and the applicant addressed these concerns (details in Staff Report) in revised condition 2 and the ~~deletion~~ of condition 19. Staff is also proposing condition 7 to address wetland buffer concerns and conditions 11 and 12 to address blank walls. She also clarified that staff has received a more extensive set of drawings and materials from the applicant than is normally available during construction review. Staff has informed the applicant that we are reviewing this project at a land-use level, she continued, and that any additional information that is more appropriate for construction review has not been reviewed or considered yet for approval. She concluded ~~with~~ staff ~~recommendations~~ ~~for~~ approval of the project with the plans, drawings, conditions, Staff Report, attachments, and other material presented tonight, plus any conditions or motions the Commission chooses to offer.

Applicant Presentation

Steve Crawford, Director of Capital Projects for Issaquah School District, said the applicant team tried to respond to comments we heard at the Community Conference for this project, particularly for access and vehicular circulation. The circulation pattern has been revised and is now as Tarce just described, he stated. Those major changes eliminated a lot of traffic heading to the south of the site, he continued. He explained the re-analysis of traffic impacts, including the walking area assigned to Clark Elementary. He displayed a diagram of the proposed site and discussed the playground facilities, parking, and buildings on the site. He showed photos of where buffers and screening are proposed and diagrams of floor plans.

LEONG asked about the long driveway on the west side, where buses run to the south end, and expressed concern about vandalism at the end of the driveway. Crawford explained where gates

Development Commission
7-20-16

will be located. LEONG asked could the driveway be shortened by providing a turn-around, which would also reduce the impervious area. Crawford said the driveway requires the radius shown for turning purposes. LEONG also asked about the use of portables. Crawford explained portables are used to accommodate future growth, and for financial reasons they are preferable to permanent structures. He showed where portables will be located on site and how they will be used.

MORGAN asked about condition 2, which refers to sound absorbing material in the wall (“A masonry wall... shall be provided to mitigate the noise...”), and noted that masonry doesn’t seem like it would be sound-absorbing. Tarce said the walls are acoustic walls that are engineered with holes that absorb sound. MORGAN said we don’t want the sound to bounce off and reflect back to the school. Crawford said the cost difference would not be significant between masonry and other materials. He gave an example of another sound-absorbing wall used elsewhere by the School District. The intent is to prevent sound transfer to the neighborhood by using an appropriate material for the wall, he stated.

MORGAN noted the wall is specified to be “no greater than 10 feet tall.” Could it be, say, only one foot tall, he asked. Crawford said the plan is for an 8-foot wall, and that is what we have indicated in discussions with the community. Tarce said ~~staff can take another look at that language~~ [the Commission can propose a revision to the condition to clarify the minimum height.](#)

MORGAN noted there are discrepancies in figures given in the Staff Report and exhibits as to the number of parking spaces that will be required and provided. Tarce said these documents are created in different stages of the application discussion so the numbers may vary slightly. However, she continued, the applicant is proposing more than the minimum number, so it is our view to allow the School District to determine the final number as long as it is more than the required minimum. MORGAN asked whether less parking would allow enough impervious surface flexibility to use river rock around the portables. Crawford replied we have different and distinct uses for the kinds of parking shown, and we will meet the minimum requirement and maybe more than that. He showed where some parking may be reduced as the project moves into the construction planning phase. MORGAN noted it seems like river rock would be a pervious, not impervious, surface. Tarce said in making that determination, we look not only at the surface but also at compaction. In this case, the subgrade would probably still be impervious, she stated.

BRENNAN noted the table in Attachment 11 indicates sidewalks are recommended on both sides of First Street. Crawford noted a new five-foot sidewalk will be added to the east side, resulting in a five-foot sidewalk on both sides of First Street. He described the new configuration. BRENNAN said concern about that was raised at the Community Conference, and this configuration sounds like a significant improvement.

Public Comment

SOWA opened the meeting for public comment at 8:11 PM.

Chris Craven, 580 Front Street, Issaquah, expressed her appreciation to staff and the Commission for digging into the details of this proposed project and listening to the public’s concerns. She said she would like to see the gate that LEONG referred to in his comments called out and included as part of the conditions, and noted that the property needs to be closed off when Issaquah School District staff are not onsite. She expressed concern about the long driveway configuration and safety issues there. She gave examples of how safety could be compromised. She expressed appreciation for changes in pedestrian access and the parent drop-off area. She said she hopes the northernmost parking lot is left flexible as she still sees an opportunity for a bus drop-off area there in the future. She gave her observations about the need for more barriers to keep balls from

Development Commission
7-20-16

the ballfield coming onto neighbors' property. She also said work at Gibson Ek has already started and work has taken place outside scheduled hours, smoking from workers onsite has come into her windows, and so on. She said she would like to request that some sort of monitoring be done to be sure contractors are abiding by their agreements and regulations.

Jimmy Lee, owner of Spa Chi, 80 SE Bush Street, Issaquah, said his understanding is that changes along Bush Street could eliminate parking there, and if parking is to be eliminated, he would like to request that it be eliminated on the side of the street opposite his business, where the community pool is located. He expressed concern with people having to cross the street unsafely if parking on the same side of the street as his business is eliminated.

Mary Lynch, 2690 Oakcrest Drive, Issaquah, thanked staff and the School District for addressing concerns with this project. She continued her comments about sidewalks along Bush Street that need to be raised or have buffers, and the need to look at them from the perspective of the City's Walk-and-Roll program. She spoke about the ongoing congestion issues around the Food Bank, including parking issues. She noted there has been talk about possibly changing school hours, and that needs to be accounted for. She urged that consideration be given to improving all crosswalks for pedestrians and students who will be walking, and said including a turn lane creates a higher risk for more pedestrian-vehicle accidents. She noted that no bicycle routes are included, and that students also use skateboards to get to school. She said the Council is considering limiting construction activity in the City to Monday through Friday, 7 am to 7 pm. When this project gets to the construction phase, she said, the construction route needs to be clearly identified and marked. This area has narrow streets, and with the school and food bank there are a lot of children and sometimes elderly people navigating those streets. She said another issue is that citizens don't know who at the City to talk to about their construction activity concerns.

David Kappler, 255 SE Andrews Street, said the addition of a turn lane on SE Bush Street could become a bottleneck westbound, and he doesn't see the need for a center turn-lane west of First Street. He said he agrees with the previous speaker that traffic around the food bank is a big problem, and described some of the conflicts he has observed. He said he thinks many students at Gibson Ek, which is a relatively small school, will want to take advanced classes available at Bellevue or Issaquah high School, and the easiest way for them to get there will be to walk on the grass area that goes down to the Rainier Trail. That is the shortest way and kids will naturally gravitate that direction, he stated. He gave more details of how he thinks the planned walking route will not be well utilized by students.

Hearing no additional requests to speak, SOWA closed public comment at 8:26 PM.

Commissioner Discussion/Review of Green Sheets

HARRISON commented about the need for the School District, City, and Police Department to come up with a plan for traffic control officers to be onsite when the school becomes operational, at least in the very beginning while people are getting used to new traffic configurations. He said he agrees with comments made about traffic concerns around the food bank and school traffic problems.

LEONG asked what type of gate is at the end of the long driveway. Crawford replied currently it is a chain-link type fence.

GINTHNER said the Development Commission often hears concerns from the public about problems with construction activity around the City, and we should have information available to distribute when it comes up. Staff said they will identify the right phone number to call. HARRISON

Development Commission
7-20-16

noted that one construction project of which he is aware was recently contacted by the City and reminded of permissible work hours, so it is a viable mechanism. Sloman said this is an issue before the City Council now, so perhaps there will be better compliance once the City's regulations and process has been clarified.

SOWA asked Commissioners to indicate "Acceptable" or "Not Acceptable" to the applicable items in the Design Criteria Checklist (the "green sheets") beginning on page 58, Appendix 2. Commissioners indicated "Acceptable" to all items. Other comments are as follows.

BRENNAN asked will lighting, brought up earlier during Public Comment, be addressed during the construction permit phase. Tarce replied yes, all exterior lighting is subject to the regulations are in the land use code.

MORGAN asked staff to comment on the elimination of the stairway to the Rainier Trail. Tarce replied staff's rationale is detailed in the Staff Report. Basically, she continued, we looked holistically at the site and projected where middle school students were likely to walk. She showed where pedestrian traffic has historically taken place, and said staff's intent was to ensure that students can continue to walk to the new school location. So we found it best to use the existing wide sidewalk on the north side of the community center, which is also wheelchair accessible, and have it be the connection for both bikes and pedestrians to get to the Rainier Trail and for students to get to their new school. She said it made sense for students to walk in an open area rather than have to use what is a loading dock and parking lot. Sloman added the Parks Department also had concerns about the new stairway connection at the bottom, specifically that parents might want to use it to pick up their children there, which would create more complications with traffic patterns. She said staff could see that high schoolers might think of it as a short-cut, but we also were concerned about how elementary school children might use it.

HARRISON said pedestrians tend to take the path of least resistance, and the route you have identified will take more time. How will you encourage students to take the longer route, he asked. Crawford said the Gibson Ek High School will offer a unique program of classes on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays only; on Tuesdays and Thursdays, students will be in internships offsite. He said the school district doesn't think there will be that much foot traffic between Gibson Ek and Issaquah High School, and doesn't foresee a lot of pedestrian traffic there. BAKH said he agrees that middle schoolers will try to take the fastest route, which would be west to east, instead of right across to the Rainier Trail, and downhill through the parking lot. HARRISON agreed. Crawford showed where a School District fence will discourage that.

Commission Decision

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY LEONG that the Development Commission approve Clark Elementary and Gibson Ek High School, SDP16-00003, with plans, architectural drawings and technical studies submitted between April 15 to April 30, 2016, the Staff Report dated June 8, 2016, with Attachments 1 through 10, Exhibit 1 and the recommended conditions of approval, with revisions proposed tonight for conditions #2, #5, #21, deletion of conditions #19 and #29, and the addition of condition #32.

MOVED BY MORGAN, SECONDED BY BRENNAN that condition #2 be revised to state, "A masonry wall, no greater than 10 feet tall and no less than eight feet tall..." MOTION CARRIED BY THE UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT.

Development Commission
7-20-16

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY MORGAN that the Development Commission direct the Development Services Department to prepare Findings of Fact which affirm the Development Commission's decision to approve the Site Development Permit for Clark Elementary and Gibson Ek High School, SDP16-00003, with plans, architectural drawings and technical studies submitted between April 15 to April 30, 2016, the Staff Report dated June 8, 2016, with Attachments 1 through 10, Exhibit 1 and the recommended conditions of approval, with revisions proposed tonight for conditions #2, #5, #21, deletion of conditions #19 and #29, the addition of condition #32, and the additional revision offered tonight to condition #2. The staff analysis and conclusions in the Staff Report and Staff Memo, as well as the staff presentation tonight, shall serve as the Findings of Fact. MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT.

MORGAN noted the Development Commission is frequently hearing from the public about construction issues, such as noise, traffic, hours, and so on, and said he would like to be sure people know that the Development Commission does not control those aspects of these projects. However, he continued, by coming to the Development Commission meetings and expressing their concerns, City staff is hearing them and can address them. Wright suggested that a fuller discussion of the impacts of construction activity can be scheduled for a future Development Commission meeting. Sloman added citizens can contact the main Development Services Department at 425-837-3100 to report any issues with construction activity.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Development Agreement (DA) 16-00002 with Silverado Care
Request approval of an application to enter into a Development Agreement with Silverado Care (Silverado) to build a clustered plat of up to a maximum of nine parcels located at 7932 Renton-Issaquah Road SE at the intersection of NW Talus Drive.**

Staff Presentation

Christopher Wright explained that the application under consideration tonight is for a clustered plat development agreement between the City and Silverado. He noted that earlier the Development Commission approved-reviewed a request from Silverado for an assisted living facility on this parcel, which would have required a code amendment to allow the development to proceed, but that the City Council did not approve the request. The project being presented tonight does meet the confines of City code, he continued, and referred to the most recent Development Services Director interpretation that addresses the City's position on allowing an assisted living facility within the SF-E zone.

He continued by reading the definition of "clustered development" in the City's land use code. MORGAN and HARRISON noted that the reference to "concentrates buildings housing" in the first line of the definition is unclear and confusing. LEONG agreed, but said we know what is meant, and said he feels we can move ahead with the discussion. Staff made a note to review the definition at the appropriate time.

Wright continued with the purpose of clustered housing standards and the components of development agreements. He explained that the decision being asked of the Commission tonight is a recommendation on whether to proceed with a development agreement. The Council will be the final decision maker, he stated. He explained the steps required in proceeding through the clustered plat approval process, and noted the recommendation being requested tonight is the first of many steps in reviewing this project. He also referred to the conditions staff is recommending on pages 8 and 9 of the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Development Commission
7-20-16

Paul Mullin, Silverado, with a new facility at 4400 Columbine Drive, Bellingham and corporate offices at 6400 Oak Canyon, Irvine, CA, said Silverado's original intent was to build much-needed senior housing for the residents of the Issaquah area. This project continues that intent to build much-needed housing, specifically clustered housing, working with John Stefani of the Stefani Land Company. He referred to a letter he received from King County about a trailhead on the east side of the property, as well as concerns the City has about wetlands protection on the property, and said we are in favor of working with the City to address those concerns. He said with this clustered housing proposal, 95 percent of native growth trees on the site will be preserved. The intent is to stay away from Tibbetts Creek and build in ways that have minimal impact to native timber and the hillside. He noted that the development across from this property, Timber Ridge, serves many people who need senior housing and skilled nursing care, and Silverado has their full support.

Public Comment

SOWA opened the meeting for public comment at 9:24 PM.

David Kappler, 255 SE Andrews, Issaquah, clarified that the development agreement question is a legislative, not a quasi-judicial, issue. Keith Niven, Development Services Director, replied that is correct. Kappler continued it will become a quasi-judicial issue as the Commission gets further into the approval process. He said the lots intended for low-income units are not reasonable as they are located far from public transportation. He also expressed concerns about the need for a bridge across Tibbetts Creek, other critical area issues, and how sewer service will be provided. He spoke in favor of the opportunities for trail access and connections, as well as preserved open space.

Mary Lynch, 2690 NW Oakcrest Drive, Issaquah, expressed concern with affordable housing being located across the Creek with no time constraints placed on building another bridge; flooding in the area; the lack of proximity of the affordable housing units to public transportation; traffic and pedestrian safety concerns; needing to give up parking in order to provide vehicular access to the roadway; and the distance from the proposed affordable housing units to the road.

Connie Marsh, business owner at 1175 N.W. Gilman Blvd., Suite B-11, Issaquah, and Issaquah resident, referred to the City Council's decision that an assisted living facility would not be an allowable use for this property. What we have here is a few houses with a clubhouse, and questioned whether that is a legitimate use for the clustered housing designation. She said the bridge required across Tibbetts Creek will likely cost something like a half-million dollars, and she said she thinks it is a specious location for affordable housing. She noted that there is nothing in the City's plans that would link trails on this property to anything else, so they would be trails that end nowhere. She said the proposal for a clubhouse is confusing, and there isn't enough information about it. She also said that the phone number given by staff to contact the Development Services Department doesn't work, because no one is there to answer it after business hours or on weekends. The same situation exists on Front Street right now with construction, she continued. People are being forced to walk there in unsafe ways, but who do you call. She concluded we don't have enough information about this development agreement request and she would like to see the Development Commission delay taking action until there is more complete information about what exactly is planned.

Hearing no additional requests to speak, SOWA closed public comment at 9:37 PM.

Commissioner Discussion

HARRISON said he has looked at the definition of the City's green necklace, and it doesn't appear there is any connection between the green necklace and this site. Is there a connection,

Development Commission
7-20-16

conceptual if not direct, that links this property, he asked. Niven replied no, there is no direct connection. This property is not part of our trail planning effort because it is privately owned. As properties become developed, then the City can look at opportunities to link them to the larger green necklace for the City, he said, and would be something we would look at if this project moves forward. HARRISON noted the property offers great opportunities for connecting to the trail system, and asked how it could be connected to what the City already has planned. Niven replied the City has a new Parks and Recreation Director coming on board in a few weeks, and that would be on the Parks Department's work plan for 2017. HARRISON noted a lot of time and effort are being spent to reinvigorate the Coho salmon run in the creek, and there is an emphasis in the material provided on protecting the land, but the access to affordable housing seems problematic in terms of its environmental impact.

Mullin said we have no plan right now to do a bridge; that would be up to the City. He continued the cost would likely be more like \$100,000 to build the bridge, not \$500,000, and it could be part of the trails system, but we have no definite plans right now. What you see here is the result of the City's request to us to provide some ideas for discussing a development agreement around the concept of affordable housing, so it is just conceptual at this point. HARRISON asked about sewer services. Niven replied the idea is that the developer would deed these two lots to the City at no charge, and to create two affordable housing units east of Tibbetts Creek. Obviously the decision would be made at the Council level, he continued, but these are some preliminary ideas. That would require a basic driveway-like bridge over Tibbetts Creek from which sewer and water pipes could be hung to serve those two lots.

PRICE asked questions about density, and cited different density figures in the Staff Report. Wright explained that if the development agreement was approved and the plat process started, the back parcel could not be developed. He explained how much of the property is critical areas and buffers, and where development could take place. Mullin said each lot would be around 5,000 to 7,000 square feet, on average, so the housing would be really clustered onsite. PRICE asked is the clubhouse use permitted under the code. Wright replied the code does allow a banquet-type facility that could be used for meetings and so on. Mullin added the banquet facility is envisioned as an amenity for the residents. PRICE said so it would be an accessory to the people living there. Mullin replied yes. MORGAN asked would it be a dining facility that would serve breakfast, lunch, and dinner for residents, and if so, how would that differ from the assisted living facility that Silverado proposed earlier. Mullin replied a memory care unit was proposed earlier, but that is not our intention this time. Our intention is to provide housing, which could be adult family homes, senior housing and so on, in a clustered subdivision, subject to what is allowed in the City's SF-E zone. Under the zoning restrictions, a banquet facility is allowed, he noted. Niven added the Commission could include a specific recommendation on including a banquet facility in its recommendation.

BRENNAN referred to the letters from Silverado's legal representatives that were provided in advance of the meeting, and said it seems that the banquet facility could serve the proposed housing in a way that creates an assisted living facility situation, which the City has determined is not allowed. The Commission continued to clarify how the City's interpretation of what is allowed in the SF-E zone impacts what the developer has proposed in this development agreement and why the City Council made its recommendation to not approve Silverado's original proposal for an assisted living facility at this location.

BRENNAN clarified that the development agreement is for clustered housing, and only what is allowed in the code could be developed. He continued the interpretation is an administration action that has a separate process, and has determined what would be allowed to be developed in this zone. Niven replied that is correct. The applicant is looking at this project as a home-building

Development Commission
7-20-16

opportunity and not necessarily as an assisted living development project. BRENNAN asked what is the public's ability to weigh in with comments on this project. Wright explained the process leading from the development agreement to the preliminary plat application to construction review of the final plat.

The Commissioners discussed the inclusion of a banquet hall in the development agreement proposal, including whether parking would be available were the banquet hall to be used for, say, a wedding. Niven noted that the City's code would address issues of housing size, parking requirements, size of the banquet facility, and so on, and would be addressed during the land use review. Mullin said we are not tied to the concept of including a banquet facility; our idea was to include it as an amenity for residents. HARRISON asked for clarification of what is being required of the Commission tonight. Niven replied the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on proceeding with a development agreement for clustered housing with Silverado. If that recommendation is upheld by the Council, we will move forward with the preliminary plat process, which will include SEPA review, HPA and Army Corps of Engineers review, mitigation for crossing Tibbetts Creek, and so on.

The Commission continued its discussion of the type of housing the applicant could propose on the site and whether the use could change in, say, 20 years. SOWA clarified that the request is to recommend approval for the City to enter into a development agreement with Silverado to develop housing in keeping with the constraints of the City's zoning and other regulations. Niven confirmed that yes, the application in front of the Commission is for clustered housing, and added it is being submitted by the developer in response to the City Council's decision that their original proposal for assisted housing is not allowed under the SF-E zone. He added from the City's perspective, all kinds of housing are badly needed in the City, and this opportunity to receive two affordable housing units from the developer would be an asset for the City.

Commission Decision

HARRISON noted there will be lots of opportunity for debate and comment before a final decision is made about this project, which will be the responsibility of elected officials. Given that, he continued, he feels comfortable with the Commission proceeding with a recommendation to the Council on the development agreement.

MOVED BY BRENNAN, SECONDED BY MORGAN that the Development Commission recommend approval to the City Council of a clustered development agreement between the City of Issaquah and Silverado for 9 lots of clustered development, with 2 lots to be deeded to the City for future affordable housing units, for uses allowed within the SF-E zone, and to be generally consistent with the draft agreement, attachments, and exhibits in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2016, including the three conditions listed on pages 8-9 of the Staff Report. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to conduct, SOWA adjourned the meeting at 10:47 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lowe
Recording Secretary

Development Commission
7-20-16

(Note: Alternate Members participated in, but did not vote on, decisions at tonight's meeting as there was a quorum of Regular Members present.)