CITY OF ISSAQUAH
PLANNING POLICY COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 27, 2017

City Hall South
Council Chambers

135 E. Sunset Way
Issaquah, WA 98027

PPC MEMBERS PRESENT
Carl Swedberg, Vice Chair
Ron Faul
Joy Lewis
Troy Rahmig
Jon Stob

STAFF PRESENT
Trish Heinonen, Long-Range Planning Manager
Christen Leeson, Senior Planner
Dave Favour, Project Manager
Kurt Seemann, Transportation Manager

OTHERS PRESENT
Stacy Goodman, City Council President

CALL TO ORDER

SWEDBERG, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM. He noted that election of officers is being delayed until June when new members and alternates can be present and participate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED BY FAUL, SECONDED BY LEWIS that minutes of the PPC meeting on April 13, 2017 be approved as presented. MOTION CARRIED BY THE UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL PPC MEMBERS PRESENT.

SWEDBERG introduced Stacy Goodman, City Council President, who thanked PPC for its recent memo to Council following its review of the 2016 Comp Plan amendments, specifically comments on state growth targets, service/infrastructure, and provision level of service; the City's affordable housing strategy; and community sustainability indicators. She thanked PPC for all its contributions to the City, and described staff's ongoing work on the Comp Plan updates, including the methodology used. The following is an excerpt from a memo (memo is attached, in full, to these minutes) to PPC from Council that Goodman read aloud:

> I would like to note in particular that the Council was not aware that you were working from aged rate studies. Thank you for pointing this out to the Council. It is my understanding that City staff is reviewing all impact and mitigation fee rate studies, ages, and data-input needs, and will be making a recommendation later this year to the Council regarding how to prioritize and schedule any fee-study updates that are needed. The 2017 budget and work plan include updates to the Parks, Traffic and Non-Motorized impact fees, and the General Government Cost Allocation Plan. It may be necessary to incorporate funding and staff time into the 2018 budget and work plan for other updates next year. Also, the Council may consider asking the Administration to include an aging schedule in future budgets to ensure the Council is kept current on the need for updates. Most of your other comments and concerns regarding infrastructure keeping pace with development, growth targets, sustainability indicators, affordable housing, etc., are topics of interest to the Council and included in discussions this year as part of the moratorium.

PUBLIC HEARING: Olde Town Subarea Plan Update

Favour made staff's presentation on the Olde Town Subarea Plan Update. He said tonight staff intends to show the Commission the results of public outreach on the proposed update, a review of the plan, a summary of the electronic survey results, the overall plan format, and changes since the April 13 meeting. Staff then proposes that PPC ask questions of staff, hear from the public,

have a discussion, and then, if the Commission feels comfortable doing so, make a recommendation.

Favour discussed the process timeline, including activities from 2014 to the present and activities scheduled for 2018. He continued with a summary of the open houses held as part of public outreach, beginning in May 2016. He gave results from the electronic survey (456 electronic responses, 21 paper responses), including what people did and did not favor in terms of residential single-family housing, including design, garages, accessory dwelling units, additional density, and so on. He gave results from survey questions on what design and type of buildings are favored on Front Street; what land uses would be favored on East Sunset Way; and traffic concerns in Olde Town.

Favour continued his presentation with an overview of the Olde Town Plan, which was adopted in 1999 and updated to remove references to the bypass in 2009. He continued with a description of the elements in the plan, including new additions in this iteration, and key topics in each chapter. He showed highlights of elements that are new since the April 13 PPC meeting. New pieces include changes to the Vision, Goals and Policies; introduction; guiding principles; definitions; maps; and discussions.

Leeson continued staff's presentation on the revised Old Town Community Vision. She said staff has tried to eliminate redundancies, such as Policy A-5, which was merged into the item just above it. She gave other examples of how redundancies were eliminated in the revised version of the plan, as well as modifications made as a result of the Commission's discussion at the April 13 meeting. She showed a map that identifies neighborhoods within Olde Town.

Seemann continued staff's presentation on connectivity and mobility, referring to Exhibit C beginning on page 32 of 49. He said staff's proposed changes are intended to reduce redundancy and repetition, and increase clarity. He went through the strike-through version beginning with the Vision and Goals A, B, and C (revised Goal C replaces Goal D and E).

Favour continued with proposed changes to chapter on Environment. SWEDBERG asked for clarification about the version of E Policy A-1 being shown on the screen. Favour noted the version being presented tonight is the latest version, developed since the agenda packet was sent. He continued with the proposed changes to the chapter on Economic Vitality.

Leeson presented the proposed changes to the chapter on Housing, noting that the new version has an emphasis on small-scale, residential neighborhoods, in keeping with the results of the survey. She continued her presentation on the goals and policies in the Housing chapter. She gave an outline of the next steps in the process of reviewing and approving this update, leading to projected Council action on June 19, 2017.

Commission Questions
LEWIS asked about "Old" vs. "Olde". Heinonen said staff's practice in working on the update has been to use "Olde" when referring to the established, original plan adopted in 1999 and amended in 2009 because that is the way it appears in the original documents, and "Old" when referring to the new proposed update. LEWIS asked whether that change has been established as a City policy. Heinonen said no, and the Commission can make a recommendation on keeping the "e" in Olde or not keeping it.

LEWIS spoke in favor of separating Amendment 1, updating the elements of the Olde Town Subarea Plan, and Amendment 2, Boundary Change (page 47 of 49) into two actions by the Commission tonight. She noted from her recollection, the Commission has not heard much from

staff or had any discussion about the proposed boundary change. She continued that there seems to be a compression of the area within Olde Town that is concerning to her, and from her understanding of feedback from the public, it would be a concern for the public as well. She said that other than a recommendation from the Old Town Task Force, she couldn't recall receiving any information from staff to the Commission on this issue.

FAUL asked what is the motivation to change the boundary. Leeson replied the task force said that, in its view, Olde Town doesn't really start until you get to Dogwood Street, and the Creek seems to create a natural boundary. FAUL asked for clarification of what that change would mean. Heinonen said without the change, the Staples property would be partially in Olde Town and partially in Central Issaquah, and staff thought this was a way to be more logical and make the creek the border between Olde Town and Central Issaquah. She noted the Commission may elect to make a different recommendation as part of its deliberations tonight.

The Commissioners gave their perceptions of how the property in question would function as a northern gateway to Olde Town and the advantages/disadvantages of changing the boundary. RAHMIG said the explanation from staff has helped him understand why the change is being proposed. FAUL said he is favoring leaving it as part of Olde Town; otherwise, it would be part of Central Issaquah, and would create a situation where there are two competing visions right next to each other. LEWIS said she questions why the City would want to shrink this boundary, as this area is important to the heart of our City, and is confused as to the motivations of why this change should take place.

LEWIS continued her comments on OTC Policy C-2 on page 29 of 49, noting that the language "consider reducing" is weak and should be stronger. She said she understands that the code will have more specifics, but the policy should state something like "shall not exceed the height of buildings alongside them." FAUL suggested "limit building height to three stories." LEWIS noted there are references elsewhere in this document to preserving view corridors, and this should be consistent with those references.

She continued on OTC Policy C-3, the reference to "quality materials" seems innocuous and not concrete enough. Leeson suggested staff add "such as…" and give examples, which is done elsewhere in the document.

RAHMIG referred to OTC Goal C, on page 28 of 49 ("Maintain the traditional character and scale of the Cultural Business District and Sunset Neighborhood while allowing these areas to evolve and grow." He said the last few sentences of that goal seem to be almost value judgments that do not really belong. Heinonen agreed, and said this language is being put forward because it determines what will go into code. Staff will take another look at it.

FAUL asked about the name "CBD" on the map. Heinonen noted this is not a zoning map, and it names the cultural and business neighborhoods of Issaquah as "CBD." Leeson gave examples of why this area is a cultural part of Issaquah.

LEWIS said on page 29 of 49, OTC Policy B-2 should be struck completely ("Establish maximum parking requirements and consider lessening minimum parking requirements, as found in Central Issaquah, to help maintain the character of the area…"). She said she was not in favor of allowing businesses to provide less parking than what is required, and gave examples of parking along Front Street and in Olde Town from her experience.

PUBLIC COMMENT
SWEDBERG opened the meeting for public comment at 7:41 PM.

Chris Craven, 580 Front Street South, Issaquah, expressed his dissatisfaction with the significant public properties, schools, community center, community swimming pool, and green spaces that are missing from the Olde Town map displayed tonight. She said the northern gateway to Olde Town should get equal treatment with the southern gateway, and gave her perception of how gateways function for visitors. She said she agrees with the survey respondents who said that addressing regional traffic is critical.

Lindsey Walsh, 3065 NE Harrison Drive, Highlands resident, Issaquah, said she agrees with keeping the property changes as they are and not changing them. She spoke about the opportunity at Front Street and Gilman to have signage there indicating that the site is a gateway to Olde Town. She said she agrees with LEWIS' comments on the proposed parking revision. She said staff may want to reconsider the references to traffic calming strategies (C&M Policy B-1) as the respondents in the community survey disagreed. She said on page 34 of 49, C&M Policy C-3.d, you may want to suggest only requiring "weather protection over pedestrian streets" in the CBD as they are now integrated into the City's Streetscape Plan. On page 44 of 49, she suggested how the Commission might recommend a way for the City to encourage development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

Steve Pereira, 170 NW Dogwood Street, Issaquah, spoke in favor of retaining the "e" in Olde Town. He continued with his thoughts on the proposed boundary change, which he thinks could worsen traffic and presents more negatives than positives. He gave comments on the section on bicycle facilities and stormwater. He said economic vitality is important but it has to be balanced with livability standards, and gave examples. He said the section on small-scale cottage-type housing needs to be fleshed out. ADUs will require additional parking. He said he was concerned that weather protection on Front Street could create more problems with people smoking within 25 feet of entrances. He said the language on policies such as building heights should be stronger, and favors a two-story height restriction in Olde Town.

Andrew Turner, 260 N. Alder Street, Issaquah, said he has a young family that prefers a safe, walkable neighborhood and also likes having easy access to restaurants and businesses on Front Street. He spoke in favor of allowing homeowners in Olde Town freedom in their own design aesthetic as opposed to legislating what homeowners can and cannot do. He said he recognizes that developers have different incentives, and supports different design standards for developers. He noted his family walks to school every day and favors anything that would ease traffic and congestion and promote safety. He spoke about the need to better define "small scale" in the Housing section and the need to identify where the gaps referred to in C&M Policy A1.e exist ("Complete gaps and enhance existing incomplete connections throughout Olde Town"). He also agreed that "Olde" helps promote an authentic sense of place and should be retained.

Jennine Bingham, 375 S. Andrews Street, Issaquah, agreed that keeping "Olde" is important, and noted that the meaning of the word "olde" is "quaint." She said she has been a resident of Issaquah since 1969, and gave details of her experience living in the City in the 1970s through the present. She said she spent some time over the weekend trying to get the public survey into the hands of senior residents in Olde Town who are not inclined to use the City's Web site, and described her difficulties in doing so. She said she was able to submit 21 additional completed surveys as a result of her efforts. She said staff should reach out and work with the people most affected by cut-through traffic, rather than do a survey of City residents as a whole, many of whom are just interested in getting where they want to go and do not live in Olde Town. She said she also didn't think it was right for the City to consider dropping "Olde" in favor of "Old" without a vote of the people.

Mary Lynch, 2690 NW Oakcrest Drive, Issaquah, noted she was a Central Issaquah task force member. She explained her concerns about the proposed boundary change and said she favors not changing it. She described the other elements she would like to see on the Olde Town map. She expressed concern that multi-modal trails and sidewalks need to include provisions for people who use motorized chairs. She suggested the use of permit stickers for Olde Town residents that would allow them to park on neighborhood streets, as many other cities do. She expressed her concern about stormwater, noting that trees have been taken off Front Street, which impacts not only stormwater but walkability. Those trees need to be put back, she continued, as well as promoting green roofs and rain gardens. She said the Issaquah School District should have been a partner in this plan. She discussed the need to account for mobile homes and tiny homes, co-housing, and aging in place. She said the City needs to look at all of its underlying codes to be sure they are current and reflect best practices.

Mel Morgan, Jr., 4018 240th Place SE, Issaquah, and member of Development Commission, said the parking requirements across the City are all the same except for the CBD, and gave the specific requirements for the CBD. He suggested looking at the City's parking standards before deleting the policy in the Olde Town Subarea Plan that speaks to parking.

Connie Marsh, Squak Mountain resident, agreed with previous speakers about language that is too weak. She said the map is incomplete and does not reflect any particular vision or concept for the future. She spoke about her vision of what Olde Town should be in 20 or 30 years, and said it should not be allowed to languish. She said she agrees with a previous speaker about allowing homeowners flexibility in designing homes in Olde Town. Other comments included axial views must be protected from public areas; better clarification of what is meant by wayfinding; her perception that the public has indicated they do want retail on Sunset, but they want small and not large commercial retail; the plan doesn't include adequate maintenance policies for landscaping and streets; cut-through traffic is not well defined; and the "expedited review" referred to in EV Policy C3 appears to be old language and needs clarification.

Hearing no additional requests to speak, SWEDBERG closed the opportunity for public comment at 8:26 PM.

Commissioner Discussion
FAUL said he feels the Commission may not be ready to vote on the proposed update tonight, and that further discussion is needed.

LEWIS asked why the needs of the homeless and very low-income population are not addressed in the Housing section. Heinonen explained a subarea plan such as this one only contains policies that are specific to that subarea. Policies that apply citywide, such as tree canopy, sustainability, and affordable housing, are located in the City's overarching Comprehensive Plan.

RAHMIG asked staff to speak to comments made during public comment on the map. Leeson said the map was only intended to indicate different neighborhoods within the subarea and was not intended to show all public spaces, view corridors, and so on. RAHMIG said he understands it is a reference map only, and asked about identifying all the gateway points to Olde Town on the map. Heinonen said staff can do that. STOB said he thought the general concern expressed that the southern half of Olde Town was not being well depicted on the map is valid. He said in his view, a comprehensive map should be on the first page or two of the plan, and should lay out the different areas and the vision for each.

FAUL suggested adding language to the Housing section, H Policy A1, "Establish architectural standards that help ensure new and redevelopment is constructed in the same traditional style and

scale as the existing Small Scale residential Neighborhoods," as follows: "Including front yard setbacks and landscaping, dedicated entry walkways, main entry locations, garage placement and porches." He added putting more specific language into the policy will help us define more accurate code.

LEWIS agreed, and said she also would like to see "small scale" better defined. She also said using the word "consider" is an issue in H Policy A3. SWEDBERG asked whether the reference to "traditional materials" in H Policy A3 should list specific materials. Heinonen said to avoid scattering the list of materials throughout the policy, a list of traditional materials appears in the discussion of Housing Goal A and applies to all of the policies that follow.

STOB asked how small scale will be defined. Heinonen referred to the discussion of cottage housing at PPC's April 13 meeting, and noted that cottage housing typically has common yards, shared parking facilities, and so on. STOB said his concern is with ensuring a variety of square footages and a mix of appropriate sizes, including small-, medium-, and large-size cottage housing. LEWIS said she also is thinking of tiny homes, which are typically enclosed structures that may or may not have shared areas. Heinonen said staff will work on that.

FAUL suggested changing "consider limiting" to just "limit" on H Policy A3.

LEWIS said the wording of H Policy C1 ("Require ground floor cultural and/or retail uses in mixed-use buildings…") seems excessively "flowery" and doesn't seem to achieve the goal of encouraging mixed use and discouraging a retail-type appearance at street level. Staff made a note of it.

RAHMIG noted that EV Policy C1 would appear to be in conflict with a policy to limit parking on Sunset, and if it only applies to the CBD, staff might want to qualify how it is stated.

FAUL asked about the inclusion of a policy that addresses p-patches and flower gardens. Heinonen replied that policy already exists in the City's Green Necklace policy.

FAUL suggested that the Commission consider adding language to address bus shelters. He said his concern is that covered shelters should reflect Olde Town, and are placed in a thoughtful way that fits into the architectural character of Olde Town. Otherwise, the City may just have to accept whatever shelters Metro Transit decides to install, he said. He said he has photos available for viewing that illustrate his design concerns. Heinonen said the photos would be more appropriate in the design standards than in this plan. LEWIS suggested staff use the photos as a reference point and said she appreciated FAUL's research.

LEWIS said the language on bicycle facilities in C&M Policy C should include language that says such facilities should be integrated into the Olde Town neighborhood and fit with the community.

LEWIS noted C&M Policy E2 is crossed out except one line on page 35 of 49. Leeson noted that line has been moved to C&M Policy C5 on the previous page, and made a note of it.

LEWIS asked for clarification of OTC Policy D2 on page 39 of 49, which seems to encourage lessening of parking requirements. Heinonen explained that onstreet parking is considered public parking; private parking is regulated by City Code, including minimums and maximums that must be provided. She continued as a result of the moratorium, the Council has asked staff to look at parking in Central Issaquah, and a consultant is working on that now. We will be using that work to see what could apply to Olde Town as well, she added.

LEWIS said on page 41 of 49, EV Policy B2, she favors stronger language than just "develop strategies" ("Develop strategies, such as concealment of new infrastructure, to balance potential aesthetic negative impacts to the historic character of Olde Town"). Heinonen explained that the City is partnering with other Eastside cities on a consortium to make sure the cities have a role in determining the placement and appearance of infrastructure for current and new WiFi and cell service. One of those strategies is concealment, she added, which is why it is specified in the policy. STOB added of course we don't want to prohibit infrastructure from locating in the City because it is potentially very beneficial. Heinonen agreed. RAHMIG suggested dropping "WiFi" and just stating "internet connectivity and cell service."

RAHMIG asked about the comment made during public comment about accommodating motorized chairs. Seemann said the City would be prohibited from constructing any sidewalk that was not ADA compliant and accessible.

RAHMIG noted there seems to be some repetition on page 37 of 49 in E Policy B3 and E Policy A4 about acquiring creek-side parcels. Staff made a note of it.

LEWIS asked whether the Olde Town Subarea Plan addresses the water plume from toxic chemicals associated with the older homes in the neighborhood. Heinonen said the City has a sewer and water comprehensive plan that is updated every five years, and that lists the infrastructure that needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Recommendation
MOVED BY FAUL that the Commission continue its discussion of the proposed Olde Town Subarea Plan Update to an upcoming PPC meeting, possibly in June. MOTION failed to receive a second.

The Commissioners discussed how to proceed with regard to the proposed boundary change.

MOVED BY LEWIS, SECONDED BY RAHMIG that the PPC recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment 1 updating elements regarding Olde Town Community, Connectivity and Mobility, Environment, and Economic Vitality, and adding a Housing element, as outlined in the Staff Report dated April 27, 2017, as amended by the comments, suggestions, and wording changes made by Commissioners at tonight's meeting, and including retaining "Olde" as the official name of Olde Town. (Amendment 2, Boundary Change, was not included in the motion.) MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT (FAUL voted in the minority).

OTHER/ADJOURN
Heinonen said the next PPC meeting will be May 11 at 5:00 PM, and will be the first meeting with new PPC members and alternates. With no additional business to conduct, SWEDBERG adjourned the meeting at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lowe
Recording Secretary

CITY OF
ISSAQUAH
WASHINGTON

Executive Office
130 E. Sunset Way | P.O. Box 1307
Issaquah, WA 98027
425-837-3020
issaquahwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Policy Commission, c/o Joan Probala, chair

From: Stacy Goodman, City Council President

Re: PPC's 10/13/16 memo re: Additional Recommendations related to the Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Date: April 27, 2017

I am writing on behalf of the City Council to thank you for PPC's additional recommendations related to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. A copy of your memo is attached.

Before responding to the substance of your memo, I first thank all of you for your hard work and thoughtful comments. The City and this community, and not just the City Council, relies on your dedicated work as a critical part of the decision-making process. Second, and as Chair of the Council's Land and Shore Committee this year, I acknowledge the frustration with reviewing the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, as it was lengthy and challenging. The 2016 amendments were adopted by the Council on March 20, 2017.

Your memo addressed three areas of recommendations: (A) State Growth Targets, Service/Infrastructure Provision, Level of Service, (B) City Affordable Housing Strategy and (C) Community Sustainability Indicators. Thank you for the recommendations.

I would like to note in particular that the Council was not aware that you were working from aged rate studies. Thank you for pointing this out to the Council. It is my understanding that City staff is reviewing all impact and mitigation fee rate studies, ages, and data-input needs, and will be making a recommendation later this year to the Council regarding how to prioritize and schedule any fee-study updates that are needed. The 2017 budget and workplan include updates to the Parks, Traffic and Non-Motorized impact fees, and the General Government Cost Allocation Plan. It may be necessary to incorporate funding and staff time into the 2018 budget and workplan for other updates next year. Also, the Council may consider asking the Administration to include an aging schedule in future budgets to ensure the Council is kept current on the need for updates.

Most of your other comments and concerns regarding infrastructure keeping pace with development, growth targets, sustainability indicators, affordable housing, etc., are topics of interest to the Council and included in discussions this year as part of the moratorium. Thank you again for the thoughtful memo.

CITY OF
ISSAQUAH
WASHINGTON

Development Services
1775 – 12th Ave. NW | P.O. Box 1307
Issaquah, WA 98027
425-837-3100
issaquahwa.gov

October 13, 2016

To: City Council

From: Planning Policy Commission, Joan Probala, Chair

Re: Additional Recommendations related to the Comprehensive Plan Amendments

The Planning Policy Commission has been working on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan amendments since January. Our work was frustrating this year, as the data we need to make solid and thoughtful recommendations was not available. As such, in addition to our recommendation to move the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments forward, we are sending these additional recommendations for your consideration.

A. **State Growth Targets, Service/Infrastructure Provision and Level of Service**

Recommendations:

1. Ensure that the City provides adequate services to maintain the required level of service as specified in the Capital Facilities Element, and infrastructure, shown by the Transportation Improvement Program and accepted level of concurrency before and during permitting new growth for the community. Especially, do not grow past the State Targets before services and infrastructure is provided to the existing community.
2. Fund the updates of all impact fee and mitigation fee rate studies that are over three years old in the 2016 budget, and then update the rate studies at three-year intervals so that the data the City uses in its decision making and fee collection is current and accurate. For example, Police and General Government Buildings mitigation fee rate study was last updated in 2008, and the Fire Protection impact fee rate study was last updated in 2006.
3. Update the City's Capital Facility Plan, as using the most recent 2014-2019 Capital Facilities Plan to evaluate the City's Level of Service within the Capital Facilities Element is not accurate or helpful for decision making.

B. **City's Affordable Housing Strategy**

Recommendation:

Take a hard look at the City's strategy for affordable housing provision, including what incentives are offered by the City to create affordable housing, and find innovative ways to increase the City's affordable housing while our "market rate" housing stock increases.

C. **Community Sustainability Indicators**

Recommendation:

Update all Community Sustainability Indicators using community outreach as in original indicators project, as many need updated context given our community values and needs, plus additional indicators should be added. For example, the City should move toward mandatory composting or at least mandatory availability of composting.