



# PLANNING COMMISSION

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING

### MEETING SUMMARY

Special Meeting  
Thursday, October 27, 2016, 6:00pm  
City of Sammamish Council Chambers

### COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Frank Blau, *Pos. 6, Chair*  
Eric Brooks, *Pos. 1*  
Larry Crandall, *Pos. 4*  
Nancy Anderson, *Pos. 7*  
**Absent:** Shanna Collins, *Pos. 3, Vice-Chair*

### STAFF PRESENT

Jeff Thomas, Director – Community Development  
Tawni Dalziel, Senior Stormwater Program Manager  
Doug McIntyre, Senior Planner  
David Goodman, Management Analyst  
Tammy Mueller, Administrative Research Assistant

### CONSULTANTS PRESENT

Brittany Porter, AHBL

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Frank Blau called the Sammamish Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:02 pm.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Larry Crandall motioned; seconded – **Approved 4:0**  
The Agenda was approved as read.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** No minutes submitted for approval.

**Public Comment: Non-Agenda:** (3 Min Individual / 5 Min Representative)

[Bookmarked Video Link](#)

- Mary Wictor, 408 208th Ave. NE, Sammamish, WA
  - Topic: Tree removal & retention – public education

Time: 6:04pm

**Public Comment Closed**

### NEW BUSINESS

**Comprehensive Plan Amendments – 2017 Docket – Work Session**

Doug McIntyre, Senior Planner and David Goodman, Management Analyst presented a PowerPoint presentation ([link](#)) informing the Commission of the proposed items for the 2017 docket. Copies of the proposed docket items are located in the packet ([link](#)).

Staff and Commission commenced discussion:

- **Overview:** Sammamish Municipal Code (SMC) allows City to consider certain amendments types (text amendments & site-specific land use) to the Comprehensive Plan on an annual basis. Received 8 proposals: 4 from citizens, 4 from City.
- **Summary of Proposals:** A summary of each proposal was provided by the Staff. They can be found in the presentation and the packet.

- **Proposed Schedule:**
  - November 3: Planning Commission Public Hearing
  - November 15: City Council Public Hearing
  - January 15, 2017: Deadline for approved site-specific land use map amendment applicants to submit additional materials
  - 2017: Staff conduct full analysis on approved docket proposals, return to Planning Commission and City Council for deliberation
- **Commission gave the following comment:**
  - Clarification regarding whether the Maclean Family LLC property resides within Sammamish or Issaquah and whether this is the property that was affected by a recent fire.
    - Staff verified that it exists within Sammamish and it was affected by a fire.
  - Requested whether Staff have enough time to complete all docket items should all be added to the docket.
    - Staff clarified the docket procedure and replied that if items are added to the docket, they will then be analyzed further for feasibility and scheduled accordingly at the appropriate time.
  - Clarification of whether they are discussing the proposal merits or just feasibility at this stage.
    - Staff responded that feasibility is all that is required at this stage.
  - Requested whether the Staff understand the full scope of the work involved for each proposal at this stage.
    - Director responded that Staff does have the ability to process all proposed docket items in 2017 through the legislative process. Stated that all proposals have been inspected by legal counsel and do not conflict with other policies, nor are they illegal. He provided examples of items which would have been rejected, making it clear that the items presented to the Commission have been deemed acceptable.
  - Requested whether all proposed docket items will fit within the 2017 work program.
    - Director responded that the work program is currently under development but that it is feasible to address them all in 2017.
  - Requested the flexibility of the deadlines and whether some may be delayed until 2018.
    - Director replied that this is possible, though it is feasible for all to be addressed in 2017 and that they would be staggered throughout the year by proposal on the work program.
  - Requested whether an item denied previously could be added to the docket.
    - Staff replied that there is a time frame of several years where, if previously rejected, it cannot be added to the docket. None of the items proposed now have previously been denied.
  - Clarified whether zoning has to be done for public benefit, agreeing that it does.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Housing Element – Public Hearing**

Chair opened the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Housing Element.

*Doug McIntyre, Senior Planner* and *David Goodman, Management Analyst* presented a PowerPoint presentation ([link](#)) informing the Commission of the proposed amendments to the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan and requested the Commission's recommendation to the City Council for approval. Copies of the proposed amendments are located in the packet ([link](#)).

Staff and Commission commenced discussion:

- **Background:** The Growth Management Hearings Board determined that the Comprehensive Plan fails to make adequate provisions for existing and projected needs for all economic segments of the community, thus the Housing Element must be amended to comply by December 9, 2016.

- **Compliance:** Recommendations to comply include adding a summary of the 2012 KCCPPs guidance regarding the role of cities in helping to meet the countrywide need for affordable housing, an estimate of countrywide affordable housing need proportional to the City of Sammamish's growth targets, and amending the goals and policies to clarify and strengthen the City's commitment to meeting its responsibilities in helping to meet countrywide affordable housing needs.
- **Content:** Majority of revised language is based on text from a draft of the Housing Element which was recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council in 2015. The changes proposed for compliance with the Order include:
  - Measures to ensure that the county-wide need is addressed
  - Support for regional coordination
  - Provisions for monitoring
- **Compliance Scope:** RCW 36.70A (Growth Management) planning goals and mandatory comprehensive plan elements are discussed.
- **Proposed Schedule:**
  - October 27: Planning Commission Public Hearing
  - November 8: City Council Study Session
  - November 15: City Council Public Hearing, First Reading
  - December 6: City Council Second Reading, Adoption
  - December 9: Deadline to comply with GMHB order
  - January 2017: GMHB to assess compliance with order

### Public Hearing Comment – Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Housing Element (7 Minutes)

#### [Bookmarked Video Link](#)

- Mary Victor, 408 208th Ave. NE, Sammamish, WA Time: 6:46pm
  - Topic: Housing affordability vs. Affordable Housing; Housing Element Ordinance delayed to incorporate additional changes; Town Center
- Paul Stickney, 504 228th Ave. SE, Sammamish, WA Time: 6:49pm
  - Topic: Holistic view of the Housing Element within the Comprehensive Plan  
*Presentation: On Hold - Important: Housing Element Ordinance*
- Paul Quinn, 2714 232nd Place SE, Sammamish, WA Time: 6:57pm
  - Topic: Homeless population within Sammamish, Affordable Housing, economic diversity within Sammamish, increasing City contribution to ARCH

### Chair closed the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Housing Element.

### Deliberation of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Housing Element commenced:

- Stated that the Commission could look to ARCH more in the future for additional solutions to the points addressed in public comment and the public hearing, though this does not impact the Comprehensive Plan Amendments deliberated upon tonight. Gave assurances that future discussion for Affordable Housing will not end with the recommendation tonight.
- Regarding the consultant report in the packet, table 2: questioned whether there was a math error.
  - Staff replied that there was, they are aware of the error, and have already corrected it.
- Clarified that Affordable Housing and Low Income Housing are two different concepts.
  - Staff replied that they are, with Affordable Housing being based on local income medians.
- Requested whether this change would affect the Town Center.
  - Staff replied that the proposed amendment would affect the entire City, including Town Center, as the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan is a component of the Town Center Plan.
- Requested how the monitoring requirement would be implemented.
  - Staff clarified the process.
- Stated concern that Staff may not follow up with policy action items.
  - Staff explained that planners build the framework, such as the Housing Element, and do everything they can to implement the action items.
- Requested whether housing element action items would be included in the 2017 Docket.

- Staff replied that the docket is for small changes or error corrections to the Comprehensive Plan while broader policy issues are done under the 8-year periodic update. This amendment is an exception as it is to comply with the GMHB Order.
- Stated concern regarding the lack of immediate action plan and that previous opportunities to conduct a needs assessment or include one in the Housing Element seem to have not occurred.
- Referred to the explanation from the ARCH Consultant during the 10/20/2016 meeting, stating that the City's housing is unaffordable to most and the City is not in compliance with its affordable housing goals. Stated a desire to see this change occur rather than focusing on framework. Stated that policies should include language to recognize that the City cannot meet its goals locally, rather that the County's goals will need to be considered and occur regionally rather than city by city. To make housing affordability a reality in Sammamish, the City needs to be better able to manage what is being built by the developers and would be willing to explore amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element that would work to solve this problem rather than simply identifying it, as the Order does. Specifically, language pertaining to market need versus affordability is sought to be clarified.
- Stated the desire for a baseline to be indicated for current Sammamish figures versus goals.
  - Staff stated that they are looking at the growth target for 2035 in the Housing Element. They further explained that the breakdown of shares is on growth numbers as it is not accurate to look at the current stock. They are focusing on addressing affordable housing with future development.
- Stated that if the Town Center project is the City's only solution to affordable housing, it will have failed in 5 years for long-term goals. Stated that they need more action points to address this problem outside of the Town Center, especially the need for a more data-driven process followed by informed action plans.
- Requested to know how long the City has been underperforming or has been aware of the problem and done nothing.
  - Staff replied that Sammamish has 90% ownership properties where rental properties are more generally affordable housing options, thus explaining the City's underperformance.
- Inquired as to whether the annexation of Klahanie, which includes rental properties, was taken into account with the Housing Element figures.
  - Staff responded that it had.
  - Director provided background information into the Housing Element, stating that ARCH assisted with the needs analysis in its development and admitted that historically, the City has not done well with affordable housing. However, projects are moving forward with ARCH's assistance to increase performance. Numerous ideas are included within the Comprehensive Plan to implement policy. In-between updates, planners facilitate these policies. The City creates a list of work items based on these policies and recommendations. Since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2015, this is year 1 of the so work is still being done behind the scenes and will begin showing up on the work program for 2017. Public comment provided may yet influence this work.
- Inquired as to whether suspending the adoption of the ordinance was possible.
  - Director stated that it was not an option provided to the City by the GMHB and it is not recommended by the City. Appeal is an option but suspending is not.
- Larry – Goal H6 monitoring will be strong. Once policies and goals are in place, this section will allow for their monitoring.
  - Director suggested that after the GMHB finds that Sammamish has complied with the Order, that Art Sullivan, ARCH representative, present to the Commission again to discuss implementation of policies and monitoring.
- Questioned whether the City could commit to regular updates coming to the City Council.
  - Director stated that it is likely they can commit.
- Stated approval regarding a monitoring process being added to the language.
- Requested clarity regarding whether policy would explicitly enable or disable the ability to perform additional tasks which have been requested, stating that current language appears to enable additional work.
- Requested the reason for the term “context sensitive” being stricken from the plan.

- Staff responded that the policy language was strengthened and made more direct by removing the term as it was a limiting factor.
- Commission stated the need to be internally consistent with the rest of the Comprehensive Plan, explaining that this language was added to help ensure consistency with other elements.
- Staff stated that actual regulations would be specific and that policy language should be as direct as possible with regulations filling any gaps to be specific.
- Requested whether monitoring had been done in the past regarding housing stock and whether current monitoring was taking place.
  - Staff stated that they would look into the matter, stating that monitoring is likely being done by state or federal agencies.
  - Commission stated that monitoring should be looked at regionally and stated the need to obtain the monitoring numbers.
  - Staff stated that this is a short-term item the City can look into in a current way now that the policy language has more teeth.
- Commission stated that the City could begin monitoring immediately, citing the concern that without monitoring combined with the rapid non-affordable housing development, opportunities are being lost without realizing it.
- Commission stated desire to use whether the majority of City Staff could afford to live in Sammamish as a metric for whether the City is meeting its affordable housing requirements. Would also like to know what percentage of teachers, police, etc. who work in Sammamish live in Sammamish, stating the need to know that number now in order to develop a plan towards fixing it, then evaluate every year and adjusting where necessary.
- Stated that currently, the needs of the community are unknown and that we are basing decisions off regional numbers rather than local. Having the data to support plans and decisions is a must.
  - Staff stated that regional collaboration does assist with this as a collaborative approach is more effective, though agree that local data would be helpful.
- Stated that the Commission is not satisfied with the direction the City appears to be going but is satisfied with the current document before them, its direction, and addressing of concern.

**Motion to recommend adoption:** Larry Crandall motioned to recommend adoption; seconded. **Approved 4:0**

The Planning Commission made a recommendation to adopt the proposed amendments to the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan to bring it in compliance per the GMHB compliance order with the expectation that the City work toward better monitoring and policy creation to address the Commission's concerns.

Chair called for a short recess at 7:47pm. Resumed at 7:57pm.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Low Impact Development (LID) Code Amendments – Public Hearing**

Chair opened the public hearing on the Low Impact Development (LID) Code Amendments.

### **Public Hearing Comment – Low Impact Development (LID) Code Amendments (7 Minutes)**

[Bookmarked Video Link](#)

- Mary Wictor, 408 208th Ave. NE, Sammamish, WA Time: 8:00pm
  - Topic: Compaction, site prep, drainage review requirements, height restrictions, weed barriers, landscaping, stricter monitoring requirements, metals leaching into stormwater

**Chair closed the public hearing on the Low Impact Development (LID) Code Amendments.**

Deliberation of the LID Code Amendments commenced:

- Noted that not all public comment had been responded to in the deliberation table and requested whether Staff were still thinking to implement these items.

- Staff responded that they were, though some points would need to be addressed under the King County Surface Water Design Manual, not the LID Code Amendments.
- Chair read Vice-Chair's prepared comments in her absence, requesting that SMC 21A.36 and 21A.35 6A-6E be removed.
  - Staff responded that 6A-6E concerns ground cover types in parking lots which the Commissioners feel do not align with the proposed LID requirements for bio-retention, though bio-retention is not the only form of LID BMP which could be utilized, citing other options. By removing 6A-6E, the code would essentially mandate that parking lots utilize bio-retention as the only LID BMP available.
  - Commission clarified Staff comments whether the trade-off was A-E or F.
  - Consultant replied that there could be a mix of A-E for parking lots which use bio-retention.
  - Commission requested whether percentages of techniques were taken into account to stipulate how much of one technique could be utilized.
  - Consultant stated that bio-retention requirements are based on size according to the manual, not percentages.
  - Commission requested clarity regarding the landscape section which references parking as well.
  - Staff offered to add language to clarify that bio-retention is an option for LID BMPs in parking lots.
  - Commission stated that the section does not appear to relate, requesting this relationship be clarified.
  - Staff suggested adding language to the section heading. Also clarified the cafeteria menu options of the KCSWDM.
  - Consultant stated that the intent of adding F and the design criteria for bio-retention was to close the gap where bio-retention was required but would need to adhere to standards that don't line up with LID. This was so if adhering to the KCSWDM, the code doesn't prohibit one from implementing the LID techniques.
  - Commission stated that it will consider this but that it seemed counter-productive when attempting to promote alternative LID options. Stated understanding that parking lots are a special case, though their impact is also something that should not be ignored. Requested language to show the intention of the LID requirements.
  - Staff suggested adding language indicating that LID BMPs should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible in parking lots and that landscaping items could have a list which they must consist of, though want to ensure that influence over bio-retention is kept rather than just landscaping.
  - Commission suggests re-arranging the order of 6A-E.
  - Staff suggested adding language to section 6 to clarify and address the Commission's concerns.
- Commission stated that the 2:1 ratio of coniferous to deciduous trees seemed good, however the current language is reversed from what was previously discussed.
  - Staff suggested changing the language to specify that at least 70% of trees be coniferous versus deciduous. Stated that this code was not changed as part of these LID code amendments but could be.
  - Chair reminded of original intent that coniferous trees are likely not to thrive in parking lots where deciduous do.
  - Staff provided examples of new techniques from current research which assist with tree survival and growth within parking lots, possibly allowing for coniferous trees to survive, though these techniques do add additional cost to projects.
  - Commission expressed hope that tree selection would be addressed in the upcoming Urban Forestry Program.
  - Commission stated that a 2:1 coniferous : deciduous ratio should be stated.
  - Staff requested clarity on whether the language should allow this or require this.
  - Commission clarified "allow".
  - Staff suggesting striking 6E entirely to allow developers to select the percentage of tree type for themselves.
  - Commission requested the intention of 6E as it currently is.

- Staff explained that coniferous trees reduce runoff. If 6E is stricken using 100% deciduous trees would not support LID.
- Commission stated that if there is an opportunity in the Urban Forest Management plan to allow for change to this section, then the issue can wait to be addressed then. For now, they request that 70% be changed to 50%.
- Staff stated that they will change the language to reflect that 50% of trees in parking lots should be deciduous.
- Questioned whether the intention regarding watershed will be captured.
  - Staff replied that the drainage review core requirement is to look at the location of discharge. Staff inspect the site which creates the watershed context for a site-specific project. There is nothing in the SMC to address this in terms of site design.
  - Commission requested whether “natural discharge location” or other similar language are in SMC.
  - Staff responded that if it is, it would be located in Title 13 or the KCSWDM.
  - Commission requested clarification for whether the natural discharge location would be in a watershed context.
  - Staff replied that it would and would work to locate it.
- Regarding the deciduous tree requirement, stated that 50% of trees should be coniferous, not deciduous, though remarked that there is currently not enough information available to determine whether 50% is possible in a parking lot context. Suggest striking E completely until data is obtained which would specify a better percentage recommendation.
  - Commission also recalled that Staff had mentioned that deciduous trees can have value in parking lots.
- Commission addressed heavy metal introduction into watershed via runoff, asking whether there was any data regarding this.
  - Staff stated that the use of LID BMPs would help to reduce the impact of pollutants to surface waters. Regarding water runoff from rooves with galvanized nails, LID BMPs would help filter these so pollutants, thus the matter is addressed.
  - Commission requested figures on how effective the filtering is.
  - Staff stated that the KCSWDM has some modeling to show that a certain amount of surface water will get into the ground while some will run off.
  - Commission asked whether there were attempts to limit the use of certain materials, either with mitigation or restriction.
  - Staff stated that they would need to include metal-leaching rooves as a pollutant, then list mitigation requirements which is outside of the LID code amendments being discussed tonight.
  - Commission stated satisfaction that there is a characteristic in the context of LID amendments, though would like to see this addressed further in the future.
- Staff stated that the intent of 6E is to reduce runoff from new developments and suggested changing the language to include at least 50% of coniferous trees in parking lots while the rest could be deciduous.
  - Commission asked whether these percentages count strictly for trees or whether it considers shrubs as well?
  - Staff responded that it is strictly trees.
  - Consultant stated that shrubs need to be evergreen, not deciduous.
  - Commission recommended language to require herb coverage instead.
  - Staff stated that that is outside of the scope of the LID code update, though they can revisit these ideas at another time.
  - Regarding 6E, the Commission stated that they would support changing the language to 50% coniferous.
- Commission recommended restructuring section 6 to address Vice-Chair’s concerns.
  - Staff stated that this was possible.
  - Commission stated that they accept the explanation for why other decisions were made but request that section 6 be restructured to better show its intent.
  - Staff stated that they will include intent language for section 6.

**Motion to recommend adoption:** Larry Crandall motioned to recommend adoption; seconded. **Approved 4:0**

The Planning Commission made a recommendation to adopt the proposed LID code amendments with the exception of the discussed revisions to Section 6.

**Motion to recommend amendment:** Eric Brooks motioned to amend Section 6E to state that 50% of trees must be coniferous; seconded. **Approved 4:0**

**Motion to recommend amendment:** Chair Blau motioned to amend Section 6 to change the order of subsections to better convey their intent. **Approved 4:0**

**Public Comment – Agenda (7 Minutes)**

No public comment provided.

**Public Comment Closed**

**Motion to Adjourn:** Larry Crandall motioned to adjourn; seconded. **Approved 4:0**

Meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.

Chair: Frank Blau

PC Coordinator: Tammy Mueller

[Video Audio Record 10/27/2016](#)

*Roberts Rules of Order applied: [RONR (10<sup>TH</sup> ed.), p. 451, 1. 25-28]*