



2017 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Regular Meeting Date: 03.15.2017

Planning Commission
Meeting:

First Wednesday of every
Month @ 7:00pm

Planning & Community
Development Department

1812 Main Street
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
(425) 377-3235

www.lakestevenswa.gov

Municipal Code

Available online:

www.codepublishing.com/WA/LakeStevens/

*Items attached

**Items previously
distributed

Items to be
distributed

- A. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:00pm**
Pledge of Allegiance
- B. **ROLL CALL**
- C. **GUEST BUSINESS**
- D. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - 1. Approval of February 15, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- E. **PUBLIC HEARING:**
 - 1. LUA2016-0171-Docket Ratification

Public hearing presentation will follow the public hearing format listed below:

PUBLIC HEARING FORMAT

- 2. PC Chair Opens Public Hearing
- 3. Staff Presentation
- 4. Commission's questions for staff
- 5. Proponent's comments
- 6. Comments from the audience
- 7. Proponent rebuttal comments
- 8. Close public comments portion of hearing by motion
- 9. Re-open public comment portion of hearing for additional comments (optional)
- 10. Close Hearing by motion
- 11. **COMMISSION ACTION BY MOTION—Recommendation to Council**
 - A. Approve
 - B. Deny
 - C. Continue

- F. **DISCUSSION ITEMS-**
- G. **Breifing- Stormwater Manual- Senior Planner Pratschner**
- H. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS**
- I. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT—**
- J. **ADJOURN**

SPECIAL NEEDS

The City of Lake Stevens strives to provide accessible opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Please contact Steve Edin, City of Lake Stevens ADA Coordinator, at (425) 377-3227 at least five business days prior to any City meeting or event if any accommodations are needed. For TDD users, please use the state's toll-free relay service,

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Community Center
1808 Main Street, Lake Stevens
Wednesday, 15, 2017

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 pm by Chair pro-tem Vicki Oslund

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janice Huxford, Tracey Trout, Vicki Oslund, Linda Hoult

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jennifer Davis

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Russ Wright, Senior Planner Stacie Pratschner, and Clerk Jennie Fenrich

OTHERS PRESENT: Sally Jo Sebring

Excused Absence: Commissioner Hoult made a motion to excuse Commissioner Jennifer Davis. Commissioner Huxford seconded. Motion carried. 3-0-0-1.

Guest business. Sally Jo Sebring inquired if the recorded minutes could be posted to the website. Staff said they will see if we are able to.

Action Items:

1. *Approve Minutes of February 1, 2017 Meeting Minutes.* Commissioner Huxford requested the minutes include more details of the conversation that the Commissioners had regarding Community Development. Minutes were tabled until next meeting to include more of the discussion from the previous meeting.

Discussion Items:

1. Senior Planner Pratschner gave a presentation on the Amendments to the municipal code to adopt the 2012 Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Discussion followed. Community Development Director Wright reported this is a mandate by the State. All projects will be required to meet these requirements. Commissioner Huxford asked if any permits were in the works would they be subjected to the new regulations. The projects outstanding have until June 2020 to complete their project without having to conform to 2012 requirements.
2. Senior Planner Pratschner gave a briefing on permit extensions on subdivisions. City Council asked for provisions to be granted longer extension at the discretion of the Planning director. This is an opportunity to extend current subdivisions that were affected in the economic downturn.

Commissioner Reports-None

Planning Director Report:

Community Development Director Wright spoke to the changes around City Campus. He also reported that a team has been selected to design the Chapel Hill site that will house a library and Police Department. He also reported the next Downtown meeting will be February 7, 2017 and invited all to attend.

Adjourn. Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Huxford, seconded by Commissioner Trout. Motion carried 4-0-0-1. Meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Vicki Oslund Chair-pro tem

Jennie Fenrich, Clerk, Planning & Community Development

DRAFT



Staff Report
City of Lake Stevens Planning Commission

Public Hearing 2017 Docket Ratification
Date: March 15, 2017

Subject: 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification Public Hearing

Contact Person/Department: Stacie Pratschner / Senior Planner and Russ Wright / Community Development Director

ACTION REQUESTED: Hold a public authorization hearing on proposed Comprehensive Plan map and text amendments to determine if the proposals merit consideration on the 2017 Docket. If docketed, city staff will conduct additional analysis, based on the merits of the application compared to established review criteria, for review and recommendation by the Planning Commission and action by the City Council. This action is to set the 2017 Docket only and not a recommendation of approval or denial of any amendments.

SUMMARY: Public hearing to consider a city-initiated land use map amendment, concurrent area-wide rezone and Comprehensive Plan text amendments proposed for inclusion on the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.

BACKGROUND/ HISTORY:

Under the Growth Management Act, the City can amend its Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map once per year, with a few exceptions, through an annual docket process. The Comprehensive Plan provides a specific docket review process (Chapter 1, pages I-14 through I-20). A staff summary and analysis for each map and text proposal (Attachments 1-10) describe how each proposed amendment is consistent with the annual amendment and ratification criteria.

DISCUSSION:

Staff will begin by discussing the requirements for ratification specified in the Comprehensive Plan. Next, staff will summarize each of the proposed amendments, consistency with the ratification decision criteria, findings and recommendation. Staff has provided a recommendation for Planning Commission review on each project summary sheet. A space is included on each sheet for Planning Commission's recommendation as well.

If City Council ratifies the 2017 Docket, staff will provide a detailed analysis for each proposal to recommend if a proposal meets the criteria to grant or deny the request.

RECOMMENDATION:

Forward a recommendation to City Council designating which proposals should be ratified for inclusion on the 2017 Docket. Staff will prepare a letter of recommendation to the City Council for review and signature by the Commission Chair and Co-Chair

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Analysis Sheets

B. Maps (to be provided at hearing)



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

M-1 - Staff Summary
Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017
Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated map amendment and text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary	
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Chapter 2 Land Use Element – Figure 2.3 Land Use Map and associated text amendments.	
Proposed Change(s): City request to change the land use designation for four (4) parcels totaling approximately 4.14 acres adjacent to 99 th Avenue from Commercial and Mixed Use Neighborhood to Public / Semi-Public to support new civic buildings. The city will also process a concurrent area-wide, minor rezone to change the zoning designation of the four (4) subject parcels to the Public / Semi-Public zoning designation.	
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens	Property Location(s): 26 99 th Avenue NE, Lake Stevens, WA
Existing Land Use Designations	Proposed Land Use Designation
Commercial and Mixed Use	Public / Semi-Public
Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning District
Business District and Mixed Use Neighborhood	Public / Semi-Public

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: The proposed land use map change is not designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	

<p>2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed land use map change will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.</p>	X	
<p>3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Reapplications for reclassification of property reviewed as part of a previous proposal are prohibited, unless the applicant establishes there has been a substantial change of circumstances and support a plan or regulation change at this time. Discussion: The land use designation for the subject properties has not been considered previously.</p>	X	
<p>4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. By extension, this is a Planning and Community Development function.</p>	X	
<p>5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR</p>		X
<p>6. All of the following: a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND Discussion: the proposed minor land use map change meets the following selected goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use and Housing Elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2.1 provide sufficient land area to meet the projected needs for housing, employment and public facilities within the city of Lake Stevens; • Goal 2.2 Achieve a well-balanced and well-organized combination of residential, commercial, industrial, open space, recreation and public uses; • Goal 2.10 ensure that land uses optimize economic benefit and the enjoyment and protection of natural resources while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare; and • Goal 2.14 design and build a healthy community to improve the quality of life for all people who live, work, learn, and play within the city. 	X	

<p>b. The public interest would best be served by considering the proposal in the current year, rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. The city is not considering a subarea plan or other amendments for the property; therefore, there is not a need to postpone review of the request to ensure consistent land use designations in the area.</p>	X	
--	---	--

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-2 Staff Summary

Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017

Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Chapter 2 – Land Use Element
Proposed Change(s): City-initiated text amendment to modify the description of the Local Commercial land use designation in support of two (2) citizen-requested land use code amendments to permit car washes and mini-storage in the Local Business zoning designation along with other changes that may be identified to this element.
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: The proposed revision will support concurrent citizen-initiated requests to amend the land use code.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed revisions will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city evaluates amendments to the Comprehensive Plan annually to ensure appropriate projects are identified.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is a Planning and Community Development department function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X

<p>6. All of the following:</p> <p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND</p> <p>Discussion: The amendments will follow selected goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use and Economic Development Elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2.10 encourages the city to ensure that land uses optimize economic benefit and the enjoyment and protection of natural resources while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare. • Goal 6.4 encourages supporting employment growth in the city by developing zoning for employment/business areas that is flexible to support large employers; • Goal 6.8 encourages supporting businesses and job creation. 	X	
<p>b. The public interest is best served by considering the proposal in the current year rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-2 Staff Summary
Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017
Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Chapter 5 - Parks, Recreation & Open Space Element
Proposed Change(s): City-initiated request (LUA2017-0016) placeholder to add, describe and update the status of parks projects in Chapter 5 and on the Capital Project List.
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: The proposed revisions to Chapter 5 are not designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed revisions will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city evaluates amendments to the Capital Facilities plan annually to ensure appropriate projects are identified.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is a Planning and Community Development department function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X
6. All of the following:	X	

<p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND</p> <p>Discussion: The amendments will follow selected goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan's Park and Capital Facilities Element.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 5.1 provide a high-quality, diversified parks, recreation and open space system that provides recreational and cultural opportunities for all ages and interest groups; • Goal 5.5 maintain park facilities to maximize life of the facilities and to provide an attractive and pleasing environment for users; • Goal 5.6 the city recognizes that land is in high demand and that acquisitions must be pursued as quickly as possible to implement the community's vision concurrently with developing and improving existing facilities to achieve a high-quality and balanced park and recreation system; • Goal 9.4 provide needed capital improvements to maintain adopted levels of service. 		
<p>b. The public interest is best served by considering the proposal in the current year rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-3 Staff Summary

Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 28, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Chapter 8 - Capital Facilities Element
Proposed Change(s): Placeholder for city-initiated text amendments to add, update and describe park and road projects to the Capital Project List and 6-year Capital Improvement Plan, including:
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: The proposed revisions to Chapter 8 are not designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed revisions will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city evaluates amendments to the Capital Facilities plan annually to ensure appropriate projects are identified.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is a Planning and Community Development department function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X
6. All of the following:	X	

<p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND Discussion: The proposed amendments meet the following selected goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan’s Parks, Transportation and Capital Facilities Elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 5.1 provide a high-quality, diversified parks, recreation and open space system that provides recreational and cultural opportunities for all ages and interest groups; • Goal 5.5 maintain park facilities to maximize life of the facilities and to provide an attractive and pleasing environment for users; • Goal 5.6 the city recognizes that land is in high demand and that acquisitions must be pursued as quickly as possible to implement the community’s vision concurrently with developing and improving existing facilities to achieve a high-quality and balanced park and recreation system; • Goal 8.4 provide a transportation system that supports existing land uses and accommodates anticipated growth; • Goal 8.6 strive for continuous and long term expansions to the trail and pedestrian systems; • Goal 8.7 promote pedestrian and bicycle access to public facilities and centers. • Goal 8.17 maintain, preserve, and operate the existing transportation system in a safe and usable state; • Goal 9.4 provide needed capital improvements to maintain adopted levels of service; and • Goal 9.5 coordinate land use decisions and financial resources with a schedule of capital improvements to meet adopted level of service standards, measurable objectives. 		
<p>b. The public interest is be served by considering the proposal in the current year rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process. Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-4 Staff Summary
Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017
Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Appendices
Proposed Change(s): Update Appendix A – SEPA Addendum #10 to be prepared as environmental review for 2017 Docket
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: The preparation of a SEPA addendum will not be designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The SEPA addendum will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city reviews its Comprehensive Plan annually.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is a Planning and Community Development function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X
6. All of the following:	X	

<p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND</p> <p>Discussion: The SEPA addendum will fulfill the following selected goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan's Introductory Element.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1.1 provide for a consistent review and revision of the comprehensive plan; and • Goal 1.2 ensure that the city's comprehensive plan is consistent with state, regional and countywide planning policies and ensure each element is internally consistent. 		
<p>b. The public interest is best served by considering the proposal in the current year, rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-5 Staff Summary
Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017
Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Placeholder
Proposed Change(s): Placeholder to address any inconsistencies identified during the yearly docket review process.
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: Proposed placeholder updates are not designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed placeholder updates will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city reviews its Comprehensive Plan annually.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This a Planning and Community Development function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X
6. All of the following:	X	

<p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed amendments meet the following selected goals and policies of affected Elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1.1 provide for a consistent review and revision of the comprehensive plan; • Goal 1.2 ensure that the city’s comprehensive plan is consistent with state, regional and countywide planning policies and ensure each element is internally consistent; and • Others to be evaluated as needed 		
<p>b. The public interest is served by considering the proposal in the current year, rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket Ratification

T-6 Staff Summary

Lake Stevens City Council & Planning Commission

City Council Hearing Date: March 28, 2017

Planning Commission Hearing Date: March 15, 2017

SUBJECT: City-initiated text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary
Location in Comprehensive Plan: Updates to dates, covers, footers, the Executive Summary and the Table of Contents as needed.
Proposed Change(s): Updates to dates, covers, footers, the Executive Summary and the Table of Contents as needed.
Applicant: City of Lake Stevens Planning & Community Development

ANALYSIS: Annual amendments shall not include significant policy changes inconsistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan Element Visions and must meet the identified criteria included in Revisions and Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Section H.

Ratification Review – Decision Criteria	Yes	No
1. Is the proposed amendment appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan rather than implementation as a development regulation or program? Discussion: Proposed text updates are not designed to implement a development regulation or program.	X	
2. Is the proposed amendment legal? Does the proposed amendment meet existing state and local laws? Discussion: The proposed text updates will be reviewed against the current Comprehensive Plan and applicable state laws related to process and environmental review.	X	
3. Is it practical to consider the proposed amendment? Discussion: The city reviews its Comprehensive Plan annually.	X	
4. Does the City have the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposed amendment? Discussion: The Growth Management Act and the city’s Comprehensive Plan set a process to review annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This a Planning and Community Development function.	X	
5. Does the proposed amendment correct an inconsistency within or make a clarification to a provision of the Plan? OR		X

<p>6. All of the following:</p> <p>a. The proposed amendment demonstrates a strong potential to serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the Comprehensive Plan? AND</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed text updates fulfill the following selected goals and policies of affected Elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1.1 provide for a consistent review and revision of the comprehensive plan; • Goal 1.2 ensure that the city’s comprehensive plan is consistent with state, regional and countywide planning policies and ensure each element is internally consistent; and • Others to be evaluated as needed 	X	
<p>b. The public interest is served by considering the proposal in the current year, rather than delaying consideration to a later subarea plan review or plan amendment process.</p> <p>Discussion: The Comprehensive Plan sets a procedure for evaluating amendments annually. There is not a need to postpone review of the request.</p>	X	

Recommendation	Yes	No
Staff recommends City Council and the Planning Commission consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.	X	
The Planning Commission recommends City Council consider this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket (see attached recommendation letter).		
The City Council accepts this proposal for inclusion in the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket.		



Staff Report
City of Lake Stevens Planning Commission

Briefing
Date: **March 15, 2017**

Subject: **LUA2016-0171**: Amendments to the City of Lake Stevens Municipal Code to Adopt the 2012 DOE Stormwater Manual

Contact Person/Department: Stacie Pratschner, *Senior Planner* / Russ Wright, *Community Development Director*

SUMMARY: Amendments to the municipal code to adopt the 2012 Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.

ACTION REQUESTED OF PLANNING COMMISSION:

This is a briefing and no action is required.

BACKGROUND / HISTORY:

Under the Federal Clean Water Act, jurisdictions must implement stormwater management programs and regulations within prescribed time frames. The Department of Ecology (DOE) has been delegated authority by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to administer these regulations. The DOE issued the Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit (NPDES), effective August 1, 2013 through July 13, 2018, which requires local governments like the City of Lake Stevens to adopt the 2012 DOE Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.

A public hearing was held with the Planning Commission on January 4, 2017 to review the original scope of the proposed updates. A first reading and public hearing was held with the City Council on January 24, 2017, with a motion passed to continue the hearing and hold a second reading at a later date. Staff described the revised the scope of the required updates to the Planning Commission on February 15, 2017. These updates will need to include a closer review of municipal code regulations and ensure that the bulk and dimensional standards are not a barrier to implementing LID on development sites.¹

Planning and Public Works staff have completed the LID Summary Reporting Template provided by the Department of Ecology (**Exhibit 1**). Staff will be working on the following proposed edits to the LSMC in order to better implement LID principles in the city:

- A list of appropriate native/drought tolerant plants that may be used by developers to fulfill landscaping and screening requirements;
- Permit bio-retention facilities in lieu of landscape strips and islands;
- Amendments to minimum parking space dimensions to permit smaller parking pads and allow more compact car spaces; and

- Updates to both the city's Land Disturbance and Critical Areas regulations.

Staff issued a SEPA DNS on December 20, 2016 and sent the proposed amendments out for agency review. The city was granted expedited review from the Department of Commerce on January 4, 2017. Staff will re-issue SEPA pursuant to the new scope of work and coordinate with the Department of Commerce on any required additional review.

RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation required at this time.

REFERENCES:

1. AHBL for the Puget Sound Partnership.
2012 Integrating LID into Local Codes: A Guidebook for Local Governments. Tacoma:
Puget Sound Partnership.

EXHIBITS:

1. LID Code Requirements Report Template

LID Code-related requirements - Reporting Template

Name of Jurisdiction: **City of Lake Stevens**

Document Name: Code chapter, rules, standards, and other enforceable documents	Corresponding Page Number in the LID Guidebook for Local Governments	Section reference, date last updated, page number, etc	Name of Reviewer(s)	Action taken to meet Permit requirements	Describe/Note How Revision(s) made to meet permit requirements OR if No revision(s) was made to this document, explain why.	Measures to minimize:				
						Impervious surfaces	Impervious on	Native vegetation	Runoff	Stormwater
2015 - 2035 City of Lake Stevens Comprehensive Plan	Page 40: Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies	LID Goals and Policies in both the Environmental and Natural Resources Elements (Chapters 4 and 8): Last updated in 2016.	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	No revisions proposed to this document.	The city's Comprehensive Plan contains LID goals and policies throughout the Environmental and Natural Resources Element and the Transportation Element. This includes emphasis on the use of grasscrete and pervious pavement for streets, bioretention in landscape strips and policies encouraging efficient land use, green building design and density transfers to protect critical areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 41: Landscaping and Screening	Chapter 14.76 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Amend existing code	Chapter 14.38 already gives preference to native / drought tolerant plants. The city will emphasize use of native / drought tolerant in remainder of code and recommend a list of appropriate plantings for developers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 41 and 42: Open Space and Tree Preservations	Chapter 14.76 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	No changes/ action taken	The city administers a robust screening and tree replacement program pursuant to Chapter 14.76 LSMC that emphasizes the retention of significant trees.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 42: Street Frontage Landscaping	Chapter 14.76 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Amend existing code	Chapter 14.38 already allows bioretention cells in parking lots. The city will amend the street frontage standards and parking standards to permit bio-retention facilities in lieu of landscape strips and islands.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 42 and 43: Design Guidelines and Standards	Chapter 14.38 LSMC and the Subarea Design Guidelines	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Amend existing code	The Subarea regulations address a number of LID elements discussed in the Guidance Manual, including maximum parking spaces, maximum setbacks, encouragement of shared driveways and parking areas, LEED certification and emphasis on native plantings in landscape areas. The city will recommend amendments to the rest of the code to allow similar techniques citywide.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 43: Parking	Chapter 14.72 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Amend existing code	Chapter 14.72 LSMC contains provisions to encourage the joint use of parking spaces, allow for shared and satellite parking and permit administrative discretion when requiring parking for businesses on pre-developed sites. The city is considering amendments to the minimum parking space dimensions to permit smaller parking pads and allowing more compact car spaces.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 44: Zoning District Bulk and Dimensional Regulations	Chapter 14.48 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	No changes/ action taken	Chapter 14.48 LSMC contains provisions for cluster subdivisions, which requires greater amounts of open-space dedication than traditional subdivisions. No changes are proposed to height, setback or impervious surface standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 45: Subdivision Standards	Chapter 14.18 LSMC	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Amend existing code	Pursuant to the Snohomish County, et. ux., v. Pollution Control Hearings Board, No. 92805 ruling, the city is reviewing all projects received after January 1, 2017 per the 2012 DOE Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. The city will formally adopt the current manual with the proposed updates.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 46: Off Street Parking	LSMC 14.72.030	Russ Wright, Community Development Director, Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner and Mike Messer, Fire Marshal	Amend existing code	The Planning Department is considering amendments to the minimum parking space dimensions to permit smaller parking pads.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Lake Stevens Municipal Code (LSMC) Title 14	Page 47: Fill and Grade and Clearing	LSMC 14.44.100 - .130	Russ Wright, Community Development Director and Stacie Pratschner, Senior Planner	Developed new code	The city proposes a new chapter, Chapter 14.50 LSMC, named "Land Disturbance" to regulate land disturbance activities, including the clearing and removal of vegetation, excavation, grading, filling and other earthwork activities. Staff also proposes amendments to Chapter 14.08 Definitions of the LSMC.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

		SP 2-021 Reduced Standard Collector	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revise EDDS standards to reduce impervious surface	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-022 LID Collector	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-030 Local Access	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-031 LID Local Access	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-040 Reduced Standard Local Access	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-121 LID Cul-de-sac	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-220 Porous Asphalt Pavement Typical Section	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		SP 2-230 Pervious Concrete Typical Section	Adam Emerson, Senior Engineer, Mathew Goad Engineer Tech	Amend existing code	Revised to reduce impervious surface	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EDDS	Page 47 Engineering and street standards					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>