Background:

A priority of Washington’s Growth Management Act of 1990 (GMA) was to preserve “resource lands”, specifically lands for agriculture, forestry and mineral extraction. The GMA was also intended to make development more sensible and cost effective. Both objectives are furthered by efforts to contain urban development in concentrated areas, rather than allow it to sprawl over the countryside.

To implement those objectives, the GMA required most counties to establish urban growth areas (UGA) “within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature.” Rural areas would be appropriately down-zoned and major roads and utilities provided only in urban areas.

In the early 1990s, Snohomish County prepared a new Comprehensive Plan. Population growth was projected over the next twenty years and urban growth areas were established to accommodate most of that growth to the year 2012. Part of the projected growth was allocated to the existing cities. Lynnwood was given about 4,000 new residents as our share of the County’s twenty-year growth and most of it has already been accommodated.

Counties must review their urban growth areas and densities every ten years to keep current. This is usually done after a major U.S. Census. The review is now in progress. The State Office of Financial Management (OFM) has provided twenty-year population projections for Snohomish County and it’s the county’s job to figure out where this new growth will occur. Ideally, it will be accommodated within existing UGAs. However, if that’s not feasible, UGA boundaries may have to expand. Determining exactly how much and where expansion will occur can be a difficult and politically influenced task.

For the past couple years, the cities and Snohomish County have been working together to measure our “buildable lands” and assess our capacity for additional growth. Lynnwood completed a major update of its own Comprehensive Plan in 2001. This helped determine our growth capacity – based on our own community vision and goals. We are now at the point of assisting Snohomish County in its 10-year Plan Update and in determining where the new growth will go.

The Challenge:
Snohomish County is beginning a ten-year update of its Comprehensive Plan. The County is responsible for accommodating future growth and must coordinate its Plan with the Plans of its 20 cities. It must also address UGA expansion and other issues.

The following population projections were made by OFM.

**2025 Projections – for Snohomish County:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Distribution</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,062,903 – high growth (+72% growth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>929,314 – intermediate (+50% growth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>795,725 – low growth (+29% growth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most new growth should occur in urban areas. The following is a summary of the current population distribution in Snohomish County:

**Snohomish County – Population Distribution:**

- 37% live in cities in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA)
- 24% live in unincorporated portions of the SWUGA
- 21% live in other cities and UGAs
- 18% live in rural/resource unincorporated areas

Lynnwood is not located at the outer edge of the Southwest Urban Growth Area, so UGA expansion is not necessary for our growth. However, if the UGA cannot be expanded sufficiently, other “reasonable measures” have been identified to help us accommodate the growth in other ways. Such measures might include clustering, smaller lots, higher densities, etc. If such measures are necessary, we will be affected. In turn, if the cities can accept more development and people, the need for UGA expansion will be lessened.

**Factors to Consider:**

Lynnwood was asked to provide basic “targets” for planning purposes. Similar targets are being gathered from all other cities and will be combined to see if they adequately accommodate our future growth.

The target numbers are just the beginning. Other factors will also be considered in determining where to allocate the County’s population and employment projections. Those factors may include some or all of the following:

- How much room exists now for more growth and people (buildable lands study)?
- What are the current growth patterns and development trends?
- What are the infrastructure and funding issues?
- What are the roles of each jurisdiction in the region? Will they change?
- What reasonable measures can we use to increase our capacity?
- Is it premature to include any City Center units in these calculations?
- Which of the reasonable measures can Lynnwood afford – and not afford?
- Which of the measures will be politically impossible or socially undesirable?
- What are the potential adverse impacts of UGA expansion?

**The Process:**
The following is a summary of the new process for allocation of projected 2025 growth in which we are now involved. This process includes both population and employment:

- Oct. 2002 – Snohomish County Tomorrow held a retreat at which this project was discussed and direction provided to guide the allocation process.
- Population and employment growth ranges were established for each jurisdiction. Lynnwood can expect from 6,700 to 10,200 new residents by 2025.
- Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) also projected pop. and employment. The preliminary population allocations were based on PSRCs subcounty forecasts.
- Cities may recommend countywide policy changes and UGA adjustments.
  - Each city will provide its own preliminary growth target by April 1, 2003.
- SCT and others will compare the collective totals with OFM population ranges.
- SCT Steering Committee will make recommendations to the County Council.
- County Council will adopt the initial 2025 growth targets into the CPPs.
- Cities and County will revise their Plans to accommodate the 2025 growth.
- A reconciliation process will settle any differences.
- Following reconciliation, the County Council takes final action on the targets.

**Lynnwood’s Population Target:**

The following is the preliminary target population range for Lynnwood. Our task is to review the range and recommend a specific 2025 population target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current: 2000 Population</th>
<th>33,847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected: 2025 Low Pop.</td>
<td>40,570 (+ 6,723 or +20% growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 High Pop.</td>
<td>44,080 (+ 10,233 or +30% growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Target Population</td>
<td>42,538 (+ 8,691 or +26% growth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**

- In 2002, the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan was amended and our land use build-out figures were revised through the Buildable Lands program, using different methods and more specific adjustment factors and calculations. It was determined that Lynnwood can accommodate an additional 4,491 persons, based on our current Comprehensive Plan and zoning.
- The projection is lower than the “low” end of the range for Lynnwood. If we based our target population on the citywide figure alone, we would submit a growth target that is outside our range.
- The City Center Plan is a significant activity that should also be considered. If adopted as currently proposed, it could result in up to 4,000 additional multi-family dwellings. The plan has not yet been adopted and its implementation is likely to extend beyond the 2025 growth target. Therefore, we are including just 50% (2,000 units) of the proposed residential units, at an occupancy of 2.1 persons per unit. This would result in 4,200 new residents.
When the City Center Plan’s partial growth of **4,200** is combined with the citywide build-out capacity of **4,491**, based on the Buildable Lands study, our new growth would total **8,691**, which puts us within the target range.

Cities were also asked to accompany their growth target selections with information on potential measures to achieve the growth targets. Lynnwood has sufficient growth potential to meet its targets through implementation of its current Comprehensive Plan (supported by consistent zoning) and adoption and implementation of the new City Center Plan as currently proposed.

It’s understood that our target population will be affected if the City Center Plan is not adopted, is significantly changed prior to adoption, or if the Comprehensive Plan or zoning is changed at some time in the future.

**Employment Targets:**

The employment figures for Lynnwood (within current City boundaries) are as follows:

- **Current:** 24,493 – Estimated Lynnwood Employment 2000
- **Projected:**
  - **low** employment estimate for 2025: 39,660
  - **high** employment estimate for 2025: 47,560
- **Proposed Target:** **46,243** – Lynnwood Jobs in 2025 (+89% growth)

**Rationale:**

- Our task is to settle on a reasonable employment target for 2025. The previous 10-year employment projections (to 2012) called for 13,227 new jobs in Lynnwood. The projections were not based on the City’s Plan, zoning or land availability and were considered overly optimistic. By 1998, Lynnwood had gained only about 2,500 new jobs and was 10,700 jobs short of its 2012 target.

- The current economic malaise adds doubt to the reliability of past projections. Local projections may be flawed if they disregard local plans, zoning, available lands for new commercial and industrial development and other local factors.

- Lynnwood already has a major mall and a generous amount of strip commercial development. To find an employment target within the given range, we would have to look to a different kind of growth – such as a new City Center.

- The Alderwood Mall expansion is expected to add **1,200** new jobs. Natural job growth in areas outside the mall and City Center could add **2,000** or more.

- The draft City Center Plan calls for eventual development of 7.5 million square feet of retail and office development. Assuming an average of one new job per 300 sq. ft., City Center growth could generate about 25,000 new jobs. However, for purposes of the 2025 target, we will assume 75% development within this time frame, or **18,750** jobs.

**Summary:**

- 18,750 new jobs in City Center (75% build-out)
- 1,200 new jobs at the Alderwood Mall
- 2,000 new jobs outside Alderwood Mall and City Center
- **21,750** total new jobs by 2025
Recommendations:
The Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on both the population target and the employment target for 2025. The Commission may agree with staff’s recommended targets. Or, if it disagrees with those targets, it may make a different recommendation – along with supporting rationale.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to set Lynnwood’s population and growth targets as follows:

- 2025 Population Target 42,538
- 2025 Employment Target 46,243

Next Steps:
- A City Council Work Group was briefed on February 12.
- A City Council Work Session is scheduled for March 3.
- A resolution will be offered for Council action at its March 10 business meeting.
- The City’s targets will be forwarded to Snohomish County by its April 1 deadline.

◆ ◆ ◆
Lynnwood Planning Commission  
Meeting of February 27, 2003

Staff Report

Agenda Item: H-1
Mobile Home Park Study Phase 2

Action:

No action necessary. In this briefing staff will describe the background and schedule for the mobile home park study for the Kingsbury East and The Squire mobile home parks, located northwest of the intersection of 44th Avenue and 176th Street. This is a chance for the Commission to become more familiar with the issues and to offer any early ideas or suggestions to staff.

Background:

During 2001, the plan and zoning designations of many properties throughout the city were changed in order to achieve consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning maps. The Kingsbury East and The Squire mobile home parks were identified at that time as having conflicting plan and zoning designations. As the mobile home stock in Lynnwood is aging, with three out of every four homes considered substandard for “manufactured homes” according to HUD code, these properties had been given plan designations for multiple-family to promote redevelopment. The zoning, however, still had not been changed from single-family. The Planning Commission thus recommended that the comprehensive plan designation continue to be multiple-family MF-1 and that the zoning designation be changed to multiple-family RML. The City Council took no action, however, as all mobile home parks were put on hold for further study. The Council’s priority at that time was to preserve single-family housing and discourage multiple-family development.

Last year, during the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendments process, the Planning Commission recommended these two mobile home parks for single-family SF-2 plan and single-family RS-7 zoning designations, consistent with the goals of the City Council. The Council adopted a package of Comprehensive Plan amendments that included changes to several mobile home parks. Removed from the package, however, were recommendations related to Kingsbury East and The Squire, due to the disagreement between the recommendation and the desire of the park owners for multiple-family designations. During the Plan/Zoning Consistency process and the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, the City Council has not stated a definitive position regarding these two parks.
Both parks are similar in size, design, age, and style of structures, etc., as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kingsbury East</th>
<th>The Squire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>17408 – 44th Ave. W</td>
<td>4515 – 176th Street SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
<td>Don Potter</td>
<td>Wanda Stewart (Les)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>5.6 ac.</td>
<td>5.3 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-1977 Units</strong></td>
<td>38 (81%)</td>
<td>43 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Value</strong></td>
<td>$27,655</td>
<td>$26,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Plan/Zone</strong></td>
<td>MF-1 / RS-8</td>
<td>MF-1 / RS-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Snohomish County Assessor’s Office, February 13, 2003

**Kingsbury East:** Current Comp. Plan: **MF-1** Current Zone: **RS-8**
-- Located between commercial businesses and residential neighborhoods.
-- Residential uses border the park to the north, south, and east (across 44th Ave).
-- Directly north of The Squire Mobile Home Park.
-- Current SF zoning is inconsistent with multiple-family (MF-1) Plan designation.

**The Squire:** Current Comp. Plan: **MF-1** Current Zone: **RS-8**
-- Adjacent to multi-family residential to the south and west, single-family to the east.
-- Located directly south of Kingsbury East Mobile Home Park.
-- Current SF zoning is inconsistent with multiple-family (MF-1) Plan designation.

The City Council would like the Planning Commission and staff to spend more time sorting out the issues and maybe return with a proposal that everyone agrees with. Council member Jim Smith suggested a possible “blending of uses” that might result in “multi-use, sensible development.”

**Previous Recommendations:**
As mentioned earlier, previous study conducted by the Planning Commission resulted in different recommendations. In 2001, the Commission recommended the Plan to be multiple-family MF-1 and the zoning to be RML. In 2002, however, the Commission recommended the Plan to be single-family SF-2 and the zoning to be RS-7. The RS-7 zoning designation was intended to give the owners greater density and flexibility if they decide to redevelop while keeping the properties single-family in nature. This recommendation seemed to be in line with Council priorities, but since it resulted in objections by the owners to the loss of their MF Plan designation, the Council continued these parks for further study.
Options:
Since 44th Avenue is primarily residential in the immediate vicinity of these two parks, the most obvious options are single-family or multiple-family. It may be worthwhile to look for a transitional type of development that would fit between the commercial of Highway 99 and the quieter single-family neighborhoods. There are a few possibilities:

- **Small-lot Single-family**: This also can be done in a multiple-family zone, but there’s no guarantee that the owner won’t want an apartment building instead.
- **Cottage Housing**: This is a possible Comp. Plan and Zoning amendment, but is not in place yet. It is not known how the Council will receive it. This might be the right vehicle to carry it along.

Process:
Last year’s mobile home park study was a legislative exercise involving all the parks and related development regulations that apply citywide. The focus has now been narrowed to two specific parks and, therefore, is now in the quasi-judicial realm.

Last year we invited all the mobile home park owners to a public meeting but didn’t invite the homeowners. This time, the homeowners are awaiting their opportunity to comment. Based on experience, staff anticipates that they will want to keep their single-family zoning to fend off redevelopment, while the owners will want to maximize the value of their properties with multiple-family zoning, even if they aren’t planning to redevelop soon.

Timing:
April 1 is the deadline for Plan Amendment applications. As this is a carry-over project, it will automatically be on the proposed Study List. Even so, it should be well-defined by the first of April. We will be busy processing all proposals after April 1, so it would be a good idea to get a head start and hold the public meeting in March. The public meetings will be held in the Council Chambers. Prior to the meeting we will provide notice and information to the homeowners.

Tentative Schedule:  [subject to adjustment, as needed]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>Planning Commission work session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 27</td>
<td>Homeowners’ meeting with the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Planning Commission public hearing on Comprehensive Plan Study List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(and recommendations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Council Work Session #1 on recommended Study List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>Commission – general Work Session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>Council Work Session #2 on Study List – if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Council approval of Study List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>Commission – Work Session on Study List items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Commission hearing &amp; recommendations on Plan amendment proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
<td>Council public hearing on final proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Adoption of 2003 Plan Amendments and related zoning changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND:
Staff presented a project outline for Phase 2 of the Development Regulations Update Project at the January 23rd Planning Commission meeting. We have been delayed in getting a spot on a City Council agenda to present the project outline but we are proceeding with project work in the meantime. It now appears that we may be able to report to the City Council on March 3rd.

One of the early project steps identified in the outline is to prepare a draft listing of zoning districts. This is an activity that needs to be done in advance of preparation of land use tables and development standards for each of the districts. Adding to the urgency of getting this work done now is the potential impact that changes in the zoning districts may have on the Comprehensive Plan. If such zoning district changes will require changes in the future land use categories of the Plan, we need to know what the changes will be before the April 1st deadline for listing proposed Plan changes.

PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICTS
A discussion draft of proposed zoning districts has been prepared. An attachment provides a statement of the purpose and general description of each district. This discussion draft is very similar to the one presented to the Advisory Committee and Planning Commission last year. Some additional detail has been added and the two new College District zones have been added. It has been an objective of the development regulations update project to reduce the total number of zoning districts from the number now in use in order to reduce the complexity of use and administration of the regulations. With the completion of the Phase 1 amendments, several districts were eliminated. With the adoption of the College District Sub-area Plan, two new districts were added. In the exchange, we did move closer to our district reduction object with a net reduction of districts. The following listing of proposed zoning districts provides for 16 base districts with 4 overlay districts. This is close to our original guideline of having no more than 15 base zoning districts. Of course, when the consultant makes recommendations for City Center districts there may be more than the one placeholder district included in the following listing. So, we will be giving additional thought to ways...
in which we can combine and reduce the overall number of zoning districts. But, there is nothing that says we must have fewer districts. We will have the number that it takes to regulate land use in Lynnwood to the best effect for the common good.

- RSL, Residential Single-family Low Density
- RSM, Residential Single-family Medium Density
- RSH, Residential Single-family High Density
- RML, Residential Multiple-family Low Density
- RMM, Residential Multiple-family Medium Density
- RMH, Residential Multiple-family High Density
- CL, Commercial Low Intensity
- CLM, Commercial Low-Medium Intensity
- CM, Commercial Medium Intensity
- CMH, Commercial Medium-High Intensity
- CH, Commercial High Intensity
- CIP, Commercial-Industrial Park
- I, Industrial
- PF, Public and Semi-public Buildings and Facilities
- PRO, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
- OPD, Overlay Planned Development
- OMU, Overlay Mixed Use
- CDMU, College District Mixed Use
- CDO, College District Overlay
- OSA, Overlay Sensitive Area

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS**

As stated earlier, the time sensitive decision needed at this time is to determine what amendments to the land use categories on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan would be needed to accommodate the proposed amended list of zoning districts. Staff had given some thought to the changes required and they are shown in the following listing of Comprehensive Plan land use categories in bold highlighting. These changes are in discussion draft stage and subject to revision through Planning Commission suggestion or staff second thoughts.

- SF1 – Low Density Single-family Residential
- SF2 – **Medium** Density Single-family Residential (formerly High Density)
- **SF3 – High Density Single-family Residential**
- MF1 – Low Density Multiple-family Residential
- MF2 – Medium Density Multiple-family Residential
- MF3 – High Density Multiple-family Residential
- MU – Mixed Use
- LC – Local Commercial
- **CC – Community Commercial**
- RC – Regional Commercial
- **CCR – City Center Redevelopment**
- **CI – Commercial-Industrial Park**
- I – Industrial
- PF – Public Facilities
- PRO – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

The significant proposed changes are the addition of a high-density single-family residential category and a category to hold a place for the City Center Sub-area Plan. The minor changes include renaming the Business-Technical Park and realigning and renaming a commercial category.

**ATTACHMENT**

City of Lynnwood Zoning Districts – Purposes and General Descriptions

◆ ◆ ◆
RSL, Residential Single-family Low Density – This zoning district is intended to implement the SF-1 Low Density Single-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for single-family detached residential units at an average density of not less than four, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. The average lot area within a subdivision shall not be less than 8,000 square feet; however, individual lots may be smaller through the use of lot size averaging. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.

RSM, Residential Single-family Medium Density – This zoning district is intended to implement the SF-2 Medium Density Single-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for single-family detached residential units at an average density of not less than X, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. The average lot area within a subdivision shall not be less than 6,000 square feet; however, individual lots may be smaller through the use of lot size averaging. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.

RSH, Residential Single-family High Density – This zoning district is intended to implement the SF-3 High Density Single-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for single-family attached or detached residential units at an average density of not less than X, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. The average lot area within a subdivision shall not be less than 4,000 square feet; however, individual lots may be smaller thorough the use of lot size averaging. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.

RML, Residential Multiple-family Low Density – This zoning district is intended to implement the MF-1 Low Density Multiple-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for multiple-family residential units at an average density of not less than X, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.
**RMM, Residential Multiple-family Medium Density** – This zoning district is intended to implement the MF-2 Medium Density Multiple-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for multiple-family residential units at an average density of not less than X, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.

**RMH, Residential Multiple-family High Density** – This zoning district is intended to implement the MF-3 High Density Multiple-family Residential Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for multiple-family residential units at an average density of not less than X, or greater than Y, dwelling units per net acre. Compatible non-residential uses are allowed in the district.

**CL, Commercial Low Intensity** – This zoning district is intended to implement the Local Commercial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. The zone is primarily intended to provide convenient and close access to businesses that serve the everyday retail and service needs of nearby residential areas. Impacts on residential areas will be minimized by limiting the range of permitted uses in proportion to the service needs of nearby residents and by only permitting uses that primarily serve nearby residential areas. Businesses that likely would attract customers primarily from more distant areas are not allowed. Business in this zone may serve customers that do not live in the immediate area, provided that customers from nearby residential areas constitute a major part of the business’ clientele.

**CLM, Commercial Low-Medium Intensity** – This zoning district is intended to implement the Community Commercial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. The zone is intended to allow a combination of retail and service uses that serve both surrounding residential areas and the rest of the community in existing small commercial areas in locations that are separated from the larger commercial areas in the City. These businesses may serve everyday retail and service needs of nearby residential areas, or they may provide specialized merchandise or services that attract customers from the entire community. In the past, these commercial areas may have provided merchandise or services to adjoining residential areas. However, the nature of retailing has changes so that these areas now attract businesses that serve larger market areas. Impacts on adjoining residential areas will be minimized by limiting the intensity of development.
CM, Commercial Medium Intensity – This zoning district is intended to implement the Community Commercial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. The zone is intended to provide a wide variety of retail and services for the entire City and adjoining communities. Businesses in this zone generally have market or trade areas that may extend outside the City and may reach into other counties. However, uses that serve surrounding residential areas may also be permitted in the zone. Administrative offices and similar uses that operate in a business complex setting as well as regional public facilities are appropriate in this zone.

CMH, Commercial Medium-High Intensity – This zoning district is intended to implement the Regional Commercial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This zone is intended to provide for the location and development of one or more planned regional shopping areas. The development standards for this zone take into account the characteristics of a modern shopping center recognizing it to be different than an ordinary business area in design, in ownership and management, and in community impact. While an ordinary business area develops gradually and therefore is regulated on a parcel by parcel basis or as each building is constructed, a planned regional center is developed all at once or in large stages.

CH, Commercial High Intensity – This zoning district is intended to implement the Regional Commercial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan; and the Subarea Plan for the City Center. The zone is intended to provide for high intensity office, retail, and other service uses in the core commercial area of the City. (Note: This is only a placeholder zoning district. The consultant will propose the actual zoning for the City Center area in the next few months. The actual zoning for the City Center may include more than one zoning district.)

CIP, Commercial/Industrial Park – This zoning district in intended to implement the Commercial/Industrial Park Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for office commercial uses, and a limited range of low impact industrial or technical uses in a planned development setting.

I, Industrial – This zoning district is intended to implement the Industrial Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for a full range of industrial uses having low to medium impact on surrounding areas.
PF, Public and Semi-public Buildings – This zoning district is intended to implement the Public Facilities Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas for buildings and other facilities owned and operated by public agencies or regulated utility companies.

PRO, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space – This zoning district is intended to implement the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan map designation; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. This district provides areas that serve the active and passive recreation needs of the citizens of the City, and provide for the conservation of natural areas.

OPD, Overlay Planned Development – This zoning district overlays one or more base zoning districts, requires master planning of the entire development area, allows greater flexibility in the application of development standards, offers density and/or intensity bonuses in exchange for increased public benefits, and is intended to implement the purposes of the underlying Plan map designations and zoning districts; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan.

OMU, Overlay Mixed Use – This zoning district overlays one or more base zoning districts allowing for the inclusion of uses not otherwise permitted within the base zone, and is intended to implement the purposes of the underlying Plan map designations and zoning districts; and the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan.

CDMU, College District Mixed Use – This mixed-use district is in use only in the area of the College District.

CDO, College District Overlay – This overlay district is in use only in the area of the College District.

OSA, Overlay Sensitive Area – This zoning district overlays one or more base zoning districts and prohibits, limits, or places special restrictions on development that would otherwise be permitted in the base zone, and is intended to carry out the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan regarding the protection of sensitive areas.
Recommendation:
Comment on the Draft City Center Plan. Staff will include the Commission’s comments in the report to the City Council on the Draft Plan for the March 3 Council meeting.

Background/Discussion:
At a work session on February 13, the Planning Commission heard a presentation on the Draft Plan for redevelopment of the Lynnwood City Center. This presentation was part of the ongoing effort to inform the Commission about the City Center Planning Project.

The Draft Plan was issued for public comment on February 3, which triggered the “Reality Check” part of the project. The Reality Check is intended to make sure that the planning project is “on the right track” and to identify any major changes to the direction of the planning project prior to starting work on the project’s implementing documents (zoning regulations, design guidelines and standards, capital facilities program, implementation strategies). During the Reality Check, staff is soliciting comments on the Draft Plan from the public, City boards and commissions, and local and state agencies.

Purpose of this Work Session:
This work session provides the Commission the opportunity to comment on the direction of the planning project, and particularly the type and intensity of the proposed redevelopment of the City Center.

The Commission will have further opportunities to comment on the Plan when the Final Plan is issued. Following issuance of the Final Plan and implementing documents, additional work sessions and a public hearing with the Commission will be scheduled.

Next Steps:
At the City Council work session on March 3, the Council will be asked to authorize preparation of the implementation documents.

Attachments:
None; the Draft Plan was distributed to the Commission at the February 13 work session.
## Lynnwood Planning Commission
### Meeting of February 27, 2003

### Staff Report

**Agenda Item: I-1**

### Upcoming Commission Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Public Hearings</th>
<th>Work Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>None scheduled</td>
<td>City Center Plan – Review &amp; Comment, Subdivision Code Rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>Mobile Home Park Study</td>
<td>Plan Amendment Docket and New Proposals, Subdivision Code Rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>Comp. Plan Amendment Study List &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>Plan Amendment Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>None scheduled</td>
<td>Plan Amendment Proposals, Development Regulations Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>None scheduled</td>
<td>Plan Amendment Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>None scheduled</td>
<td>Plan Amendment Proposals, Development Regulations Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following schedule is for planning purposes – subject to adjustments.*
Introduction:
This is an information item only at this time. The role of the Planning Commission is to make recommendations to staff to incorporate into the code amendment. The Planning Commission will have two work sessions to discuss the upcoming Title 19 (Subdivision Code) Rewrite. Following the upcoming work sessions the Planning Commission will be asked to recommend the rewrite to the City Council.

Draft Code Amendment:
At the March 13 and 27 work sessions the Commission will have the opportunity to review and discuss the proposed Title 19 (Subdivision Code) Rewrite. The Planning Commission is not required to hold a public hearing for those items amended in Title 19, however a work session comprising of discussion and comments with the Planning Commission is an important process for updating all city development regulations. The staff report of March 13 will provide a more in depth discussion as to which portions of Title 19 will be amended.

The purpose of the code amendment is to: update the city's subdivision code with respect to recent changes in state regulations, change the process in which a subdivision is approved to reflect the way the process actually is carried out, and make changes in development standards

Scheduling:
Planning Commission is tentatively scheduled to hold two separate work sessions on the draft Subdivision ordinance: one on March 13, 2003 and the other March 27, 2003. It is anticipated that a public hearing on the draft ordinance would be held by the City Council in May of 2003. Please see the attached timeline for other critical dates. If any member of the Commission would like a copy of the current Subdivision Code (Title 19) prior to the upcoming work session, please visit the city website at http://www.ci.lynnwood.wa.us or call Lee Michaelis at 425.670.6642

Attachments:
A. Title 19 (Subdivision Code) Rewrite Time Schedule (dated February 20, 2003)