AGENDA
Lynnwood Planning Commission
Thurs., May 26, 2005 — 7:00 pm — City Council Chambers, 19100 – 44th Ave. W., Lynnwood

A. Call to Order
Chair DECKER
Commissioner BIGLER
Commissioner ELLIOTT
Commissioner GEORGIEV
Commissioner JOHNSON
Commissioner PEYCHEFF
Commissioner WALTHER

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
1. Minutes of April 28, 2005

C. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

D. CITIZEN COMMENTS – on matters not on tonight’s agenda:

E. COMMISSION MEMBER DISCLOSURES:

F. PUBLIC HEARING:
1. Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)
The Dept. of Public Works has updated the TIP for the period 2006-2011. It includes descriptions and costs for 45 street projects. The public is invited to comment on transportation problems and issues and the proposed TIP at this hearing. The Commission will forward its recommendation for City Council action.

G. WORK SESSION:
1. Comprehensive Plan Amendments
This work session will cover the following “suggested amendment” proposals:
Proposal A: Timing of Plan Amendments
Proposal C: Parks & Recreation Element Update

H. BUSINESS:
1. Initiate Code Amendment
Commission to direct staff to study sign issues of immediate importance and draft correcting amendments, as necessary.

I. DIRECTOR’S REPORT & INFORMATION:
1. City Council Actions
2. Upcoming Meetings

J. ADJOURNMENT

The public is invited to attend and participate. To request special accommodations for persons with disabilities, contact the City at 425-670-6613 with 24 hours advance notice.
Introduction:

The City of Lynnwood is required annually to amend and adopt a **Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan**, which lists anticipated street projects and their costs for the six year period. This requirement is set out in RCW 35.77.010, RCW 36.81.121 and modified by HB 1525.

Attached is a summary project list for the 2006 – 2011 Six Year TIP. There are 45 projects on this year’s list, up from 27 last year, totaling $231,612,000. The projects are grouped into eight categories:

1. Annual Programs
2. New/Expanded Roads
3. Pedestrian Facilities & Trails
4. ITS
5. Transit
6. Alderwood
7. Traffic Intersection Controls
8. City Center

The Proposed TIP covers the years 2006 - 2011. The projects in the TIP are derived from The Capital Facilities Plan for 2004 with additions as indicated. Scheduling is determined by need and probable funding sources. All of these projects are based on the policies set forth in the City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan.

State of the Transportation System:

The annual updating of the Six Year TIP is an opportunity to look at how far we have come over the last few years and to look where we are headed in the future. Changes from last year reflect progress in completing projects as well as preparation for supporting major new initiatives in the City such as the City Center project. The status of each project can be found in the notes column on the attached chart.
**Recent Past:** Over the last 10 years the City has seen the completion of three very ambitious transportation projects:

1. Near completion of the I-5/196th St SW interchange improvements (The WSDOT Braided Ramp project, funded by the recent 9.5 cent tax increase, and the pedestrian connection across I-5 are the only pieces remaining)
2. Completion of SR-99 improvements
3. Completion of Alderwood Mall expansion related traffic improvements

Other recent progress includes:

- The City is well into installation of a state-of-the-art Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)
- Completion of the Regional Transit Station
- Completion of the I-5 HOV ramp (Texas "T")
- Completion of 200th St SW intersection improvements
- Completion of the Lynnwood Convention Center (expected to be a major traffic and economic generator)

We are in between major efforts now as we gear up for the transportation projects needed to support the City Center. We are also taking a look at out arterial system and have several new projects in the list that reflect future connections/extensions.

As always, funding has a major impact on when we actually undertake projects. Grants have been very tight for the past few years and that situation accounts for a number of projects being moved out. Still, we have managed to secure grants as follows:

- Two Congressional Earmark grants and two federal CMAQ (Congestion Management and Air Quality) grants for our ITS
- A federal CMAQ grant to complete the Interurban Trail Overpass at 44th Ave W
- A Congressional Earmark grant to begin the I-5 City Center Exit project
- A Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) award to build a sidewalk along 60th Ave W between 200th and 202nd.

We have also been successful at securing a scope change from WSDOT and PSRC so that we can move ahead with the pedestrian improvements along 196th over I-5. With the State legislature's passage of the recent transportation funding package funding should be more readily available over the next few years. We are hopeful that we will secure Lynnwood's share of the additional funds.

**Under Construction:** Projects under construction include

- 176th St SW Improvements – Olympic View Drive to SR-99
- 44th Ave W, New South Bound lane – 194th St SW to I-5 on ramp
In Design: Projects in design include

- I-5/196th St SW Pedestrian Improvements
- Interurban Trail, 44th Ave W Overpass
- Olympic View Drive Improvements
- Signal: Olympic View Drive at 176th St SW
- Signal: 200th St SW (AMB) at 40th Ave W
- 60th Ave W Sidewalk – 200th St SW to 202nd St SW
- I-5 City Center Exit – Access Study

Action and Scheduling:

The Commission is requested to conduct a public hearing, take and consider public input and forward the proposed 2006 – 2011 TIP to the City Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation.

The purpose of this public hearing is to accept public comments pertaining to transportation in general, specific problems or issues, and the contents of the attached Proposed Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for 2006 to 2011.

The Commission’s recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at their Public Hearing on June 13, 2005.


◆ ◆ ◆
# City of Lynnwood - Proposed Six Year TIP 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Map ID #</th>
<th>Six Year Total</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Programs</td>
<td>Overlay Program</td>
<td>5,604,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>884,000</td>
<td>928,000</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>984,000</td>
<td>1,013,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>new year added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signal Rebuild Program</td>
<td>2,429,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>383,000</td>
<td>402,000</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>426,000</td>
<td>439,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>new year added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk and Walkway Program</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>new year added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail Program</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>new year added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Expanded Roads</td>
<td>Olympic View Drive 76th Ave W 169th St SW</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>5,943,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>204th Ave W : 68th Ave W to SR 99</td>
<td>1,586,000</td>
<td>1,586,000</td>
<td>16th St SW/SR-99: WB to NB Right Turn Lane</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5 / 196th St Interchange- Phase C: Collector/Distributor Ramps</td>
<td>41,250,000</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>19,250,000</td>
<td>19,250,000</td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>Amounts revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5/SR 525 Interchange New Ramp Phase 1</td>
<td>17,950,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>Part of WSDOT share of I-5/196th Interchange project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36th Ave W: Maple Road to 164th St SW</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>441,000</td>
<td>917,000</td>
<td>2,179,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>Moved out 2 years and inflated 3%/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196th St SW/AMP: WB to NB Right Turn Lane</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>Moved out 1 year and inflated 3%/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maple Road Extension: 32nd Ave W to AMP</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>1,083,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>Scope revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33rd Ave W Extension 184th St SW Maple Road Extended</td>
<td>10,017,000</td>
<td>1,264,000</td>
<td>2,814,000</td>
<td>2,898,000</td>
<td>3,041,000</td>
<td>3,041,000</td>
<td>3,041,000</td>
<td>13,149,000</td>
<td>13,149,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poplar Extension Bridge Poplar Way 33rd Ave W</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>1,586,000</td>
<td>2,814,000</td>
<td>3,041,000</td>
<td>13,149,000</td>
<td>13,149,000</td>
<td>13,149,000</td>
<td>14,083,000</td>
<td>14,083,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Facilities &amp; Trails</td>
<td>Pedestrian Signal: SR-99 at 180th St SW</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>Moved out 3 years and inflated 3%/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5/196th St SW Ped Improvements 37th Ave W Poplar Way</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>3,255,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>3,755,000</td>
<td>4,451,000</td>
<td>4,451,000</td>
<td>Scope and amounts revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interurban Trail: 44th Ave W Overpass</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>2,938,000</td>
<td>2,938,000</td>
<td>Fully funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalks 52nd Ave W: 168th St SW to 176th St SW</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>2,865,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalks 48th Ave W: 180th St SW to 182nd St SW</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk 60th Ave W 200th St SW 202nd St SW</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Traffic Management Center (TMC) City Hall</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>1,053,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Bus Radii Improvements Various locations</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynnwood Link Feasibility Study ECC Transit Ctr Alderwood</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Lynnwood - Proposed Six Year TIP 2006-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Map ID #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Six Year Total</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>ITS Improvements: 36th Ave W 184th St SW</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Turn Lane &amp; ITS Installation: AMP - North of Sears Driveway</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: AMB 28th Ave W 188th St SW</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>Moved out one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>ITS Improvements: In Alderwood Area</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Intersection Controls</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: Olympic View Drive 176th St SW</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 200th St SW (AMB) 40th Ave W</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 52nd Ave W 176th St SW</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>Moved out 1 year and inflated 3%/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 48th Ave W 188th St SW</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 212th St 66th Ave</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 164th St SW 164th Pl SW</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 36th Ave W 172nd St SW</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Roundabout: 36th Ave W Maple Road</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>Scope changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 196th St SW Schlie Lake Road</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>New project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>200th St SW: SR-99 to 48th Ave W</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>12,842,000</td>
<td>Moved out 1 year and inflated 3%/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>200th St SW: 48th Ave W to 40th Ave W</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>4,298,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>196th St SW (SR-524): 48th Ave W to 37th Ave W</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>15,188,000</td>
<td>Moved out 2 years and inflated 3%/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44th Ave W: Master Streets Plan</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>Scope changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Grid Streets</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>New project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Promenade: 45th Ave W 196th St SW</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Traffic Signal: 194th St SW 48th Ave W</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>I-5 City Center Exit: Southbound I-5 to AMB</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>changed to $20M total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

| 231,612,000 | 17,044,000 | 40,586,000 | 69,245,000 | 48,695,000 | 41,149,000 | 12,030,000 | 238,738,000 | 20,000,000 |
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## Lynnwood Planning Commission
### Meeting of May 26, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda Item:</strong> G-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Amendments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Timing of Plan Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Parks &amp; Recreation Element Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Public Hearing
- Informal Public Meeting
- Work Session
- New Business
- Old Business
- Information
- Miscellaneous

Lynnwood Dept. of Community Development — Staff Contact: Ron Hough, Planning Manager

---

### 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

**SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS**

---

### INTRODUCTION

#### The 2005 Process:

Cities and counties in Washington may amend their comprehensive plans only once each year. Lynnwood has adopted a formal process and schedule that allows virtually anyone to request or suggest a change to the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan. The process begins with the deadline for applications on April 1 of each year.

Applicants may apply in two ways. A “formal application” may be submitted for site-specific proposals such as map amendments. All formal applications are processed. An application may also be submitted for a “suggested amendment” to the Plan. These are not site-specific, are less costly and are not processed unless approved for processing by the City Council.

City staff, Planning Commission and City Council are most directly involved in reviewing each application against a set of adopted criteria. The process is open to the public and includes a number of work sessions and public hearings. Input is encouraged.

#### Applications:

**Formal:** One site-specific “formal application” was filed this year. American Baptist Homes requested a Plan Map Amendment from SF-2 (medium-density single-family) to MF-2 (medium-density multiple-family). This change, along with a Boundary Line Adjustment, would make possible the construction of a 40-unit apartment building for seniors, located adjacent to the existing Good Shepard Baptist Church. An introductory presentation was made to the Planning Commission on April 28.
Suggested: Five of this year’s seven “suggested amendments” came from City departments. Two others were directed by the City Council. They include:

A. Timing of Plan Amendments – Dept. of Community Development
   – Scheduled for May 26 work session

B. B-2 Zone Review – Dept. of Community Dev. – Directed by City Council
   – To be completed for a future work session.

C. Parks & Recreation Element Update – Dept. of Parks & Recreation
   – Scheduled for May 26 work session

D. Transportation Element Update – Dept. of Public Works
   – To be completed for a future work session.

E. Economic Development Element Update – Dept. of Economic Development
   – To be completed for a future work session.

F. Five-year Implementation Program – Dept. of Community Development
   – To be completed for a future work session.

G. City Center Plan – Dept. of Community Dev. – Study Area directed by City Council
   – To be completed for a future work session.

Approval Criteria:
The following criteria are contained in the Implementation Element of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan. They will be used by the Planning Commission and City Council when processing the proposals. Not all criteria will apply to all proposals.

The criteria are as follow:

A. The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA) and will not result in Plan or regulation conflicts; and

B. The proposal will change the development or use potential of a site or area without creating significant adverse impacts on existing sensitive land uses, businesses, or residents; and

C. The proposed amendment can be accommodated by all applicable public services and facilities, including transportation; and

D. The proposal will help implement the goals and policies of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan; and

E. If the proposal could have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City limits, it has been sent to the appropriate Snohomish County officials for review and comment.
Proposal “A” – Timing of Plan Amendments – Implementation Element:

Applicant: Dept. of Community Development

Background:

The Implementation Element of the Comprehensive Plan includes a “Timing of Amendments” section. It was originally intended that all amendments be completed early enough to be considered in the City’s fall update of the Capital Facilities Plan and budget. The scheduled called for adoption of amendments in September. However, in early fall, the City Council is often already involved in budgets, capital facilities plan updates and other year-end business. As a result, final action on the Comprehensive Plan Amendments has slipped from the September target.

2002 amendments – adopted Nov. 12, 2002
2003 amendments – adopted Jan. 12, 2004
2004 amendments – adopted Nov. 22, 2004

Proposal:

Move the deadline for Plan Amendment applications to January 1 of each year (currently April 1), and adjust the processing schedule for earlier processing and adoption in July.

Benefits:

- Work will be done during the less busy months of spring and summer.
- Interference with other year-end City Council priorities will be reduced.
- Delays in final adoption will be minimized.
- A wider summer construction window will result from earlier Plan amendment and zoning decisions.

Proposed Changes to Text:

Guideline #6 on p. 6 of the Implementation Element will be amended as follows:

6. Plan Amendments should be processed expeditiously and completed early enough to allow any related financial implications to be considered in the annual budget process. The following schedule should be generally followed:

   **January**October:** Public notification that the City is accepting applications and suggestions for Comprehensive Plan amendments and that the deadline for submittals is **April**January 1.

   **April**January:** Planning Commission reviews all applications and suggestions for Plan Amendments, conducts a public
hearing, and recommends a Proposed Amendments List (PAL) of “suggested” amendments for the City Council’s consideration. [All formal applications will be processed.]

**May/February:** City Council reviews the Commission’s recommendations, adjusts and approves the PAL and directs staff to process the approved list.

**June/July/March/April:** Processing of applications, SEPA review, and 60-day review by state agencies and surrounding jurisdictions.

**August/May:** Planning Commission conducts public hearing(s) on all proposed amendments and forwards recommendations to City Council.

**September/June/July:** City Council conducts work sessions and public hearing(s) and adopts amendments.

**December:** City Council adopts budget which incorporates any financial adjustments resulting from the approved Plan amendments, and the annual revisions to the Capital Facilities Plan, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan amendments that were adopted earlier.
Proposal “C” – Parks & Recreation Element Update

Applicant: Dept. of Parks & Recreation

Background:
The City’s Parks & Recreation Department updates this element annually. The data to be updated this year includes, but is not limited to, the “Summary of Issues,” population, level of service, park inventories, maps and tables, priorities and goals, objectives and policies.

Part I: The proposed changes are shown in the text of the 15-page element, which is attached.

Part II: The Parks Department has also requested a change in the Plan Map designation and zoning of two residential lots in northeast Lynnwood. The lots are owned by the City and were acquired, along with two adjoining lots, for the proposed Stadler Ridge Park on 33rd Place West.

This is a quiet single-family residential neighborhood which is underserved by our park system. The 2-acre park was named Stadler Ridge Park for the pioneering Stadler family that settled there in the early 20th century.

At three public planning workshops in 2004, the neighborhood participated in the design process which resulted in the Preferred Concept Plan. The Plan’s design concept preserves the site's rolling topography and forested areas, and features a large grassy meadow, informal basketball key and play terraces that are linked with a series of stairs, paths and slides. Stone outcroppings, logs, nature trails and a dry stream bed provide natural play elements. The site’s history will be preserved with reminders of when the site was logged; the forested area still contains a felled tree with the choker and winch attached, and stumps with spring board marks. Neighborhood connections to the park include a trail built by Eagle Scouts to the Stadler Hill Homes on the west.

Proposal: The subject two lots are currently planned and zoned (SF-1/RS-8) for low-density single-family residential. The adjacent two lots to the south are planned and zoned (PRO/P-1) for parks and open space. The proposal is to include all four lots in the following designations:

PRO Parks, Recreation & Open Space (Comprehensive Plan)
P-1 Public & Semi-public Uses (zone)

This project is included in the Capital Facilities Plan, but construction cannot occur until a funding source is identified.
Next Steps:

The City Council is expected to approve the Proposed Amendments List (PAL) on May 23. All the proposals will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and Environmental Review Committee (ERC) before being recommended to the Council. As soon as the Commission makes its recommendations, the proposals will be submitted to the state for its mandatory 60-day review.

If some of the proposals are found to be more complex than others, they may require additional time and may follow separate tracks. However, all will come together in the fall for the Council’s simultaneous adoption of a complete package of amendments.

The following meetings have been tentatively scheduled to process the amendments. The schedule will be adjusted as necessary during the process.

✓ Apr. 1    Deadline for applications.
✓ Apr. 28   Planning Commission work session. Introduction to the formal application.
✓ May 2     Council work session on Proposed Amendments List, as recommended.
✓ May 16    Council work session – Memo for Action for approval of the PAL on May 23.
✓ May 23    Council consent agenda approval of the PAL for processing.
            May 26    Planning Commission work session on suggested amendments.
            June 23   Planning Commission work session.
            July 14   Planning Commission work session.
            July 18   Council work session (introduction to the formal application).
            Aug. 1    Council work session.
            Aug. 15   Council work session.
            Sept. 5    Council work session.
            Sept. 26   Council Public Hearing.
            Oct. 3    Council work session – Final Ordinances & Memo for Action.
Oct. 10    Council adoption of 2005 Plan Amendments and related zoning adjustments.
PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Parks, recreation and open space are essential to a high quality of life in a community. Since incorporation in 1959, the City of Lynnwood has acquired and developed many park and open space lands and established an excellent recreation program. As Lynnwood and the Puget Sound region grow and change, it is vital to be prepared to accommodate new growth while maintaining and enhancing the quality of life we have grown to enjoy.

This element of the Comprehensive Plan includes a summary of the existing conditions and issues relevant to the City’s parks, recreation and open space system. The element includes a demand and needs assessment and concludes with the goals, objectives and policies for the City’s parks, recreation and open space system.

Supporting data for this element on which Plan objectives and policies are based, including analyses, references and detailed inventories, can be found in the Background Report of this Plan. This element is also supported by the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, currently being updated to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

PLANNING CONTEXT

The Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan is optional under the Growth Management Act (GMA), but the City is choosing to incorporate this element into the Plan because it is a vital part of a high quality community.

The GMA goals pertaining to the parks, recreation and open space element are:

- **Open Space and Recreation:** Encourage the retention of open space, development of recreational opportunities, conserve wildlife habitat and increase access to natural resource lands.

- **Environment:** Protect the environment and the state’s high quality of life.
Regional Planning:

Lynnwood's Comprehensive Plan is consistent with Destination 2030’s policies related to parks, recreation, and open space. The Plan calls for preservation, acquisition, and development of parks, recreation, and open space facilities, including non-motorized facilities, consistent with the regional vision.

County-Wide Planning Policies:

Countywide planning policies do not specifically address community parks and recreation issues within cities or their urban growth areas. It is, however, the County's policy to provide greenbelts and open space to provide separation from adjacent urban areas, and regional park facilities within urban growth areas. Snohomish County’s Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan states that “parks are necessary for development.” This policy provides the opportunity for cities to work with the County to provide park land within urban growth areas.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The following is a summary of issues relating to parks, recreation and open space in the City. It is the intent of the Comprehensive Plan to propose solutions to these issues through the implementation of programs and policies in this element.

- Due to the limited amount of vacant land in the City, the timing of acquisition and the location of park and open space lands are important if the City wants to maintain a balance of land uses and meet the proposed level of service standards, planning standards and goals.
- There is currently a deficit of active park facilities in Lynnwood. Additional acres of Core Parks (mini, neighborhood and community parks) are needed to meet the recommended level of service for Core Parks.
- The City’s primary recreation facility need is renovation of the existing Recreation Center and construction of a new community center for programming youth/teen and senior activities, performing arts and sports. A new community center would relieve over programming at the existing Recreation Center with complimentary programs.
- Preservation of the City's historical resources and interpretation of Lynnwood’s past is a priority. Continued renovation of the historic structures, programming of heritage activities, and development of interpretive exhibits at Heritage Park will provide the community with a sense of its heritage.
- To provide more walking, bicycling and commuter opportunities, a comprehensive system of trails and bicycle lanes needs to be developed. Additional trails are also needed to meet the recommended level of service. A city-wide Non-motorized Transportation Plan needs to be currently being developed with Public Works to help identify the current and proposed non-motorized transportation needs of the community.
- The acquisition and preservation of open space continues to be a high priority, and is an important consideration when determining funding priorities.
- The availability of funding to provide new parks and recreation facilities, and improvements to existing facilities, is a critical issue. Alternate funding sources such as user fees, impact mitigation fees, grant funds, bonds, and partnerships with other agencies, non-profit organizations and the private sector, need to be considered for future parks and recreation needs.
• To reduce the demand on existing parks and recreation facilities within the city limits, the acquisition of park land in future UGA annexation areas is a major consideration. It will be necessary to pursue joint acquisition and development of these sites with Snohomish County.

• To preserve and protect our existing assets, the maintenance and operations of our parks and recreation facilities need to remain an important budget consideration.

• The preservation of existing trees during subdivision development is an issue of public concern.

• Athletic facility users have expressed a need for additional quality athletic facilities. The demand for athletic facilities in the City exceeds the current supply.

• A revised Level of Service policy may need to be considered has been recommended for parks and recreation needs in the City Center that is approximately half of the existing standard. Future characteristics and social patterns for City Center users and residents are expected to be different than that of the rest of the city. Park mitigation fees are also being considered for development in the City Center.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The City’s current parks, recreation and open space inventory amounts to 355 acres and includes park facilities, within the city and in the UGA, that offer both active and passive recreational opportunities. The park facilities within the city are categorized into the following functional classifications for planning and programming purposes, according to size and function.

Core Parks:

This system of Core Parks (mini, neighborhood and community parks) serves the City and traditionally provides a combination of active and passive uses, including play equipment, picnic areas, athletic fields, and trails. The City currently operates 16 developed parks in the Core Parks category. When funding is available, four additional Core Park properties will be developed within the city, and two park sites will be developed in the City’s Urban Growth Area. Core Park land accounts for approximately 185 acres, or 52% of the total inventory.

Special Use Areas:

Four facilities in Lynnwood are classified as “Special Use Areas” based on their current purpose and/or activity - the Municipal Golf Course, the Recreation Center, the Senior Center and Heritage Park - for a total of 81.45 acres. Because of its historical purpose and lack of active recreation elements, Heritage Park is included in this category.

Open Space:

The City’s Open Space classification includes large natural areas (outside of parks) and urban greenbelts. It is the City’s policy to preserve natural resources for the conservation of important habitats and for passive recreational use, whenever possible. Approximately 113 acres in and around adjacent to Lynnwood are preserved as Parks and Recreation-maintained open space. Scriber Lake Park and Scriber Creek Park are included in this category because they do not have active recreation elements.
Detailed information and the locations of Lynnwood’s parks, recreation and open space facilities are included on Table 1 and the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Map in this Plan and on Table 4 in the Background Report.

The “Regional Parks” classification, previously are not included in the City’s parks and open space inventory, has been eliminated from the City’s current inventory. Regional parks are typically large facilities that draw from multiple jurisdictions and are often located in unincorporated urban growth areas. These facilities are historically provided at the County level, whereas neighborhood and community parks are provided by cities, usually within their boundaries. Meadowdale Beach County Park is an example of a regional park within our UGA.

DEMAND AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Over the years, the City of Lynnwood has continued to improve and expand its inventory of recreational resources. Residents are well served by a variety of leisure opportunities, but with population growth comes an increasing demand for more parks, open space and recreation facilities in order to maintain the recommended Parks Level of Service Standard (LOS).

**Level of Service:** The recommended Parks LOS standard in Lynnwood is 10 acres per 1,000 population. This standard is expressed as acres of park, recreation and open space needed for each 1,000 persons, using the 2003 OFM estimated population of 34,500 34,540. The standard is further delineated as 5 acres per 1,000 population for Core Parks (mini, neighborhood and community parks), and 5 acres per 1,000 population for Other Park Land (open space and special use facilities). A reduced Parks Level of Service Standard equivalent to 65 acres per 1,000 is recommended for the City Center project.

The demand and need for parks, recreation and open space in Lynnwood has been assessed through analyses of existing conditions, potential park sites, available resources and level of service. Trends in recreation were considered and public input was obtained through surveys and community meetings.

### Table 1: Parks, Recreation and Open Space DEMAND AND NEED WITHIN THE CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demand 2</td>
<td>Need 3</td>
<td>Demand 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>3.32 ac</td>
<td>5.178 ac</td>
<td>5.776.58 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>45.21 ac</td>
<td>51.75–81 ac</td>
<td>57.7765.87 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>94.77 ac</td>
<td>115.58–71 ac</td>
<td>147.10 ac 147.10 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>143.30 ac</td>
<td>172.870 ac</td>
<td>192.55219. ac 55 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Park Land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Required Acres</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Required Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>81.45</td>
<td>69.068</td>
<td>77.028</td>
<td>0-6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>113.19</td>
<td>103.50</td>
<td>115.53</td>
<td>2.3418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>194.64</td>
<td>172.50</td>
<td>192.55</td>
<td>0.2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>337.94</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td>385.10</td>
<td>47.1610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Trails: 7.10 mi 8.63 mi 1.53 mi 9.63 mi 2.53 mi


Notes:
1. Includes developed and undeveloped park facilities within the city limits only.
2. Demand reflects total park acres required to meet adopted level of service standard for each category.
3. Need reflects additional park land required to meet adopted level of service standard for each category. See Table 6 in Background Report for detailed analysis.
4. City park property located outside the city in the UGA is not included in the City’s demand and need analysis.
5. The 2025 population estimate includes the City Center population, which is projected to be 5,400. The demand and need for 2025 reflects the recommended LOS standard reduction to 5 ac/1000 for the City Center population.

Population projections were applied to determine future impacts on the City’s existing parks system. In addition to maintaining and improving the City’s existing facilities, additional park facilities will be needed to meet current and future demands and the recommended LOS within the City and in the City’s urban growth areas.

Within City Boundaries:

The adopted Parks Level of Service Standard is 10 acres per 1000 population. The current level of service the City has achieved is 9.798 acres per 1000 population. Applying the LOS to the existing inventory reveals the need for an additional 29.874 acres in the Core Parks category to meet the demand (recommended acres) for 172.57 acres of active park land. The inventory also shows a deficit of 1.534 miles in the Trails category to meet the demand for 8.634 miles of trails outside parks.

By the year 2025, it is estimated that Lynnwood’s population will increase to approximately 38,510-43,910. This includes the estimated City Center population of 5,400. The need for park land in the City Center is calculated using the reduced Parks LOS Standard of 5 ac/1000. Applying the same LOS in 2025, continued park acquisition and development will be necessary to meet the demand for parks, open space and recreation facilities in 2025. Table 1 summarizes the existing and future demand and need within the city. See Table 6 – City Level of Service/Demand and Need in the Background Report for a more detailed analysis.

Within Urban Growth Areas:

New residential and commercial development in the UGA is generating demand for parks, recreation facilities and open space. In the future North Gateway annexation area, approximately 93 acres of open space in the Swamp Creek corridor have been preserved jointly by Snohomish County and the City of Lynnwood. The City has also acquired a 9-acre future neighborhood park site adjacent to the North Gateway annexation area, and 7.69 acres of future community park property in the Tutmark Hill area east of Interstate 5.
There are currently no active use park facilities in the City’s UGA, which has a population of over 30,000. As a result, some of Lynnwood’s existing parks are over-burdened with non-resident use. Applying our Parks Level of Service standard to the UGA population would require acquisition of approximately 300 acres of parks and open space. To provide park facilities needed by the growing population now and in the future, the City will continue to seek equitable methods of acquisition and development with Snohomish County and other jurisdictions.
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

GOAL: Provide a comprehensive system of parks, open space and recreation facilities that serves the needs of current and future residents, and visitors to Lynnwood.

Subgoal: Park System

Provide a system of mini, neighborhood and community parks to meet the recreational needs of the community.

Objectives:

P-1: Acquire Core Park land in the city to help meet the community’s recreational needs.

Policy P-1.1: Provide the minimum adopted level of service of 5 acres/1000 population for Core Parks.

Policy P-1.2: Acquire park land in accordance with the Annual Budget and Capital Facilities Plan.

Policy P-1.3: Annually Review vacant and underdeveloped parcels and park service areas to determine underserved neighborhoods in the city.

Policy P-1.4: Plan for the location of parks in the proximity of high-density developments.

Policy P-1.5: Use a variety of methods for funding acquisition of park lands including grants, user fees, City funding, interjurisdictional cost-sharing, land developer contributions and other sources.

Policy P-1.6: Adopt and implement a program to require new residential and commercial development to provide impact mitigation to the City, either by dedication of park land, plazas, park improvements, or payment of “in-lieu-of” fees.

Policy P-1.7: Preserve land for future park development.

P-2: Acquire park land in urban growth areas for future development.

Policy P-2.1: Pursue cooperative planning efforts with Snohomish County and neighboring jurisdictions in urban growth areas and future annexation areas.

Policy P-2.2: Annually review potential parks and open space sites in UGA, and related facilities needed to provide the recommended level of service.

Policy P-2.3: Seek methods of acquisition and development of these sites and facilities, which reflect the responsibilities of Snohomish County and the City.

P-3: Acquire Tutmark Hill properties in UGA for community park development by 2006.
P-4: Plan and develop new parks and renovate existing parks in the city and in urban growth areas.

Policy P-4.1: Design new parks in accordance with the purpose, size and classification of each.

Policy P-4.2: Design new parks and provide improvements to existing parks to promote public safety and security.

Policy P-4.3: Provide a variety of recreational opportunities to serve a diverse population.

Policy P-4.4: Provide accessibility to all park facilities in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act standards.

P-5: Plan and develop Tutmark Hill community park in the UGA per Interlocal Agreement with Snohomish County, by 2008.


P-7: Develop new neighborhood parks, Stadler Ridge Park and Rowe Park, at 69th Ave and 33rd Place W per master plans in 2005 and 2006-2007.

Subgoal: Open Space System

Provide a system of open space to preserve and protect the area’s remaining native forests, wetlands, streams and wildlife habitats.

Objectives:

OS-1: Continue acquisition of open space properties in the Lund’s Gulch, Swamp Creek and Scriber Creek watersheds.

Policy OS-1.1: Provide the minimum adopted level of service of 3 acres/1000 population for Open Space.

Policy OS-1.2: Preserve areas with significant environmental features such as view corridors, landforms and plant and animal communities.

Policy OS-1.3: Use a variety of methods for funding open space acquisitions including grants, donations, tax abatements, City funding, interjurisdictional cost-sharing, land developer contributions and other sources.

Policy OS-1.4: Support volunteer and interjurisdictional efforts for restoration and preservation of the four major watersheds in South Snohomish County: Scriber Creek, Lund’s Gulch, Swamp Creek and Hall Creek.

Policy OS-1.5: Continue to encourage stewardship of open space and natural areas through the City Stewards program.

OS-2: Work with Edmonds School District and Snohomish County to acquire 21-acre Lund’s Gulch Creek headwaters property. Plan conservation and passive development of property with the Brackett’s Landing Foundation.
**OS-3: OS-2:** Develop Master Plan for Lund’s Gulch and Meadowdale Beach Park in partnership with Snohomish County, the Brackett’s Landing Foundation and Friends of Lund’s Gulch, by 2005.

**OS-4 OS-3:** Acquire open space within urban areas to buffer and enhance the built environment.

- **Policy OS-4.1:** Conduct an annual review of vacant and underdeveloped parcels within the city for potential acquisition of open space.
- **Policy OS-4.2:** Preserve open space corridors and trail linkages between parks, neighborhoods, schools and commercial centers. Where possible, acquire key linkages between parks and trail segments to create connected trail system.

**OS-5 OS-4:** Provide passive recreational opportunities in acquired natural areas.

- **Policy OS-5.1:** Provide neighborhood access to natural areas with trailheads and parking, in accordance with Chapter 17 of the Lynnwood Municipal Code and ESA regulations.
- **Policy OS-5.2:** Provide environmental educational opportunities in natural areas with interpretive signage, nature trails and overlooks.

**OS-56:** Work with Public Works and community volunteers in the enhancement of City-owned stormwater detention areas for passive community use.

**Subgoal: Facilities and Programs**

Provide facilities and programs that promote a balance of recreational opportunities.

**Objectives:**

**FP-1:** Identify and prioritize the need for new/upgraded facilities and programs on an annual basis.

- **Policy FP-1.1:** Seek adequate funding and timely development of such facilities in accordance with the Annual Budget and Capital Facilities Plan.
- **Policy FP-1.2:** Provide the minimum adopted level of service of 2 acres per 1000 persons for Special Use facilities.
- **Policy FP-1.3:** Provide improvements to facilities that are cost-effective, durable, attractive and energy efficient.
- **Policy FP-1.4:** Provide facilities that meet competitive playing standards and requirements for all age groups and recreational interests.
- **Policy FP-1.5:** Continue to offer specialized programming for diverse community groups such as seniors, youth and teens, and preschool.

**FP-2:** Complete phased development of Heritage Park by 2006, including renovation of all the historic structures, by 2007.
Policy FP-2.1: Work with the community organizations to provide information to interpret the history of the Lynnwood/Alderwood Manor area, including historical displays, programs, interpretive signage and museum services.

Policy FP-2.2: Work with Snohomish County Tourism Bureau to facilitate visitor information services.

Policy FP-2.3: Work with the Alderwood Manor Heritage Association on a park docent program and historical programming within the park.

Policy FP-2.4: Develop a lease agreement with the Sno-Isle Genealogical Society to operate a community genealogical library in the Humble House.

FP-3: Renovate the existing Recreation Center and construction of a new multipurpose community center that will provide for recreational, cultural, civic and leisure activities to serve varied age groups and community interests, beginning in 2006.

Policy FP-3.1: Consider development of a Metropolitan Park District as a strategy to achieve a property tax levy to fund site acquisition, development and operations of a new community center and renovation of the existing recreation center. Take levy to voters in the fall of 2006.

Policy FP-3.2: Acquire property for new Community Center on preferred site adjacent to Scriber Lake Park.

FP-4: Develop a master plan for Wilcox Park, Scriber Lake Park and the adjoining School District property, reflecting how these areas can be connected for pedestrian access and related activities.

FP-5: Participate in the planning and design of a regional performing arts facility.

Subgoal: Trail System

Provide a connecting system of trails for recreational, commuter and general circulation purposes.

Objectives:

T-1: With other City departments, develop a Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and Trails Master Plan that links parks, schools, community facilities, commercial centers, neighborhoods and adjacent regional trail systems, by 2006.

Policy T-1.1: Work with other jurisdictions to provide a continuous regional trail network.

T-2: Develop additional trails outside of parks to meet the adopted minimum level of service.

Policy T-2.1: Provide the adopted minimum level of service standard of 0.25 miles/1000 population for trails outside parks.
Policy T-2.2: Design and construct trails to required standards to serve a variety of users at varying skill levels.

Policy T-2.4: Include bicycle lanes when City streets are being reconstructed or built, and add bike routes to existing City streets, where feasible.

Policy T-2.5: Require new subdivisions to provide access to parks, trails and school sites.

Policy T-2.6: Encourage public and private funding for the development of trails.

T-3: Plan and construct the northward extension of the Scriber Creek Trail to generally follow the creek route, from Scriber Lake Park north to the Meadowdale area and Lund’s Gulch.

T-4: Provide improvements to the Interurban Trail to include trailheads, enhanced landscaping, signage and historic markers, by 2005.

Policy T-4.1: Support interjurisdictional efforts to provide consistent and aesthetic improvements along the length of the Interurban Trail.

Policy T-4.2: Promote trail safety through signage and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists.

T-5: Complete design in 2006 and construct Interurban Trail pedestrian bridge at 44th Ave., and to complete “missing link” in Interurban Trail between 40th Ave. and 44th Ave, by 2006.

T-6: Coordinate completion of South Lund’s Gulch Trail with Snohomish County, Brackett’s Landing Foundation and volunteers. Trail is planned to cross Lund’s Gulch Creek and connect with existing Meadowdale Beach Park trail, giving Lynnwood residents access to Lund’s Gulch open space and a walkable connection to Puget Sound.

Subgoal: Activity Centers

Ensure that parks and open space are included as part of the land use mix in the activity centers’ master plans.

Objectives:

AC-1: Work with Community Development to identify parks and open space sites, related improvements, and implementation strategies for the City Activity Centers and City Center plans.

AC-2: Establish park and open space guidelines and achieve revised level of service standards for public and private improvements in the activity centers City Center.

Subgoal: Interjurisdictional Coordination

Coordinate parks, open space and facility planning and development with appropriate jurisdictions and agencies for mutually beneficial partnerships.

Objectives:
IC-1: Partner with Edmonds School District to improve selected existing school recreation sites for shared school/park use.

Policy IC-1.1: Work with other agencies to provide adequate recreational facilities for community use.

IC-2: Work closely with service providers and other local private and non-profit organizations in order to meet the diverse program and special events needs of the community.

IC-3: Pursue cooperative planning efforts with Snohomish County in the urban growth area to provide parks and open space in future annexation areas.

Subgoal: Facilities Management

Manage and maintain parks, open space and recreation facilities to optimize use and protect public investment.

Objectives:

FM-1: Continue a regular schedule for maintenance of parks, facilities and open space, and revise annually.

Policy FM-1.1: Maintain and upgrade existing parks and facilities for the safety, comfort and satisfaction of park users.

Policy FM-1.2: Ensure that adequate funding and staff are available for management and maintenance of parks, facilities and open space.

Policy FM-1.3: Promote interjurisdictional operations of parks and facilities.

Policy FM-1.4: Advise the City Council and other City boards and commissions on a regular basis about facility management issues.

Policy FM-1.5: Update staff training in playground safety standards and play equipment inspection.

FM-2: Coordinate the operations and maintenance of Heritage Park with community groups, including operations of the Visitor Information Center, museum and Alderwood Manor Heritage Cottage, Sno-Isle Genealogical Library, heritage programming and demonstration gardens.

Policy FM-2.1: Work with non-profit organizations and other community volunteers on parks, trails and open space service projects through the "City Stewards" volunteer program.

FM-3: Continue to implement City Pesticide and Fertilizer Use Policy within the City on public properties, including posting of areas to be treated in accordance with state and local requirements.

Subgoal: Monitoring and Evaluation
Monitor, evaluate and update parks, recreation facilities and open space to ensure balanced, efficient and cost-effective programs.

Objectives:

ME-1: Update parks, facilities and programs in accordance with public input and survey results.

Policy ME-1.1: Encourage community input by providing opportunities for public involvement in park, recreation and open space planning.

ME-2: Annually update the Parks and Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with the City Comprehensive Plan and State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) guidelines, by 2005.

ME-3: Continue public information program to increase public awareness of the City’s parks, recreation and open space system.
Recommendation:

Initiate a code amendment to review the City’s Sign Code (LMC Chapter 21.16) as it pertains to signs in the public rights-of-way and to free-standing portable signs.

Background/Discussion:

On December 9, 2004, Senior Planner Darryl Eastin presented a summary of Sign Code issues to the Planning Commission. The City Council stated in April, 2000, that they would like to revisit specific sign regulations after staff had some experience with implementing the new sign ordinance. Since then, the Council has discussed sign code issues at three work sessions in 2002, 2003 and 2004. The Council’s issues are listed in Attachment A.

In addition, staff’s experience with the new regulations identified certain areas that need to be clarified or improved through minor revisions, as listed in Attachment B.

On February 3, 2003, the Council discussed the sign issues and identified the following four specific issues as being of special interest to them:

2. Wall signs on multi-story buildings.
3. Signs on “Mansard” style roofs and parapet walls and sloped roofs for existing tenant space with little tenant building frontage for signs.
4. Wall signs in Industrial Zones.

The Council also agreed with staff’s suggestion to prepare a separate draft ordinance that covers clarification and minor revision of sign regulations, as identified in Attachment B.

At the February 4, 2004 work session, staff asked the Council to reach consensus on each issue and related alternatives. Attachment A includes those issues and alternatives on which the Council appeared to reach consensus.

Mr. Eastin no longer works for the City and was unable to follow-up with a continued Sign Code discussion on January 13, 2005, as planned. Staff will soon be talking with our new City Attorney about signs in the public rights-of-way. Those and other sign issues may be addressed in future amendments.
Lynnwood’s sign code includes some provisions that are being tested in law suits and court cases in other jurisdictions. When the City Council became aware that the sign code was being reviewed, the Dept. of Community Development was discouraged from strict code enforcement until the Council has time to study the issues and adopt the needed changes. Code amendment proposals must be reviewed and recommended by the Planning Commission before being acted upon by the City Council.

**Next Steps:**

Only the Planning Commission and City Council can initiate amendments to City codes. If the Planning Commission agrees to initiate a review of the Sign Code, staff will bring issues, options and draft amendments for further discussion and public hearings. The Commission will then make its recommendations to the City Council which, in turn, will hold at least one hearing before taking final action.

The “issues” attachments are for the Commission’s information only. They are not proposals.

Code amendments may be approved at any time of the year, provided they are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

■ ■ ■
### Attachment “A”

#### COUNCIL’S SIGN CODE ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>LMC SECTION</th>
<th>COUNCIL COMMENTS</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE TO CURRENT REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Should the maximum height for pole and monument signs be reduced from 25 ft. to 20 ft.?</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.1.c 21.16.310.A.2.c</td>
<td>Lowering maximum height would make a number of these exiting signs nonconforming.</td>
<td>Lower maximum height to 20’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Should commercial real estate signs not be allowed in street frontage landscape areas?</td>
<td>21.16.310.I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase min. setback from street to 10’, 15’ or 20’ depending on width of street frontage landscape area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Should nonconforming pole signs that identify a business be required to be removed or made conforming when that business is replaced by a new business? <em>(Assumption: The above would include signs with nonconforming setback, height and sign area only. It would not include signs that do not comply with current sign design guidelines and landscaping requirements.)</em></td>
<td>21.12.400 21.16.250</td>
<td>Check with other jurisdictions to see if they have a similar regulation.</td>
<td>Require nonconforming pole sign(s) that identify a business to be removed or made conforming when that business is replaced by another business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should nonconforming pole signs be required to be removed or replaced with conforming signs after a set period of time to amortize value of the nonconforming signs? <em>(Assumption: The above would include signs with nonconforming setback, height and sign area only. It would not include signs that do not comply with current sign design guidelines and landscaping requirements.)</em></td>
<td>21.12.400 21.16.250</td>
<td>Check with other jurisdictions that have nonconforming sign amortization programs.</td>
<td>Require nonconforming signs to be removed or replaced with conforming signs after a set period of time to amortize value of the nonconforming signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Should signs in a foreign language only be allowed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require signs to be in English or include a translation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lower maximum height to 20’.*

*Increase min. setback from street to 10’, 15’ or 20’ depending on width of street frontage landscape area.*

*Check with other jurisdictions to see if they have a similar regulation.*

*Require nonconforming pole sign(s) that identify a business to be removed or made conforming when that business is replaced by another business.*

*Check with other jurisdictions that have nonconforming sign amortization programs.*

*Require nonconforming signs to be removed or replaced with conforming signs after a set period of time to amortize value of the nonconforming signs.*

*Require signs to be in English or include a translation.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>LMC SECTION</th>
<th>COUNCIL COMMENTS</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE TO CURRENT REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Should design criteria be established for freestanding incidental directional signs?</td>
<td>21.16.310.C 21.16.310.A.3</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to establish design criteria.</td>
<td>Establish basic design criteria that are similar to criteria for ground signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Should advertising and business identification be allowed on freestanding incidental directional signs?</td>
<td>21.16.310.C</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to limit advertising and business identification on these signs.</td>
<td>Do not allow advertising or business identification on these signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Should the maximum size of wall signs for institutional uses (schools and churches) in Residential zones be increased? If so, how much?</td>
<td>21.16.290.A</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to allow these signs to be larger, but no consensus on size.</td>
<td>Allow maximum wall size to increase from 6 sq. ft. to 15 or 20 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Should the Lynnwood Convention Center be allowed to have a freestanding electronic changing message sign that is high enough to be seen from I-5?</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.1.c 21.16.310.D</td>
<td>Have PFD do research to determine necessary height of sign.</td>
<td>Allow convention center to have one freestanding sign up to X ft. high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Should Neighborhood Identification signs be allowed in public right-of-way? If so, how large should they be?</td>
<td>11.62.020</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to allow these signs in public right-of-way.</td>
<td>Allow these signs in public right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Should a fee be charged for commercial real estate signs?</td>
<td>21.16.310.I</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to charge a fee.</td>
<td>Charge a fee for these signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Signs for auto dealers (new &amp; used).</td>
<td>21.310</td>
<td>Appeared to be a consensus to continue to prohibit use of balloons, banners, pennants and flags by auto dealers. Check types of signs other jurisdictions allow for auto dealers.</td>
<td>Allow business signs that address auto dealer sign needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>LMC Section</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Maximum size of directory wall signs for tenants in multi-tenant retail buildings and multi-story office buildings that do not have building frontage that faces a street.</td>
<td>21.16.310.B.1.a</td>
<td>Allow the maximum size of such directory wall signs to increase from 10 to 15 SF. Clarify that this additional sign area can exceed the overall sign area maximum of 15% of the façade area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sign limitations in the Restricted Business zone.</td>
<td>21.16.310.K</td>
<td>Restore limitations that were inadvertently eliminated with adoption of the new sign regulations in 2000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Signs on “Mansard” style roofs and parapet walls and sloped roofs for existing tenant spaces with very little and/or narrow wall area on which to place a sign.</td>
<td>21.16.310.B.3</td>
<td>Allow signs on “Mansard” style roofs and “Mansard” style parapet walls and sloped roofs above existing tenant spaces with such conditions. (Currently, only one roof sign is allowed per building and only under special circumstances. Also, currently signs on “mansard” style roofs and parapet walls are considered roof signs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Color bands and other areas painted on buildings or on other materials placed on buildings that are the same color or indistinguishable from the color(s) of the sign placed within or next to it.</td>
<td>21.16.200 &amp; 21.16 Figure 1</td>
<td>Color areas on buildings that match (or indistinguishable from) the colors of a wall sign and touch or surround the sign should be considered sign area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ground signs on decorative walls, planters and other landscape structures.</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.3.k</td>
<td>Allow ground signs on such walls and structures permitted within the building setback, as long as they are at least 5 feet from street right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18. Wall signs in Industrial zones. | 21.16.330.B.1 | Eliminate following special limitations:  
- No more than one sign per business.  
- Signs shall be a uniform color & letter style compatible with bldg. materials used on site.  
- Signs shall only be located on bldg. frontages. (Make more consistent with wall sign requirements in Commercial zones.) |
<p>| 19. Minimum spacing between ground signs on sites in Industrial zones. | 21.16.330.B.3.b | Eliminate minimum spacing between ground signs on sites in Industrial zones (300 feet) to be consistent with ground sign requirements in Commercial zones. (Max. of 2 ground signs per street would remain unchanged.) |
| 20. Measuring height of ground and monument signs. | 21.16.310.A.2.c | Clarify that the height of such signs is measured from average finish ground level at the mid point of the sign base (same as pole signs). |
| 21. Regulations for residential construction signs. | 21.16.290.E | Reference requirements for Commercial constructions signs if they are the same. |
| 22. Wall signs on canopies. | 21.16.310.B.1 | Clarify that canopies constructed of the same materials as the building to which they are attached and canopies supported from the ground by a post/column may have walls signs. (This would include gas station canopies.) |
| 23. Wall signs on buildings with multiple wall segments and/or canopies. | 21.16.310.B.1, 21.16 Figure 2 | Clarify which overall building façade a wall segment or canopy side corresponds to. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>LMC Section</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Wall signs on canopies over drive-through windows and gas pumps</td>
<td>21.16.310.B.1 &amp; 21.16 Figure 2</td>
<td>Clarify which side of such canopies would be considered a “primary public entrance” for sign placement purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wall sign height.</td>
<td>21.16.310.B.1.b</td>
<td>Clarify that wall signs should not extend above wall to which they are attached to be consistent with new Citywide Design Guidelines adopted in 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Freestanding sign spacing on a business site.</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.1 &amp; 21.16.310.A.2</td>
<td>Clarify that pole signs on a business site must be at least 250 ft. apart. Clarify that this spacing requirement does not apply to monument or ground signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Sign area bonus for pole signs 50 feet or more from the street.</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.1.a</td>
<td>Clarify how sign area bonus works (Create a table.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Maximum sign area for pole signs.</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.1.a</td>
<td>Clarify that the max. area for a pole sign is 155 SF unless, it is 50 ft. or more from a street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Nonconforming pole (pylon) signs with individual sign components.</td>
<td>21.16.250</td>
<td>Clarify that individual sign components can be replaced on nonconforming pole signs as long as the supporting frame/structure is not altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Monument Sign sight triangle.</td>
<td>21.16.310.A.2.c &amp; 21.16 Figure 4</td>
<td>Clarify that the street intersection sight triangle should be measure from the outside edge of the sidewalk, if right-of-way line is not close to edge of sidewalk at the street corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Billboard signs.</td>
<td>21.02.085 &amp; 21.02.698</td>
<td>Clarify that billboard signs are defined as off-premise signs and therefore prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Signs in new College District Mixed Use Zone (CDM) and College District Overlay Zone (CDO).</td>
<td>21.57.500.D.4 &amp; 21.58.400 &amp; 500</td>
<td>Clarify that business signs must comply with requirements of 21.16.310, except that no pole, monument or roof signs are allowed. Clarify that the portion of EdCC zoned CDM may have monument signs per 21.16.300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Flashing lights (e.g. strobes) in business windows.</td>
<td>21.16.200 &amp; 21.16.220</td>
<td>Clarify that flashing lights, such as strobes in business windows are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. LED “Palm Trees” and other illuminated objects.</td>
<td>21.16.200 &amp; 21.16.220</td>
<td>Clarify that such objects are considered “art”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Banners for Temporary Special Events at City parks and public schools.</td>
<td>21.16.260, 21.16.290 &amp; 21.16.300</td>
<td>Clarify that these signs can be used with limitations at City parks and public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Freestanding sign area transfer to a building wall.</td>
<td>21.16.310.B.1</td>
<td>Clarify that freestanding sign area transfer not counted in determining total allowable wall sign area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Permanent banners of any type on private property.</td>
<td>21.02.665, 21.02.670, 21.16.220, 21.16.260, 21.16.310.G</td>
<td>Clarify that all permanent banners (except those considered “art”) are not allowed on private property. This would not include banners that qualify as seasonal decorations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lynnwood Planning Commission
### Meeting of May 26, 2005

### Staff Report

Agenda Item: I-2

### Upcoming Commission Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Meeting Cancelled</td>
<td>Lack of business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>Public Hearing:</td>
<td>Transp. Improvements Plan (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business:</td>
<td>Initiate a Code Amendment (Sign Code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>Cancel?</td>
<td>Consider canceling this meeting if the agenda is light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>Public Hearing:</td>
<td>None Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Session:</td>
<td>2005 Plan Amendments – Continued review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>Public Hearing:</td>
<td>None Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Session:</td>
<td>2005 Plan Amendments – Final Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign Code Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Session:</td>
<td>Sign Code Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following schedule is for planning purposes – subject to adjustments.