AGENDA
Lynnwood Planning Commission
Thursday, September 11, 2014 — 7:00 pm
City Hall, Council Chambers, 19100 44th Ave. W., Lynnwood WA

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   1. None. Minutes of the August 28, 2014 meeting will be considered at a future meeting.

C. CITIZEN COMMENTS – (on matters not scheduled for discussion or public hearing on tonight’s agenda) Note: Citizens wishing to offer a comment on a non-hearing agenda item, at the discretion of the Chair, may be invited to speak later in the agenda, during the Commission’s discussion of the matter. Citizens wishing to comment on the record on matters scheduled for a public hearing will be invited to do so during the hearing.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   1. 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Highway 99 Consistency

E. WORK SESSION TOPICS
   1. Draft Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (continued)

F. OTHER BUSINESS

G. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

H. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

I. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

J. ADJOURNMENT

The public is invited to attend and participate in this public meeting. Parking and meeting rooms are accessible to persons with disabilities. Upon reasonable notice to the City Clerk’s office (425) 670-5161, the City will make reasonable effort to accommodate those who need special assistance to attend this meeting.
I. Application Name and Number

File Name: 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendments - Highway 99 Consistency

File Numbers: CPL-001454-2014

Date of Hearing: September 11, 2014

Applicant: City of Lynnwood
Community Development Department
4114 198th St. SW
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Staff Contact: 
Gloria Rivera, Senior Planner
(425) 670-5409, grivera@ci.lynnwood.wa.us

Todd Hall, Senior Planner
(425) 670-5407, theall@ci.lynnwood.wa.us

II. Proposal

The following is the 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket, which contains one City-initiated project that is up for consideration by the City Council.

A. General Plan Amendment

2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Highway 99 Consistency (CPL-001454-2014)

This proposal is for text amendments to the Highway 99 Subarea Plan as part of the annual update to the City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan. Currently, there are inconsistencies between the Subarea Plan and the City’s development regulations (Title 21 – Zoning Code). Two amendments are to be considered as part of this proposal. The first amendment includes removing unlimited height to provide...
consistency with the zoning code. The second amendment includes removing the minimum lot area for multi-family development outside the nodes and to provide consistency with the zoning code. Specific details regarding both amendments are provided below.

**Text Amendment #1 – Current Land Use (Goal 1), Policy 1.1, 1.1.3:**

Current policy reads: “Encourage specific standards for the Hwy 99 Mixed-Use zone.”

The sub-policy reads: **Do not limit building height for buildings incorporating residential development.** In order to encourage more residential development at the nodes along the corridor no maximum height is established for buildings incorporating residential units within the HMU zone. Design standards and guidelines will be established to ensure new development does not negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods.”

Table 21.46.13(a) of the development regulations reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Development Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with non-residential development only and less than 2 acres in size</td>
<td>Sites with non-residential development only, on sites 2 acres or greater in size OR sites of any size with residential development of less than 20 dwelling units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setbacks*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Property Lines</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Residential Units+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Sidewalk Width Along Public Streets</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Dwelling units/Acre++</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor-Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See LMC 21.62.450 for development adjacent to a residential zone (Transitional Property Lines).
* Applies to residential projects only; setback is from all public rights-of-way, internal circulation (vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian), parking areas, or access easement. Alternatively, where vision-obscuring glass is installed, the setback may be eliminated.
++ The minimum number of residential units to qualify for this Level shall be calculated using the entire project site. Where residential development is part of redevelopment of one or more parcels, this calculation shall be based only on the portion of the parcel(s) being redeveloped. Fractional portions of a unit are “rounded up” for this calculation.
Proposed Amendment:

Land Use (Goal 1), Policy 1.1, 1.3.3: “Encourage specific standards for the Hwy 99 Mixed Use zone.” The sub-policy reads: “Do not limit building height for Establish for buildings incorporating residential development a maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed six stories. In order to encourage more residential development at the nodes along the corridor no maximum height is a maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed six stories is established for buildings incorporating residential units within the HMU zone. Design standards and guidelines will be established to ensure new development does not negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods.”

Text Amendment #2 – Current Land Use (Goal 3), Policy 3.2, 3.2.1:

Current policy reads: “Consider allowing residential development at larger parcels outside of the nodes.” The sub-policy reads: “Allow residential development at parcels five acres or larger through approval of a planned unit development. In addition to the nodes identified in Policies 1.1 and 1.2, larger parcels on other parts of the nodes may be suitable for residential or mixed-use –with-residential development. Owners of such parcels may seek to develop the property as if it was located in a node by applying for approval of a planned unit development (PUD), as provided in the Zoning Code. An application for a PUD under this policy shall be evaluated for general compliance with the regulations of the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone, though variations from those regulations may be approved by the City Council if it finds that either site-specific circumstances necessitate a variation or that the variation is fully consistent with the purpose and intent statements of this Subarea Plan and the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone.”

Proposed Amendment:

Land Use (Goal 3), Policy 3.2, 3.2.1: The policy reads: “Consider allowing residential development at larger parcels outside of the nodes.” The sub-policy reads: “Allow residential development at parcels five acres or larger through approval of a planned unit development. In addition to the nodes identified in Policies 1.1 and 1.2, larger parcels within other parts of the corridor may be suitable for residential or mixed-use –with-residential development. Owners of such parcels may seek to develop the property as if it was located in a node by applying for approval of a planned unit development (PUD), as provided in the Zoning Code. An application for a PUD under this policy shall be evaluated for general compliance with the regulations of the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone, though variations from those regulations may be approved by the City Council if it finds that either site-specific circumstances necessitate a variation or that the variation is fully consistent with the purpose and intent statements of this Subarea Plan and the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone.”
III. Exhibits

1. Draft Ordinance
2. Highway 99 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Narrative
3. Highway 99 Corridor Maps

IV. Noticing

A combined Notice of Public Hearing and Determination of Nonsignificance was issued on August 12, 2014. The notice was published in the Herald newspaper and posted at the City of Lynnwood official posting sites on or before August 12, 2014.

The draft comprehensive plan amendments were provided to the Department of Commerce as required by RCW 36.70A.106 and WAC 365-196-630. Notices of intent were provided on April 11, 2014.

V. Background

Chapter 18.02 of the Lynnwood Municipal Code (LMC) provides a process for annual consideration of amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Review of these amendments is a major component of the Planning Commission’s annual work program.

The LMC provides for two “types” of proposals to amend the Plan: formal amendment applications and suggested amendments. Formal amendment applications are either citizen- or City-initiated for specific project-related or site-specific amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Suggested amendments are ideas or proposals that are initiated by a citizen or other private party who would like the City to consider but, for whatever reason, they do not wish to file a formal application.

One City-initiated formal application was submitted prior to the April 1, 2014 filing deadline. One privately-initiated formal amendment was submitted for 2014. However, the City Council removed the later from the docket at the July 28, 2014 business meeting.

VI. Decision Criteria and Staff Analysis

Chapter 18.04.070 LMC states that the criteria to be used in the review and approval of plan amendment requests are contained in the Implementation Element of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan.

The Implementation Element of the Comprehensive Plan states the following criteria for taking action on proposed Plan amendments:
Each component of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment package shall be reviewed and approved only if it meets all of the following criteria:

- “The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act and will not result in Plan or regulation conflicts; and

  **Staff Analysis:** The proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act. Specifically regarding the height restriction of the Highway 99 Consistency amendment, the elimination of the unlimited height will not be inconsistent with the GMA. GMA requires that housing opportunities be available within the City. Any impact created by the potential reduction of housing due to the cap on height should be offset by the increased opportunities to develop housing by the elimination of a minimum site area requirement. The restriction on the height of structures will provide for consistency with the Development Regulations in the Highway 99 Corridor.

  With regards to the elimination of the minimum site area, the elimination of five acre minimum site area will make the project more consistent with the GMA requirement to support housing. The comprehensive plan eliminating the minimum five acres will make the development regulations and Comprehensive Plan consistent.

- “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

  **Staff Analysis:** With regards to the height restriction, the elimination of the unlimited height may change development or use potential of a site within the Highway 99 Corridor. However, the reduced development intensity of the site should create less impact on existing sensitive land use, businesses or residents.

  With regards to the elimination of the five acre minimum site area, it may increase residential development in multi-story buildings along the Highway 99 Corridor. This more broadly distributed development may result in development adjacent to other businesses and residents. Businesses should be nominally impacted. Impacts to residents will be mitigated by setbacks and building height limitations when development is located adjacent to single and multi-family residential zones. Existing sensitive land uses will be mitigated by the environmental setback standards for development.

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

  **Staff Analysis:** The elimination of the unlimited height and density will reduce the impacts on all applicable public services, including transportation.
The elimination of five acre minimum site area may increase residential development in multi-story structures along the Highway 99 Corridor. The more broadly distributed development may require additional public services and facilities, however, the broad distribution throughout the Corridor will lead to less intense demand for facilities a given area.

- “The proposal will help implement the goals and policies of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan; and

  Staff Analysis: The elimination of the unlimited height in the Highway 99 Corridor may reduce the support for more intensified housing along Highway 99. However, the allowance of housing along the entire Corridor is a new concept since 2011 and its placement adjacent to the entire length of the Highway should encourage support for increased housing in the future along Highway 99 which was allowed under the previous Comprehensive Plan. The elimination of five acre minimum site area will increase residential development in multi-story structures along the Highway 99 Corridor leading to increased support for housing. Setbacks and screening will help to protect adjacent residentially zoned properties.

- “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.”

  Staff Analysis: Neither Text Amendment #1 or Text Amendment #2 will have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City Limits. In fact, the location of multi-family housing in the vicinity of goods and services may reduce the impacts outside of the City limits.

VII. Environmental Review

On August 12, 2014, the City’s SEPA Responsible Official issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (File Numbers ERC-001564-2014). The public comment period for the Determination ended on August 27, 2014. No comments were received during the SEPA public comment period. The appeal period for the Determination ended on September 10, 2014. No appeal of this Determination was filed.

VIII. Public Comment

The City received no public comments regarding the proposed amendments.
IX. Recommendation

Staff concludes that the request to amend the City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan meets all the criteria for evaluation per Chapter 18.04.070 and the Implementation Element of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing to hear public testimony regarding the proposed amendments. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission may begin deliberation and make a recommendation to City Council to hold a public hearing to consider adoption of the 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendments - Highway 99 Consistency (CPL-001454-2014), as proposed by City staff.
CITY OF LYNNWOOD

ORDINANCE NO. ___

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD, WASHINGTON, APPROVING THE 2014 AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REGARDING THE HIGHWAY 99 SUBAREA PLAN, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE, SUBMISSION TO THE STATE, SEVERABILITY AND SUMMARY PUBLICATION

WHEREAS, the City of Lynnwood adopted a Comprehensive Plan to comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act on April 10, 1995, by Ordinance No. 2033, and amended the Plan annually in subsequent years by ordinance in accordance with GMA and Lynnwood Municipal Code Title 18; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130, the City’s Comprehensive Plan and development regulations shall be subject to continuing review and evaluation; and

WHEREAS, applications and suggestions to amend the Comprehensive Plan were accepted and docketed for processing after April 1, 2014, in accordance with the approved amendment schedule; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments were subject to environmental review, culminating in issuance of Determinations of Non-Significance for the amendment proposal; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments were submitted for the mandatory 60-day state agency review and agencies were asked to comment prior to final action by the City Council, no comments were received; and

WHEREAS, the Lynnwood Planning Commission reviewed the list of annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments at their May 22, 2014 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Lynnwood City Council approved the final list of annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments at their July 28, 2014 business meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Lynnwood Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 11, 2014 on these proposals, and following the public hearing recommended approval of all the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Lynnwood City Council conducted a public hearing on October 13, 2014, and determined that taking action on the amendments, as described herein, was desirable and in the public interest and welfare;
NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD DO
ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1: Amendment of Lynnwood 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The Highway 99 Subarea
Plan is hereby amended as follows:

Land Use Policy 1.3.3: Establish for buildings incorporating residential development a
maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed six stories. In order to encourage more
residential development along the corridor a maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed
six stories, is established for buildings incorporating residential units within the HMU
zone. Design standards and guidelines will be established to ensure new development
does not negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Land Use Policy 3.2.1: Allow residential development through approval of a planned
unit development. In addition to the nodes identified in Policies 1.1 and 1.2, parcels
within other parts of the corridor may be suitable for residential or mixed-use—with-
residential development. Owners of such parcels may seek to develop the property as if it
was located in a node by applying for approval of a planned unit development (PUD), as
provided in the Zoning Code. An application for a PUD under this policy shall be
evaluated for general compliance with the regulations of the Highway 99 Mixed Use
Zone, though variations from those regulations may be approved by the City Council if it
finds that either site-specific circumstances necessitate a variation or that the variation is
fully consistent with the purpose and intent statements of this Subarea Plan and the
Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone.

Section 2: Submission of Plan to the State. The Director of Community Development is hereby
directed to submit a copy of all approved amendments to the City of Lynnwood – 2020
Comprehensive Plan and Lynnwood Municipal Code to the Department of Commerce of the
State of Washington.

Section 3: Effective Date of Amendment and Adoption. This Ordinance and the Plan and
Municipal Code amendments adopted by this ordinance shall become effective five days
following passage and publication of this Ordinance.

Section 4: Severability. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance should be
held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or
unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence,
clause or phrase of this Ordinance.

PASSED this ____ day of November, 2014, and signed in authentication of its passage
this ____ day of ______________, 2014.
APP PROVED:

NICOLA SMITH, MAYOR

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

LORENZO HINES, FINANCE DIRECTOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ROSEMARY LARSON, CITY ATTORNEY

FILED WITH ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: 

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: 

PUBLISHED: 

EFFECTIVE DATE: 

ORDINANCE NUMBER: 

Publish:

File Name: 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

File Number: CPL-001454-2014
On the ___ day of November, 2014, the City Council of the City of Lynnwood passed Ordinance No. ____. A summary of the content of said ordinance, consisting of the title, provides as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD, WASHINGTON, APPROVING THE 2014 AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF LYNNWOOD 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REGARDING THE HIGHWAY 99 SUBAREA PLAN, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE, SUBMISSION TO THE STATE, SEVERABILITY AND SUMMARY PUBLICATION

The full text of this Ordinance will be mailed upon request.

DATED this ___ day of ________________, 2014.

____________________________________
Lorenzo Hines
FINANCE DIRECTOR, CITY CLERK
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – TEXT AMENDMENTS

CPL-001454-2014 (HIGHWAY 99 CONSISTENCY)

(Incorporated by reference by the City Council into the City Comprehensive Plan on September 11, 2011)

Text Amendment #1

Current Land Use (Goal 1), Policy 1.3, 1.3.3: The policy reads: “Encourage specific standards for the Hwy 99 Mixed Use zone.” The sub-policy reads: “Do not limit building height for buildings incorporating residential development. In order to encourage more residential development at the nodes along the corridor no maximum height is established for buildings incorporating residential units within the HMU zone. Design standards and guidelines will be established to ensure new development does not negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods.”

Table 12.46.13(a) of the development regulations read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites with non-residential development only and less than 2 acres in size</td>
<td>Sites with non-residential development only, on sites 2 acres or greater in size OR sites of any size with residential development of less than 20 dwelling units/acre</td>
<td>Sites with residential/mixed use development or residential-only development with 20 dwelling units/acre or more of residential development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setbacks*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Street</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Property Lines</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Residential Units+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Sidewalk Width Along Public Streets</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>90 ft., not to exceed six stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Dwelling units/Acre++</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20 DU/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor-Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See LMC 21.62.450 for development adjacent to a residential zone (Transitional Property Lines).
+ Applies to residential projects only; setback is from all public rights-of-way, internal circulation (vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian), parking areas, or access easement. Alternatively, where vision-obscuring glass is installed, the setback may be eliminated.
++ The minimum number of residential units to qualify for this Level shall be calculated using the entire project site. Where residential development is part of redevelopment of one or more parcels, this calculation shall be based only on the portion of the parcel(s) being redeveloped. Fractional portions of a unit are “rounded up: for this calculation.

Proposed Amendment:

**Land Use (Goal 1), Policy 1.1, 1.33:** The policy reads: “Encourage specific standards for the Hwy 99 Mixed Use zone.” The sub-policy reads: “**Do not limit building height for buildings incorporating residential development a maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed six stories.** In order to encourage more residential development at the nodes along the corridor no maximum height is a maximum height of 90 feet, not to exceed six stories is established for buildings incorporating residential units within the HMU zone. Design standards and guidelines will be established to ensure new development does not negatively impact adjacent residential neighborhoods.”

**Rationale for Amendment:**

Following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations, it was brought to the attention of the City, an inconsistency for height existed between the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. Establishing a height limit of six stories would be consistent with standard five stories of wood over concrete. At the same time, the five stories would be higher than typical housing allowed in the city’s multi-family zones and would allow for increased density adjacent to Highway 99.

**Text Amendment #2**

**Current Land Use (Goal 3), Policy 3.2, 3.2.1:** The policy reads: “Consider allowing residential development at parcels five acres or larger through approval of a planned unit development.” The-sub-policy reads: “**Allow residential development at parcels five acres or larger through approval of a planned unit development.** In addition to the nodes identified in Policies 1.1 and 1.2, larger parcels within other parts of the corridor may be suitable for residential or mixed-use—with-residential development. Owners of such parcels may seek to develop the property as if it was located in a node by applying for approval of a planned unit development (PUD), as provided in the Zoning Code. An application for a PUD under this policy shall be evaluated for general compliance with the regulations of the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone, though variations from those regulations may be approved by the City Council if it finds that either site-
specific circumstances necessitate a variation or that the variation is fully consistent with the purpose and intent statements of this Subarea Plan and the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone.

Proposed Amendment:

Land Use (Goal 3), Policy 3.2, 3.2.1: The policy reads: “Consider allowing residential development at larger parcels outside of the nodes.” The sub-policy reads: “Allow residential development at parcels five acres or larger through approval of a planned unit development.” In addition to the nodes identified in Policies 1.1 and 1.2, larger parcels on other parts of the nodes may be suitable for residential or mixed-use—residential development. Owners of such parcels may seek to develop the property as if it was located in a node by applying for approval of a planned unit development (PUD), as provided in the Zoning Code. An application for a PUD under this policy shall be evaluated for general compliance with the regulations of the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone, though variations from those regulations may be approved by the City Council if it finds that either site-specific circumstances necessitate a variation or that the variation is fully consistent with the purpose and intent statements of this Subarea Plan and the Highway 99 Mixed Use Zone.

Rationale for Amendment:

Following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations, it was noted by City staff that Development Regulation had not been adopted to allow multi-family housing within the B-1 and GC zones in the Highway 99 Corridor outside of the Highway 99 mixed-use “nodes.” City staff presented an amendment to the Development Regulations to the City Council that would have allowed multi-family residential development through the PUD process on sites with a minimum of five acres. On October 14, 2013, the City Council approved an Ordinance to allow multi-family housing between the “nodes” through the PUD process without a minimum acreage requirement.
A. Is the proposal consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA) and will not result in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.

Proposal 1 (Height Restriction) – The elimination of the unlimited height will not be inconsistent with the GMA. GMA requires that housing opportunities be available within the City. Any impact created by the potential reduction of housing due to the cap on height should be offset by the increased opportunities to develop housing by the elimination of a minimum site area requirement. The restriction on the height of structures will provide for consistency with the Development Regulations in the Highway 99 Corridor.

Proposal 2 (Elimination of Minimum Site Area) – The elimination of five acre minimum site area will make the project more consistent with the GMA requirement to support housing. The comprehensive plan eliminating the minimum five acres will make the development regulations and Comprehensive Plan consistent.

B. Will the proposal change the development or use potential of a site or area without creating significant adverse impact on existing sensitive land uses, businesses, or residents?

Proposal 1 (Height Restriction) – The elimination of the unlimited height may change the development or use potential of a site. However, the reduced development intensity of the site should create less impact on existing sensitive land use, businesses or residents.

Proposal 2 (Elimination of Minimum Site Area) – The elimination of five acre minimum site area may increase residential development in multi-story buildings along the Highway 99 Corridor. This more broadly distributed development may result in development adjacent to other businesses and residents. Businesses should be nominally impacted. Impacts to residents will be mitigated by setbacks and building height limitations when development is located adjacent to single and multi-family residential zones. Existing sensitive land uses will be mitigated by the environmental setback standards for development.

C. Can the proposal be accommodated by all applicable public services and facilities, including transportation?

Proposal 1 (Height Restriction) – The elimination of the unlimited height and density will reduce the impacts on all applicable public services, including transportation.

Proposal 2 (Elimination of Minimum Site Area) – The elimination of five acre minimum site area may increase residential development in multi-story structures along the Highway 99 Corridor.
The more broadly distributed development may require additional public services and facilities, however, the broad distribution throughout the Corridor will lead to less intense demand for facilities in a given area.

D. Will the proposal help implement the goals and policies of the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan?

Proposal 1 (Height Restriction) – The elimination of the unlimited height in the Highway 99 Corridor may reduce the support for more intensified housing along Highway 99. However, the allowance of housing along the entire Corridor is a new concept since 2011 and its placement adjacent to the entire length of the Highway should encourage support for increased housing in the future along Highway 99 which was allowed under the previous Comprehensive Plan.

Proposal 2 (Elimination of Minimum Site Area) – The elimination of five acre minimum site area will increase residential development in multi-story structures along the Highway 99 Corridor leading to increased support for housing. Setbacks and screening will help to protect adjacent residentially zoned properties.

E. Could the proposal have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City limits?

Neither Text Amendment #1 or Text Amendment #2 will have significant impacts beyond the Lynnwood City Limits. In fact, the location of multi-family housing in the vicinity of goods and services may reduce the impacts outside of the City limits.