Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Planning Advisory Board (PAB) Members Present: Don Daniels, Chair; Bob Zawilski, Connie Coleman-Lacadie, Jim Taylor

PAB Member Excused: Jeff Brown, Doug Babbit, Paul Calta

Staff Present: Dan Catron, Principal Planner; Lisa Sanchez, Recording Secretary, Brad Medrud, AHBL, Inc., Contract Planner

Council Liaison Present: Mary Moss

Approval of Minutes:
Minutes of the meeting held on June 18, 2014, were unanimously approved M/S/C Zawilski/Coleman-Lacadie, approved as written

Changes to Agenda: NONE

Public Comments: Mr. Glen Spieth, Lakewood resident and Lakewood Historical Society member, mentioned that today the Mayor and City Manager dedicated the historical marker for Lakewold Gardens, a dual marker, indicating that it is a historically registered property within the City of Lakewood. The second was the Lakewood Ice Rink, which has never been designated and is no longer standing, but it was a commemoration of where it stood. Additionally, the Starlite Drive-in has been here for over 50 years and would qualify for a historical marker from the Lakewood Historical Society at some point in time if they would be interested in the designation.

Public Hearing: Proposed Code Amendments Regarding Satellite Parking Regulations
Mr. Daniels opened the hearing and invited staff to deliver opening statement.

Mr. Catron introduced Mr. Brad Medrud from AHBL, Inc. His firm was hired to process this application due to current staffing limitations in the community development department.
Testimony commenced:

**Mr. Brad Medrud**: AHBL, located at 2215 N. 30th St., Tacoma, WA 98403. AHBL was hired to review the text amendment on behalf of staff for the City of Lakewood. The subject property is 2.5 acres and is proposed for development as a satellite parking lot and is located South of the Starlite Swapmeet along 84th Street S. and is currently within the AC2 zoning district. The proposed text amendments would expand the location and duration of satellite parking lots within the city. Mr. Medrud proceeded to orally review the staff report and arguments presented from the City’s perspective on this particular application.

It is the contention of the Staff that the land use and development code text amendment is not consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan as follows:

1. Adding the AC2 zoning district to the definition of the phrase “Commercial Zones” found in the Lakewood Municipal Codes Rules of Construction will create a number of inconsistencies within the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Land Use development code.
2. The proposed text amendments are also inconsistent with the goals and polices of the Comprehensive Plan that strive to limit the further expansion of land designated for commercial use in the City.
3. The City’s zoning district designations and the Land Use and Development code carry out those land use designation policies established in the Comprehensive Plan. The City’s AC2 land use designation in the Comprehensive Plan is the basis of the AC zoning district. If the AC2 zoning district is redefined as a commercial zone it will create conflicts elsewhere in the Land Use and Development Code where commercial zones establish one standard and military related zones establish another.
4. Allowing satellite parking lots to operate year round with no limit of duration also creates conflicts with the City’s regulation of off street parking, expanding satellite parking lot beyond seasonal and temporary use to a permanent use will allow satellite parking lots to function essentially as standard off-street parking facilities. The City’s off-street parking regulations require that parking be located on the same property as the use is located or within 300 ft. with limited exceptions.

Mr. Medrud concluded by noting that a public notice was published in the TNT on June 26th, the SEPA review and determination closed on July 11th. The Community Development Department recommends that the Planning Advisory Board conclude that the proposed text amendments in general do not satisfy the criteria of LMC 18A.02.14-15. If the board finds that the proposed text amendments do not have merit, then Staff is recommending approval of the attached resolution recommending that the City Council deny the proposed text amendments

**Mr. Zawilski** had four questions as follows:

1. What is the distance between the satellite parking and the Starlite Swapmeet?
   
   *Mr. Medrud confirmed the proposed parking lot will be across 84th street.*
2. So it’s within the 300 feet, the satellite parking regulation is within half mile, correct? Mr. Medrud responded confirming the distance of proposed parking lot being within 300 feet.

3. Is the objection against the actual use of the land in this manner or the manner in which the modification of the regulation is proposed? Mr. Medrud responded saying the basis for the Staff’s objection to this particular amendment is that it will create a larger set of issues when you expand the definition of the commercial zone, there is a lot of unintended things that will happen in code beyond just being able to allow the satellite parking use, that is the primary argument.

4. So it’s more with the way it’s implemented? Mr. Medrud’s responded saying it is with the proposed nature of the text amendment rather than the proposed use itself.

Ms. Coleman-Lacadie had following question:

1. Because said property is within some of the parameters of the location of the swap meet area, does it mean that it has to change the commercial zone area in order to create a parking lot then? Mr. Medrud responded, the way the current municipal code is written satellite parking lots are only allowed within commercial zones, which do not include the AC2 as part of their definition. So, the way the code is written right now they could not propose a satellite parking use of the located in the AC2 even if it is across the street from the existing use in a commercial zone. Mr. Catron noted that as an alternative to using the property as a satellite parking lot, petitioner can also use the property as a used car sales lot which it is permitted in the AC2 zone.

Mr. Daniels asked for any other comments from the Board, with no response. He then requested a presentation from the applicant.

Mr. Steve Burnham, resident of Bonneylake, WA.
Mr. Burnham was in attendance to represent the owner, Mr. Hank Barden, of the Starlite Swapmeet and would like to offer other audience members the opportunity to comment in order to address any questions following his presentation.

Mr. Glen Spieth, City of Lakewood, WA.
Mr. Spieth didn’t note much difference between a used car lot with pedestrians, and a parking lot with people parking their vehicles and walking across the street. He commented that the Starlite has had parking problems for years, and while he is not a consumer of said operation, he does feel it’s a valid use for relief of on-street parking, especially if applicant has spent money to accomplish that.

Ms. Coleman-Lacadie asked if there were any comments from public either via email or mail? Mr. Catron responded saying that Staff did get one comment from JBLM, saying they had no comment.

No one else commented and the floor was given to Mr. Burnham to begin his presentation.
Mr. Burnham proceeded with his presentation and distributed Exhibits* A – E. Mr. Burnham stated that he and his client had visited the PAB meeting last fall on September 18, 2013 to discuss the potential code amendments. After that discussion they listened to what the comments were and Mr. Barden, owner of the Starlite determined that he'd bring forward the application. At the time of that discussion, they didn’t hear the resistance that they’ve heard in the last couple of weeks from Staff. The Staff report basically indicated that what they thought what was a relatively appropriate thing to ask for, and also a relatively minor amendment, that it changed the whole planning code of the City of Lakewood and that distressed them a little because it was not their intention. They can appreciate the Staff’s concern regarding the concept of unintended circumstances, and will admit as the applicant they did not go through and analyze the whole code to try and determine if there really was any change.

At this time Mr. Burnham distributed Exhibit F and continued to describe in detail the proposed amendments to Section 18A.2.410 (Exhibit F), Section 18A.2.130 and Section 18A.50.550(F) (Exhibit D).

Mr. Burnham and his client believe that their request does meet all of the criteria necessary for an approval by the Planning Advisory Board, because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as follows: (referring to Exhibit E)

1. Page 1 identifies that the City Council has the authority to amend the code. They were simply asking for text amendment to allow satellite parking to occur in the AC2 zone.
2. Page 2 are the elements that were previously referred to by Staff representative Mr. Medrud with comments verbally given by Mr. Burnham as to why they do meet criteria with such arguments to each standard as follows:
   A. Proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and their application cites chapter and verse of the Comprehensive Plan that support their application. Their position is that the plan will promote public safety, neighborhood appearance, economic development, transportation, and in particular, this project will reduce existing on-street parking that has been an issue with the operations and has generated complaints over the years with the Starlite operation.
   B. The Aerial Map (Exhibit C) was referred to and showed compatibility with the development in the vicinity.
   C. This parking lot will be subject to all of the development standards that are applied to the same type of parking lots in commercial zones in other locations. Petitioner is not requesting that any part of that sentence be amended. The proposed parking lot actually reduces the current impacts of the operation by moving on-street parking to off-street parking. That’s a positive!
   D. The proposed parking lot will not have any adverse impacts on public services on utilities. It will be just to park cars off street and hopefully that will reduce complaints and that type of thing.
   E. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City. There is an implication in the Staff’s report that by allowing satellite parking to occur in the AC2
zone, we increase the risk of higher density uses and more people coming into that zone. This parking lot is intended to support existing operations.

F. This criteria doesn't apply as petitioner is not asking for any changes in use.

G. They are not asking to change any of the uses in the AC2 zone except to allow satellite parking lots so they do not think that this criteria applies.

H. They've reiterated that moving on-street parking to off-street parking and consolidating to one area is a positive.

Mr. Burnham also commented that the petitioner would support a recommendation agreeing to the 6month/5year duration limitations so that it’s not an issue with Staff. Mr. Burnham thanked the Planning Advisory Board and stated that the applicant believes that it has satisfied all of the requirements to provide a recommendation for approval to the City Council.

Mr. Taylor commented that he’d heard nothing in the presentation or reviewed any documents about traffic control for this additional parking area. The traffic is pretty heavy in the additional area; do you have any proposals for traffic control portion of this request? Mr. Burnham stated that the portion of the application process handling traffic control would be addressed during that review. He further stated that they would meet whatever requirements, restrictions, and conditions that are mandated by the development code.

Mr. Zawalski directed the following questions to the Petitioner:

1. Is the intent for this request to be an additional parking lot or is this envisioning using the existing parking in the commercial area to be developed into more commercial buildings? Mr. Burnham responded saying that he not aware of, nor has Mr. Barden mentioned any future expansion. Furthermore if that is a concern it could be addressed in the development application process and have conditions that prevent future expansion of buildings onto current parking site. He also stated that if you keep the seasonal nature of Satellite Parking Lot as well as the five year term you wouldn’t be able to use this as a parking lot for permanent commercial activity parking.

Directed to the City:

2. If petitioner were to attempt to process this as a commercial project, would it have to be a change of planned use to go from parking, to more stalls, through that sort of approval process? Mr. Catron responded that the City did not have a specific regulation on the number of stalls that can be used or built.

3. Do we have any piece of land in the city that is subject to the satellite parking regulations now and do any of them fit this criteria? Mr. Catron stated that he is not aware of any.

Mr. Zawilski further commented that could see both sides of this dilemma, where the City is considered. He also realizes the need for an extra parking lot at the Starlite
operation. His suggestion would be to change Satellite Parking regulations and try to not squeeze it into AC2 designation.

Mr. Daniels asked Staff to compare this project to a prior topic regarding a Pierce Transit request to create a Bus Yard in the AC2 zone behind their current location. Mr. Catron clarified that the parcel was only partially in the AC2 zone, the remaining portion is in the Public Institutional Designation. Mr. Daniels then questioned the use being similar to the Petitioner’s request. Mr. Catron said, technically no, the Pierce Transit request would be for a public maintenance facility which is allowed in the AC2 zone. Mr. Daniels then clarified his comment by saying that if you title it differently, then you’d be in a different position.

Mr. Zawilski asked the City if they wanted the PAB to recommend rejection to this specific concept, and if there is a mid-ground where the PAB would table this and let the applicant go back to change the language for satellite parking? Mr. Catron responded that Staff would agree to do this.

Ms. Coleman-Lacadie asked where else is there an AC2 zone that would be impacted by this amendment change? Mr. Catron replied that there are several places in the code that use the term in residential zones, the term would have unintended consequences in those other instances. Ms. Coleman-Lacadie asked that the addition of AC2 in this particular area wouldn’t necessarily have to add it to those other affected areas, correct? Mr. Catron replied that they are adding it to the rules of construction and that is where the concern lies. Mr. Medrud further clarified that the altering of 2 words in a very important section of the code is actually part of a key question for this particular application.

Mr. Burnham asked the Board to modify the amendment request to address Staff. The applicant now requests to amend the application based on suggestions during the evening’s discussions. They will resubmit revised language to amend the Satellite Parking section. The affected section will be in Lakewood Municipal Code 18A.50.5500F after the word commercial in the 3rd line adding “and AC2” and leaving all else the same in that section.

Mr. Zawilski questioned the Staff if they had any comments on this recent change? Mr. Catron replied that Staff would assume petitioner simply wants to amend the application. Mr. Zawilski agreed and stated that this takes care of most the issues in the Staff report, correct? Mr. Medrud replied that this is potentially the case, but then again we’re basically throwing out the entire amendment and the proposal is completely different now so being able to say whether everything is ok now is not that easy to say, Staff also wants to revisit the SEPA review, in light of these amendments.

Mr. Burnham responded by requesting another review in 30 days to allow staff adequate review time and also allowing the applicant to send a letter to Staff stating that they are amending their application.

Mr. Daniels agreed that it would be the best course of action at this particular time.
Mr. Taylor questioned the need to create a motion, or if there was a consensus that the plan was to table discussion in lieu of the information presented. Does Staff feel comfortable that there is a consensus for the application to be withdrawn and go back for further review? Mr. Catron responded that he was not sure when the next meeting would be, but assuming that it is not for at least four weeks, that Staff was accepting of the decision to table discussion upon further review of new information forthcoming from petitioner.

Mr. Daniels responded that there will be no need for a motion or any further direction. Staff will review all comments and bring it back to the PAB in four weeks or so for further discussion.

Unfinished Business: NONE

New Business: NONE

Reports from Board Members and Staff: Mr. Catron introduced Lisa Sanchez, who is the new Administrative Assistant in the Community Development Department and will serve as the PAB secretary.

Mr. Catron reported that the website for the Visioning process is up and running in “barebones” form right now, but includes surveys in English, Spanish and Korean. Mr. Catron also indicated that the consultant would be adding materials as become available on a continual basis. A plenary Community Meeting that everyone will be invited, is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 23rd at 6pm.

Mr. Daniels further added to Mr. Catron’s comments, that the Visioning Plan is an important step for the City and he is very excited to be a part of the process. Mr. Daniels highly encourages that everyone participate by looking at the website, taking the survey, sharing any comments or concerns, telling as many people as possible about the site. We need the citizen’s input and their involvement in what they’d like to see in the future City of Lakewood.

Mr. Catron reiterated to everyone to take the survey and if you are a member of any community group, service organization, etc., there is a place on the webpage for you to sign-up and have our consultants come make a presentation to your group. That is one of the primary ways that we are planning to communicate with the community, through these standing meetings with existing community groups. If interested, please sign-up and someone will be in touch to set-up meetings as well as a presentation.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:51 pm
**Next Meeting:** The next PAB meeting is tentatively scheduled for approximately 4 weeks from today.

Don Daniels, Chair  
Planning Advisory Board

Lisa Sanchez, Administrative Assistant  
Planning Advisory Board

*Exhibits from Starlite representative Mr. Steve Burham:*
  - Exhibit A – Current Allowed Uses in AC2 Zone
  - Exhibit B – Current Uses Allowed Industrial Zone 1
  - Exhibit C – Aerial Map of AC2 Zone and Map
  - Exhibit D – Alternately proposed 84th Street Motor Vehicle Sales Lot Plan
  - Exhibit E – Requested text change to LMC 18A.2.130(K)
  - Exhibit F – Document on “How to Amend the Code”