



112 Second Street
P.O. Box 366
Langley, WA 98260
(360) 221-4246

City of Langley
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD
AGENDA
December 11, 2019 @ 3 pm
LANGLEY CITY HALL
112 2nd Street, Langley WA

1. Call to Order
2. Approve agenda
3. Approve minutes of November 6, 2019
4. Discussion Items:
 - a. Parking discussion continued (attachment from JR Fulton)
 - b. Code amendments (attachments to be sent out prior to the meeting)
5. New Business
6. Citizen comments
7. Announcements
8. Adjourn

Next Regular Meeting: January 8, 2020

Guiding Principles for Citizen Committees and Boards.

- All advisory board and committee meetings are to be conducted in public session and noticed in accordance with state law, unless otherwise advised by the city attorney.
- Individual committee members and the collective group will be fair, impartial, and respectful of the public, staff, and each other.
- Committee members will respect the limitations of their individual and collective authority. The role of the committee is to advise the city council and/or staff. Please keep in mind that committee appointment does not empower you to make final decisions, unless authorized by state law or the group's enabling ordinance, or to supervise staff.
- Members will strive to appreciate differences in approach and point of view, whether from each other, the community, the city council, or staff.
- Each member will participate in the group's discussions and work assignments without dominating the discussion or activity of the committee.
- The committee chair will ensure that all members have a fair, balanced, and respectful opportunity to share their knowledge and perspectives.
- The committee will attempt to reach consensus on issues. If consensus is not possible, strong differing opinions, such as "minority" opinions, should be recorded and acknowledged in the committee's report to the city council.
- There should be "no surprises" from the committee, either in the nature of the work being undertaken by the committee or the method and timing for conveyance of recommendations to the city council. The staff liaison fulfills an important role in assisting the committee in this regard.

When presenting recommendations to the Council, it is essential that advisory group members keep the following in mind:

- all recommendations should be in written form;
- all ideas should be expressed in clear and concise language;
- proposed solutions should be viable and cost-effective;
- recommendations should identify the reasons for the changes suggested;
- the advice should reflect a consensus of a majority of the group members.



112 Second Street
P.O. Box 366
Langley, WA 98260
(360) 221-4246

City of Langley
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
November 6, 2019
LANGLEY CITY HALL
112 2nd Street, Langley WA

ATTENDANCE

Board: Thomas Gill, chair; Burt Beusch, JR Fulton, Maralie Johnson

Absent: Tucker Stevens, Rhonda Salerno

Council member: Christie Korrow

Staff: Brigid Reynolds, Director of Community Planning

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm

2. Approve agenda

JR requested to make a statement before Item b

Burt requested an update on short term rentals.

3. Approve minutes

Minutes of October 2nd meeting were approved.

4. Discussion Items:

a. PAB membership draft code amendments

Brigid stated there have been challenges getting members. People have expressed interest, but they do not live in the City. The proposed amendments will enable people from outside the City to apply to be on the PAB.

The Board discussed the draft code. JR asked if we should include a professional who does not own a business? But works in the City?

The term is for three years and there is no limit on the number of times one can renew their appointment. Administrative staff tracks this information.

The Board agreed that it's important that the majority of the board is made up of people with a stake in the community.

Burt asked why is POS is referenced in this section. This is because some of the work they do is related to PABs purview.

Discussion of the steps that we have to go through in order to modify Chapter 18.

Thomas suggested the residency requirements be expanded to include people who live in the JPA. Another suggestion is to include people with specialized knowledge who work in the City.

JR moved and Burt seconded the following motion. To amend Section 18.20.090. B. Residency, as follows:

The Planning Advisory Board is comprised of four voting members and one alternate. Three
~~Four~~ voting members and the alternate must reside either within the city of Langley. ~~or a~~ A
maximum of one member may reside within the ~~unincorporated urban growth area (UGA) or~~
Joint Planning Area (JPA), as defined by the most current adopted comprehensive plan map; or
may own a business in the City; or may be a professional (working or retired) with specialized
knowledge on land use, architecture, planning and similar who lives within the 98260 zip code;
or is employed in the City in a profession with specialized knowledge.

Approved, unanimous.

b. JR Fulton read the following statement

"A reminder, that I am owner of a property at Second and DeBruyn which is the only undeveloped Mixed Residential (RM) multi-family property currently in Langley.

We will not be speaking about this specific property. We will however be discussing RM zoning for the entire code which could affect this property. My understanding of the shortfalls and opportunities surrounding the RM code are largely learned from study and analysis of what is needed to develop affordable housing on this property. So some may consider this a conflict that I want you to be aware of.

I believe that I am following the most recent guidelines that allow my full participation in all overall zoning issues, questions and opportunities. We will not be discussing the property at Second and DeBruyne, but zoning code that could affect it.

My hope is that we are truly inclusive and embrace opportunities to create affordable housing."

The Board determined JR can participate: this would be a conversation only, no votes will be taken, and it would not be specific to JR's property.

c. Proposed Code Amendments based on the discussion paper

The Board started discussing the discussion paper that was submitted with the agenda. Ross Chapin, architect was in attendance and he added his comments to the discussion.

Parking

The Board discussed possible amendments to the parking requirements. There are different sections of the code that contain parking regulations that need to be reviewed. Brigid will talk with Chief Don Lauer about parking issues that have been brought to his attention.

The code references table 18-1 which includes parking stall dimensions but staff cannot find this table.

Parking codes tend to be designed around suburban and large urban jurisdictions and parking requirements tend to be higher than necessary.

Issues discussed:

- Reduce parking requirements to 1 stall per dwelling unit for single and multi-family residential uses and for a multi-unit building require a percentage for guest parking, for example 10 to 15%
- The parking requirements are currently high and we don't want to turn a development into a parking lot.
- Identify streets where on street parking could be permitted
- On street parking reduces the width of the street and tends to slow traffic down
- Adequate space for pedestrians must be maintained or established
- Reducing parking requirements reduces development costs
- The code currently requires all parking to be provided on site. For multi-family developments consider allowing a percentage of parking to be permitted on the street. But these parking stalls would be open to anyone to use and not be restricted for the developments' tenants.
- Before making amendments we need an inventory of street and shoulder widths, shoulder material, site lines, etc to identify locations in the City where on street parking could take place.
- On street parking must be located in areas that are appropriate.
- Install parking meters to get some revenue. But the cost to install and enforce would likely exceed revenue. These might also change the character of the City by making a little less friendly.
- Main Street is trying to find grants for improvements to the two public (church) parking lots.
- Currently fines are low and do not cover the processing costs.
- Whether or not lines should be painted for parallel parking stalls.

- Permitting more compact car parking stalls. The code currently allows for 50% of parking stalls may be for compact cars.

Setbacks

Board members discussed different options to revise the setbacks. The setbacks in the code generally reflect a suburban form of development, i.e. large front and rear yards and isn't consistent with Langley's village character.

Current setbacks are as follows:

Zone	Front	Rear	Side	
RS5000 & 7200	20	25	5	
RS15000	20	25	10	
Mixed Res (MR)	20	25	5	10 ft side for MF development
Central Business	0	0	0	5 ft side/ 25 ft rear when abutting residential

This table outlines the main setbacks that apply and does not include all the setbacks for ADUs or accessory building for example.

Reducing setbacks need to be reviewed with consideration for unintended consequences.

There is a potential for some developers to maximize what is permitted which could result in large structures.

Issues discussed:

- Permit some things to be located in the side yard for example, generators and HVAC systems but there is noise nuisance to consider.
- Permit by right some things into the setbacks for example,
- Moving structures closer to the street could reduce infrastructure costs.
- Garages should be located behind the front face of the dwelling to reduce the dominance of the car and make a more inviting building frontage.
- Where there is an alley or lane require vehicle access from there.
- Reduce setbacks by a certain percentage of the building but not for the whole dwelling to reduce the impact of the building massing.
- Eaves are permitted to extend into the setback by 18 inches. This exception could be expanded to include bay windows, fireplaces, stair landings or similar structures.
- Corner lots are required two front yard setbacks but there is a provision to reduce this by 50%.

Building Heights

JR suggested increasing the heights in all zones. Maralie expressed concern about this and said the heights should remain as is.

Increasing height in certain zones (commercial and mixed residential) or certain locations (south of Sixth St) may be reasonable but not in all cases.

This item requires careful consideration and a clear purpose be outlined.

Makers Space

This item was tabled until next month's meeting.

d. December PAB meeting

Brigid stated she is on a course December 4th and could we change the meeting date. The Board agreed to meet on December 11 instead.

5. New Business

a.STR update - Approximately 15 permits in process. Nine to ten have been issued.
Second compliance letters have gone out. There are a few anomalies to sort out.

b.Tucker Stevens has confirmed that he does not want to be chair.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm

7. Next Regular Meeting: **December 11 at 3 pm**

Langley Parking Considerations

JR Fulton December 1, 2019

There are **several national transportation trends** that affect Langley currently and will increasingly affect it in the near future.

- Cars are increasingly hybrid and/or electric and as such, smaller than when our automobile focused zoning code was developed.
- Mobility is increasingly a service-Uber, Lyft, Reach, Car to go, Lime. These ride hailing services will increasingly reduce the need for car ownership/parking.
- Autonomous vehicles, allowed in some states, are on the horizon for Washington, which will also decrease car ownership/parking.
- Not all younger people are owning automobiles. Older residents are giving up driving for safety reasons. There is increased car sharing.

There are several **current national trends in parking**.

- Many cities and towns are eliminating or significantly reducing minimum parking requirements from their zoning codes.
- Parking is becoming more market based, rather than prescribed by zoning rules.
- With better transit, ride hailing, etc. parking needs are being reduced significantly.
- There are more cost effective methods in Commercial zones, like metering to manage parking than to build more free parking.
- Multifamily non-profit/inclusive housing are seeing significant reduction in required parking by towns and cities. Minneapolis recently reduced from one parking space for each multifamily unit to 0.5 spaces/unit. This is based on need, walkability and reducing the cost burden for multifamily occupants.
- There is a better understanding of the true need, methods of management as well as initial and long term costs related to parking.

Trends in Langley

- As “oldest average age” town in Washington, we should have the highest number of residents who have given up driving for safety.
- Many people are “over-housed” with fewer than two residents living in single family houses or 2BR apartments. (total residents/total bedrooms)
- Langley has an abundance of on street parking outside of the central business district.
- Langley has privatized some public streets allowing only adjacent home residents to park on the street.
- Langley has actively reduced on street parking along First Street and for the adjacent the Neighborhood Businesses at DeBruyne.
- Large portions of the required and constructed parking in Mixed Residential (multifamily) is unneeded, un-used and a wasteful expense.
- At least one “grandfathered” apartment building has 0.5 parking spaces per unit, without undo problems related to on street parking.

There are basically four types of parking in Langley: Commercial, Residential, Multifamily (MR) and Institutional (predominately churches and schools). Tiny House Community parking is a slightly different standard under MR.

The three most predominate forms of parking in Langley: Commercial, Residential and Multifamily (MR). Commercial parking can be characterized as primarily in the Central Business District (CBD) and is largely tax payer funded and maintained. In order of effectiveness, this includes the very effective diagonal parking downtown, along Anthes and portions of First and Second, the large parking lot at Third Street behind the Central Business District, some less effective

parallel parking along as well as some remote parking on church and school properties. There is also a small amount of private parking for offices and commercial “hotel” rentals in the CBD. Commercial parking is not currently actively managed through metering or other means.

Residential parking can be characterized as both on site and on adjacent street parking. Langley zoning requires that a single family house plus the first ADU provide two parking places on site. (A third parking space is required for a second ADU.) Single family residential parking exists and can be accessed via the right of way, perpendicular and close to the street, which is very space and cost effective. Many garages, counted as parking are not used for vehicle storage.

Mixed Residential (MR), multifamily housing has the most restrictive parking, requiring a very high number of (underutilized) parking spaces. MR requires 2 parking spaces for two bedroom units, 1 parking space for both one bedroom and studio spaces. No on street parking, regardless of abundance, can be counted toward required MR parking. Unlike other residential parking, pull in parking perpendicular to the street is not allowed, though one complex on Fourth Street is “grandfathered in”. Multifamily units are more often smaller units than single family housing; affordable units are almost always smaller unless subsidized.

Each on-site “parking lot” space of efficient parking requires approximately 300 sf of land for parking including “paved” access to the parking space. Cost for a surface space, whether it is used or not, is in excess of \$5000. Cost for a covered space under a building is in excess of \$25,000. This is first cost and does not include long term maintenance of this parking. These parking cost burdens translate directly to increased rent costs.

There are two means of parking: on-site parking and on-street parking. On-site parking is both costly and requires a significant amount of land that could be given over to gardens and other amenities. In the case of affordable housing, parking requirements/costs can be a make or break issue. On-street parking in appropriate areas is cost effective and a good use of public resources. Narrowing of streets is shown to be an effective means of “traffic calming” (reducing the speed of vehicles). Street parking is more space effective as the street serves as the access to the parking space. While not all streets in Langley are appropriate for on-street parking due to existing conditions, most streets are readily available and often used for parking. I believe the average width of the right of way in Langley, between the street edge and the property line to be on average 15-20’, providing plenty of parking access, including diagonal parking.

Where there is appropriate adjacent on-street parking available in Langley:

- Create a definition for evaluation of public streets that are appropriate for on-street parking. This can be based on a variety of information, including street width, right of way space adjacent, obstructions or physical conditions in the right of way, whether use of the right of way has been privatized, etc.
- Consider in single family zone, reducing on-site parking requirements by one **space** where appropriate on-street parking is available immediately adjacent to the property line.
- Consider in MR (multifamily) zones, reducing the on-site parking requirements by a significant percentage of the available appropriate on-street parking places immediately adjacent to the property line. I suggest that 75% of available on-street spaces be used to offset required on-site parking and remaining 25% be maintained for public use.
- Consider when dealing with existing on-street parking or creating new on-street parking that Langley create efficient parking layouts for the public good. To the greatest degree possible, do not allow privatizations of the public right of way. Avoid unnecessary parking lots.
- Where appropriate and space allows adjacent Central Business and Neighborhood Business, Institutional or public amenities and space consider proven, more efficient and cost effective diagonal on-street parking.

Based on the underutilized parking lots that I have observed at five Langley MR multifamily sites and given that we have an aging population with larger proportion of “over-housed” (fewer drivers/vehicles than bedrooms).

- Consider doing a quick internal, no cost, study to determine more accurate parking use/need based on utilization of existing MR parking lots in Langley.
 - This could be based on simple counts of used and vacant spaces done very early in morning to obtain accurate counts.
 - It could also identify the number of legal drivers in any complex and assume one vehicle/driver, which may provide a high count due to older couples owning only one vehicle.
- Based on agreed upon Survey, establish appropriate Zoning parking requirements for all MR housing, including affordable housing.

Public Disclaimer: I would like you to be aware that I, JR Fulton, am part owner of the only undeveloped (MR) property in Langley. I believe that I am encouraged to use my expertise to participate fully in all issues and opportunities that affect overall zoning, including MR, as long as we are not discussing the specific property that I own.