

MINUTES  
CITY OF LANGLEY  
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD WORK SESSION  
November 4, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM.

Members Present: Sue Walsh, Gail Fleming, Roger Gage

Absent: Dominique Emerson, Ron Kasprisin

Staff: Jack Lynch, Cheryl Knighton, Doug Yormick

Sue Walsh opened the meeting at 3:00PM.

There was some discussion on the Comp Plan updates and where they were at this point. No one has been able to look at the recent changes. Doug will send out an electronic version with the changes that have been submitted for everyone to review before the next meeting. It was decided that the public hearing will be revisited at the next meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>.

Sue is concerned about the timelines. She suggests that each member of the board take a different Element to review. The report back for a consensus to make changes they found should be made. She wants to make sure that the Summary is completed and correct. Gail wants to know what the future plan is for meeting dates. Jack feels the dates should not change at this point, that they need to stay on track and keep moving forward. Everyone agreed. Sue is willing to look at the Shoreline Element more closely. There was some concern about a "new" Planner. Fred McCarthy said at this time, Michael is still the Planner, but is only on leave until an administrative decision is made and it is quite possible that he could be returning.

Doug will update the schedule and there will be no more nightly meetings until further notice. The board would like the Land Use Element on the website for the public to review. Doug will do this.

There was an Annexation Request submitted on Sandy Point Rd. Jack explained the request was submitted and the process in which it will be brought forth to council. He will take it to council on November 16 for review. At that time, they will either accept it, reject it, or modify it. Council makes the decisions and it is not appealable. At this time the applicants have not submitted a reason for the request.

Mayor McCarthy stated he was not informed of the proposal before it was presented to the board. He read the RCW 335A.14.120 regarding the process. He explained his feelings on how it should have been presented. He wants to make sure the process is followed according the RCW. He explained the sewer system in that area and how it was approved and what kind of system it is. Sue asked if this process is unique to Langley, Jack explained yes, as far as the last time an annexation was applied for.

### **Vacant Commercial Space**

Doug and Jack met with Mainstreet Association. They would like to find ways to deal with the empty store fronts in Langley. What are some ideas that could be brought forth through the emptiness until the buildings are occupied? Application could be applied for through ordinance somehow to avoid "dead space" for visual effect- way finding etc.

## Utility Element

The city Clerk has authorized out of the 2016 & 2017 budget, for the city engineers to work on this element.

## Other Items

Gail asked about the Minnie Lane land split. Jack explained that it has been submitted but not yet acted on and it pending at this time. He has the information regarding the wetlands and will look at all of the elements. Gail asked if there were agreements in place for how board members communicate with each other with regards to respect and courtesy. Fred said that they should treat each other with respect. If there is communication that is not appropriate, the chair person should give a verbal warning, then written. Final outcome could be expulsion from the board. Sue added that in her opinion expulsion should come from the Mayor as he is the appointing authority.

The following was submitted by Ron Kasprisin as he was unable to attend:

### Density increases

I support an increase in density for selected areas of the City following detailed analysis with accessory units, multiplex infill, live/work where possible.

### Form-based Zoning

In my experience, form-based zoning can be accomplished in a small community once the initial work is done to establish the zone overlay and massing diagram. This make design review an easier and more objective process. We may have to work with a consultant on this or team of volunteers to put together.

### Residential Subdivisions

There are only a small number of parcels that can be subdivided within the city. To avoid problems similar to Edgecliff, I strongly recommend wording that encourages conservation zoning for any parcel subject to a subdivision process. Conservation zoning is density neutral in that the property owner does not lose density. The key is then given percentage of the land is to be indicated as a contiguous open space of (x) %. Minimum lot sizes are accordingly dissolved, permitting underlying density with increased open space effectiveness. A larger open space requirement can exist for the property with a percentage of that open space to be contiguous as specific site factors must be taken into account. This encourages cluster development, smaller house size and still meets financial and marketing objectives for realtors and financiers. See Urban Land Institute, Northeast Illinois Regional Planning and others.

### Historic Preservation and Design

I recommend a protection strategy for historic structure(s) and historic block patterns in downtown (First Street—double loaded corridor with zero setback, contiguous with a 25 feet height. I strongly advocate against any language that encourages new “historically themed” or renew design that reflects the historic character (style) of the downtown. Style is the key word. New buildings can be guided through form-based zoning regarding scale, roof type, front façade transparency etc., etc. without trying to mimic style as it can be a disaster (Poulsbo).

### Other Issues

I recommend that the DRB be involved in discussions related to design composition and style within the downtown area as they can have a significant role in review and advisement re: new buildings.

I recommend we bring in expertise regarding on-site storm and waste water treatment so that we can understand the options available for water retention and discharge back into the ground as opposed to being processed and flushed into the Sound. I have suggested Jerry Stonebridge of Stonebridge Environmental for this task as he is a recognized national and international expert in this field.

I have reviewed the parking study. I find no problem with the study with one exception. To add a level of detail, an effective technique to determine the length of stay per stall is as follows:

1. Number each stall on First Street
2. Note license plate numbers every half hour (using intern) from 9:30 AM until 6 PM

This can indicate either shop owner or employee use of parking space. Each space can be allocated a sales figure so the spaces or stalls are important for retail sales.

I did this with graduate students in La Conner years ago arriving at the conclusion that 27% of spaces on First Street were being used by shop owners or employees.

Meeting adjourned: 4:10 PM