



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

7:30 PM November 8, 2018
City Hall Annex

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Gerald Veltkamp, Blair Scott, Diane Veltkamp, Lynn Templeton

Absent with notice: Brett Kok and Tim Faber

Staff Present: Gudde, Planning Director; Samec, City Planner and Timmer, City Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 25, 2018

No additions or corrections. Approved unanimously. Scott / G. Veltkamp

4. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

None of the Commissioners reported any ex-parte contact or conflict of interest.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Pump Station #3 Shoreline Substantial Development and Shoreline Conditional Use Permit #18-02, 8460 Depot Road.

D. Veltkamp opened the public hearing.

Dave Timmer gave a brief description of the application.

The City's Public Works Department (PW) is seeking a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for the placement of an emergency generator that would serve as back-up power for Pump Station #3 during times of power outages.

The City's sewer conveyance system is designed to collect waste water that is generated throughout the city and safely transport it to the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) located south of downtown alongside the Nooksack River. Lynden is quite flat and therefore requires a system of 15 pumps to overcome gravity and transport waste water from across the city to the WWTP.

Pump Station #3 is located on the west side of Depot Road across from the City Park property. It serves Basin I which comprises the neighborhoods east and west of Depot Rd north to Sunrise Drive. Pump Station 3 pumps the waste water generated within this basin across Fishtrap Creek and south down Depot Rd where it can then gravity feed to the WWTP. These pump stations run on electricity. That presents difficulty during power outage events. Most pump stations in the City already have back-up generators installed. When the power goes out to Pump Station #3, though, PW has to mobilize and monitor a temporary generator in order to keep waste water from backing up into residences and potentially into Fishtrap Creek.

This proposal is to permanently install an emergency back-up generator for Pump Station 3 that will automatically activate during power outage events. This would negate the obvious logistical difficulties that PW faces when power outages occur. Pump Station 3 is close to Fishtrap Creek, approximately 75 ft from the north bank. There is not room to add the generator pad on the west side of Depot directly adjacent to the pump station. Therefore, the logical location for the new generator pad is east of Depot in the City Park property.

PW evaluated 4 possible locations for the pad which are described in the Conditional Use portion of their application. Because it is the City Park, these locations were evaluated based on the possible impact to the creek, the park and its neighbors. The location they chose is within the 200 ft Shoreline jurisdiction of Fishtrap Creek.

The ecological impact to the shoreline environment is minimal – the pad is only 140 square ft and the location is already impacted (Depot Rd, trail entrance and other utility boxes). PW is proposing planting native shrubs around the pad to visually buffer the generator and to provide native plant habitat.

Mark Sandal, Public Works. Sandal stated that a concrete pad will be built to install a backup generated for the sanity sewer Pump Station #3 near City Park. This pump station will run on its own in the event of a power outage. This is the best location of all that were looked at.

Landscape plan is attached to the PC packet. The generator will also have a 6-7-foot fence to allow for screening.

D. Veltkamp asked if the Magnolia trees nearby will need to come down due to the installation of this generator? Timmer replied, no.

Speaking in favor

None

Speaking in opposition

Don and Adelene Vandenberg, 8514 Depot Road, Lynden

300 4th Street, Lynden, WA 98264
www.lyndenwa.org

The Vandenberg's expressed concerned with the proposed location of the generator. The location is at the front of the Million Smiles Park entrance. It is a beautiful area.

Vandenberg stated, according to Public Works, there was another possible location on the other side of the creek, why was that option not further explored? Sandal stated that other areas were explored, however, they were not as convenient as the proposed location and crossing the creek presented other issues. Both the Public Works Director and the Parks Department were involved in deciding the location.

The Vandenberg's also noted that they are not sure if the proposed plantings to be used to screen the generator will do well under the existing large trees. Timmer replied, the shrubs that were chosen are shade tolerant shrubs and will eventually provide a nice screen.

The Commission discussed a change in fence material as well as landscape alternatives that would better camouflage the generator.

D. Veltkamp noted that the location makes practical sense, however, the screening needs work. The Commission would like to see a cedar fence instead of a chain link fence as it will be a better match with the park as well as an increase in the use of evergreen shrubs to provide a better, more dense screen. Staff also talked about the possibility of adding privacy screening to the fence.

Scott motioned to close the public portion of the hearing. Seconded by Templeton.

Templeton motioned to recommend approval of Shoreline Substantial Development Permit and Shoreline Conditional Use Permit #18-01, as presented, according to the findings, conditions and recommendations of the Technical Review Committee Report dated October 26, 2018, and further subject to the following condition to install cedar fencing and dense/substantial native evergreen plantings around the generator. Seconded by G. Veltkamp, and the motion passed 4-0.

6. WORKSHOP AND PUBLIC FORUM – PEPIN CREEK ZONING- CONTINUED

Gudde gave a brief overview of the documents within the Commissioners packets. A brand new Chapter 19.18 – Pepin Creek Sub-Area Zone and Chapter 19.16 which provides the revisions to the Residential Mixed Density Zone.

Gary Vis 518 Front Street

Vis asked about the need to have different buffer sizes between varying lot sizes. Does Lynden have a way to get solid information to help determine the impact between zones? The City should look at the potential max density in one location and force a

developer to mix it up. Concerned that there will be large chunks of property developed that will all look the same.

Vis noted that areas within Pepin Creek where there is commercial tied to multi-family should be looked at as it does not work.

Owen Gosal,

Gosal keeps hearing the term “keeping Lynden Lynden” - what is the definition of that?

Templeton replied, neighborhoods, large streets, community spirit, maintaining agriculture roots, etc.

Gosal thinks of Homestead when he hears Lynden. Gosal stated that affordable opportunities for housing needs to happen in this community. Concerned that we are going down a track that will ruin the next generation. Affordability must be in the forefront. We need to think of the future. A lot of young adults cannot afford to move out let alone buy a home of their own. Some are choosing not to go to college because they are worried about the debt accrued from school. They feel that they should work to save for a home.

Gosal stated that park model homes / mobile home parks are a good way to help get people established. Briefly mentioned the former dump site as a possible temporary location.

Condo and town homes do not work in the US. But that type of development is what is needed. Go to Canada to learn how they do it, both good and bad.

Brian Korthuis,

Korthuis is curious on what demographics is being targeted for the Pepin Creek. It appears as if there it is a mix for a large variety of needs.

It is important to provide opportunities for the future. Concerned that the type of people that may move into the area will not be able to maintain it.

D. Veltkamp thanked those who spoke.

Gudde gave an overview of the newest section of Title 19, Chapter 19.18, Pepin Creek Subarea Zones. Gudde explained how the chapter was configured. Primary, accessory permitted and conditional uses, development standards, setbacks, transition areas, open space, landscape requirements, senior overlay and associated permitted / conditional uses and their development standards.

Templeton cross referenced both 19.16 and 19.18 and asked, other than the minutia, what is the biggest difference between the Residential MF and the RM-PC. Both allow multi-family, the RM-PC allows a smaller lot size while RM PC requires a common open space.

Templeton wants to make sure that Pepin Creek still looks and feels like Lynden.

Staff stated that we are currently talking about a new section of code, however, for a large portion of Pepin Creek we will use zoning that already exists within the City. Parking standards will remain the same. As for street widths, in talking with Public Works, they would only be willing to allow streets that are roughly 2 feet smaller than what is currently required.

The newly proposed RM PC is a multi-family zone. The City has other multi-family zones in the community, however, this proposed code was written to alleviate some concerns of existing multi-family.

Also, given the constraints of the Stormwater, it is highly unlikely that Pepin Creek will build out to its full density. When you mix several factors together this area will not be that different from other areas in Lynden.

There was a question regarding where the Senior Overlay could be utilized. Staff replied, only in the RM-PC zone. D. Veltkamp asked for clarification on how many units can be constructed in that overlay according to 19.18.020 (E)? This may need some rewording.

Scott has concerns with the transition area. Existing houses in these areas should have a larger transition/buffer area.

Veltkamp expressed concerns regarding 19.18.020 (G)(5) as second story multi-family dwelling units in conjunction with first floor commercial does not work. The language under this section should be changed from multi-family to residential. More discussion is needed.

Under 19.18.030(A)(1)(b), D. Veltkamp has concerns with the ratio of 4-unit buildings that could be built along with an 8-unit building under this section. More variety is needed. Staff replied, that scenario could happen in any of our existing multi-family zones. D. Veltkamp stated that the intent of what is trying to be achieved is not clearly reflected. Staff will look at the ratio and try to reword.

How do you write code to protect the monotony of a development? Staff replied, you utilize the code, design standards, public hearings and the other guidelines established. Common green space is an important factor. The green space within Homestead is one of their great attributes.

Looking at Pepin Creek the City will be much more prescriptive than what was done in East Lynden.

Under 19.18.030 (B)(7), it was requested that the number of vehicles on any single-family lot be reduced on the smaller lots in Pepin Creek. 5 is too many.

Under 19.18.030(F)(1), G. Veltkamp will provide some examples of house designs that can be built on some of the lot sizes reflected under the RM-PC Development Standards. G. Veltkamp will provide examples to Staff and they will send to the PC.

Under 19.18.030(I)(2), Should there be a percentage noted for the transition. Just requiring detached single family is not enough. Transition zones should also look at heights, density, and an overwhelming amount of the same type of construction.

There was brief discussion regarding the concerns for rentals. Pepin Creek may not lend itself to rental properties as it will be costly due to the stormwater.

Under 19.18.030(K)(3)(a&b), more discussion is needed regarding the building foundation plantings. Should the minimums be increased?

The Commission chose to end review of Chapter 19.18 for the evening. Continued review regarding the Pepin Creek Senior Overlay and Uses Established will continue at the next meeting.

7. COMMISSIONERS CORNER

Templeton asked if there is a reason why PC meetings start at 7:30 instead of 7:00? The Commission chose to discuss this topic at a future meeting when Faber is present.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Templeton / Scott 10:00 pm