Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call
B. Approval of Agenda & Consent Agenda Items*
   Approval of the August 21, 2018, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Public Comments: 7:01 p.m.

Commission Members Reports: 7:03 p.m.

Director’s Report: 7:05 p.m.

New Business: 7:10 p.m.
Metropolitan Parks District: Jennifer Burbidge, Director of Parks and Recreation. The Planning Commission will hear a briefing from staff on the Metropolitan Parks District ballot issue.

Old Business: 7:40 p.m.
Housing Strategy Update: Jessica Brandt, Associate Planner. The Planning Commission will be briefed on the status of the development of the City’s Housing Strategy including recent outreach conducted with department directors related to the prioritization of action items

Project Updates: Jessica Brandt, Associate Planner; Ryan Andrews, Planning Manager. The Planning Commission will hear an update from staff on the development of regulations pertaining to small cell wireless facilities and the municipal code audit.

Communications and Announcements: 8:55 p.m.

Next Meeting: October 2, 2018.

Adjournment: 9:00 p.m.
### CITY OF LACEY PLANNING COMMISSION
#### WORK SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission Meeting</th>
<th>1. Work Session: Metropolitan Parks District (Jen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2018</td>
<td>2. Work Session: Housing Strategy Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets due: September 13th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission Meeting</th>
<th>1. Work Session: Municipal Code Audit Title 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets due: September 27th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission Meeting</th>
<th>1. Work Session: Municipal Code Audit Title 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2018</td>
<td>2. Work Session: Wireless Communications Facilities Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets due: October 11, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets due: November 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 20: Municipal Code Audit Public Hearing
Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Paul Enns.


Paul Enns noted a quorum present. He welcomed the newest Planning Commission Member, Eddie Bishop.

Dave Wasson made a motion, seconded by Sharon Kophs, to approve the agenda for tonight’s meeting. All were in favor, the motion carried. Peg Evans-Brown made a motion, seconded by Mark Mininger, to approve the August 2, 2018, minutes. All were in favor, the motion carried.

1. Public Comments: None.

2. Commission Member’s Report:
   - Sharon Kophs reported on her attendance at the Opioid Summit hosted by Thurston County. The County is launching monthly meetings to address this topic. Attendees were primarily service providers.

3. Director’s Report:
   - Rick Walk announced a fundraising event for the new Lacey Makers Space will be held September 25 at the Hub in Lacey from 4-6pm. The purpose is to announce the Makers Space to the public and highlight the technology that will be available. An invitation to the event will be sent to the Planning Commission.

4. Public Hearing:
   Pedestrian Bicycle Plan for Lacey and the Lacey Urban Growth Area:
   - Paul Enns opened the public hearing.
   - Ryan Andrews began by noting this is the first Pedestrian Bicycle Plan for the City of Lacey. The 2012 Transportation Plan identified the need for this and aligns with the Land Use element in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Ryan provided a PowerPoint presentation that discussed the plan’s objectives, project timeline, existing conditions analysis, public outreach and input, and major themes from the input. He also noted that the plan is focused on the “concerned but interested in biking” segment of the community. The plan’s three primary recommendations are: make it safe, make it connected, and build momentum.
   - There was discussion about prioritization of projects among the Planning Commissioners and staff. Ryan noted that projects were dispersed geographically and located near destinations where people want to go.
   - Karen Messmer, on behalf of Olympia Safe Streets Campaign, testified in support of the plan. She appreciates the comprehensive approach and thorough guidelines.
   - Robert Mead, lives near Woodland Trail/Chehalis Trail connection, testified in support of the plan. The bikeability of our area was a primary reason for him to relocate to Lacey and he wants the City to continue making it even better.
   - Charles Pope, Advisory Committee Member, testified in support. Commends inclusion of the youth perspective and e-bike inclusion.
Eric Palmer, 2406 Angela St, testified in support of the plan. Also provided written comments to Ryan with specific locations for improvements.

Sharon Kophs made a motion, seconded by Cathy Murcia, to recommend approval of Plan to City Council. All were in favor, the motion carried.

5. Public Hearing: Depot District:

Paul Enns opened the public hearing.

Ryan provided a PowerPoint presentation. The Depot District is the third subarea plan for the City, after the Northeast Lacey and Woodland District plans. Ryan discussed the project area, process of plan development, consultants involved, showed a video clip of a news program about the planning effort, and described the three scenarios. The Plan has four key objectives: University District improvements, Lacey Blvd and Pacific Avenue traffic calming, east end transformation with the Reserve project and pedestrian activity, and the spatial implementation strategy. This area will likely expect more housing than retail in the coming years, but transformation will be organic and gradual.

Ryan summarized the written comments received prior to the hearing.

Traffic calming on the arterial was discussed and how that would impact capacity or throughput. Ryan noted that the intent was not to decrease capacity or throughput with any calming efforts.

On page 3-24 the Gateway Features were discussed regarding timeline and branding. The branding would be done before the features to make the look consistent with the brand, whatever it may be.

Discussion about timelines and the implementation strategies. Rick and Ryan noted that this is a broad plan with general parameters, and although development isn’t predictable, having some targets helps with gauging progress. The City will seize opportunities as they can, despite timelines.

Brian Fluetsch, representing Sunset Air on Franz St and Lacey Blvd. Supportive of plan in general because of aesthetic improvements and connection with St. Martins. Concerned about compatibility issues with his business. As the neighborhood gets less industrial feeling, he’s worried about having or wanting to move his business.

Paul Perz, 8609 34th Ct SE, testified in support of the plan. Thanked staff, Planning Commission for doing this plan, and thought the process was really important and brought the community together. Wants to see more activities in Lacey for entertainment. Thinks the museum is a good anchor for the area.

Rick passed along oral comments in support from St. Martins University, from a conversation with Cecilia Loveless earlier in the day.

Discussion about how businesses will be engaged in the implementation. It was noted that as real projects come to fruition, more analysis will be needed and process would engage the users, especially for any traffic calming measures.

A member of the public asked about an I-5 interchange on Carpenter Road. Scott Egger said according to FHWA that would likely be at least 30 years away. As far as traffic calming on the one-way couplets, changing speed limits would require a council approval and public input.

Dave Wasson made a motion, seconded by Sharon Kophs, to recommend the plan to City Council. All were in favor, the motion carried.

6. Communications and Announcements: None.


8. Adjournment: 8:33 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Jessica Brandt.
Proposition 1  Formation and Funding of New Lacey Metropolitan Park District

On November 6, 2018, Lacey residents have the opportunity to vote on the formation of a Metropolitan Park District (MPD).

Election Day: November 6, 2018

Ballots should arrive in your mailbox the week of October 10.

Find Out More  visit:  ci.lacey.wa.us/MParkDist  •  call:  360.491.0857  •  email:  LaceyParks@ci.lacey.wa.us

LACEY METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT

Proposition 1  Formation and Funding of New Lacey Metropolitan Park District

What is Proposition 1?
Lacey Proposition 1 is a measure on the November 6, 2018, ballot asking Lacey voters to:
• Create a Lacey Metropolitan Park District to provide ongoing funding to acquire, maintain, operate, and improve parks, trails, recreational facilities, and programs.
• Establish the Metropolitan Park District’s boundaries as the Lacey city limits.
• Designate the Lacey City Council as the Metropolitan Park District’s governing board.
• Authorize the Metropolitan Park District’s governing board to set the tax rate at $0.47 per $1,000 assessed home value.

What is a Metropolitan Park District (MPD)?
An MPD is a junior property-taxing district, authorized by state law, to manage, control, improve, maintain, and acquire parks, parkways, boulevards, recreational facilities, programs, and services.

How Would the Metropolitan Park District (MPD) Revenue Be Spent?
If approved by Lacey voters, MPD revenue would be spent on the focus areas listed below. Phase 1 Priority Projects listed inside.

• Provide public access to city-owned, undeveloped park properties.
• Add park amenities for all age groups.
• Help maintain a safe, quality park system.
Proposition 1  Formation and Funding of New Lacey Metropolitan Park District

On November 6, 2018, Lacey residents have the opportunity to vote on the formation of a Lacey Metropolitan Park District and establish the property tax rate of $0.47 per $1,000 of assessed valuation to provide additional funding for park improvements, maintenance, acquisition, and other recreational opportunities.

When is the Last Time Lacey Had a Park Measure on the Ballot?
16 years ago. Lacey voters approved a Parks Bond Issue for $9,985,000 in 2002.

What is the Difference Between a Parks Bond and a Metropolitan Park District (MPD)?
A bond is for specific acquisition and development projects and has a defined dollar amount. An MPD provides ongoing funding for park improvements, amenities, and operations.

What is the Cost to Residents (homeowners)?
Although state law authorizes an established MPD to levy a maximum of $0.75 per $1,000 assessed valuation, the Lacey City Council authorized Proposition 1 at a levy rate of $0.47 per $1,000 of assessed property value.

The increase would cost City of Lacey property owners $11.75/month per household (not individual), based on $0.47 per $1,000 on a house with an assessed value of $300,000.

How Much Revenue will the Metropolitan Park District (MPD) Generate?
The projected revenue from the proposed MPD is $2.7 million per year, based on the 2018 City of Lacey total assessed property valuation.

What Priority Projects will the Metropolitan Park District (MPD) Revenue be Spent On?
If approved by Lacey voters, MPD revenue would be spent on the priority projects outlined in the Lacey Parks Comprehensive Plan. (See box below.)

Phase 1 Priority Projects, 2017 Parks Comprehensive Plan

- 8 Multi-Use Athletic Fields (baseball, softball, soccer, lacrosse, rugby, ultimate frisbee, football, etc.)
- Water Spray Park
- Outdoor Sports Stadium/Regional Athletic Complex Expansion
- 5 Playground Structures (various Lacey locations)
- Public Access to Undeveloped Park Land (i.e. Greg Guio Park, Pleasant Glade Park, and Meridian Campus North Neighborhood Park)
- Trail System Development
SUBJECT: Affordable Housing Strategy

RECOMMENDATION: Receive a briefing from staff about results of a housing priorities survey and provide additional feedback on the prioritization of actions that will be included in the housing strategy. No action needed, for discussion only.

TO: Lacey Planning Commission

STAFF CONTACTS: Rick Walk, Community and Economic Development Director
Ryan Andrews, Planning Manager
Jessica Brandt, Associate Planner

ATTACHMENT(S): 1. Planning Commission Dot Voting Results from August 8, 2018
2. Summary of Director’s Survey on Housing Priorities


BACKGROUND:

At the August 8, 2018 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed a number of high-level policies and potential actions that are to be included in a housing strategy. The strategy, which is currently in development, identifies actions the City could take that would aim to alleviate the City’s and region’s affordable housing and homelessness crisis. The Planning Commission conducted a voting exercise to help inform priority of actions within the housing strategy.

The overarching policies receiving the most votes were:
- Create More Affordable Housing
- Help People Stay in Affordable Housing
- Support Homelessness Services Regionally
The list of potential actions organized by short, medium, and long term time frames were also part of the dot voting exercise. After discussion about each of the actions, the actions receiving the most votes were:

- Expand the multi-family tax exemption (short term)
- Zoning changes to reduce minimum lot size, site design requirements, density (medium term)
- Zoning changes to support temporary housing of many types (medium term)
- Inclusionary zoning in designated areas (long term)

Attachment 1 shows results from the policies and actions chart with the results of the August 8, 2018 dot voting exercise.

After the Planning Commission ranked their priorities, a survey, using Survey Monkey, was sent out to City Directors asking for their priorities and comments. In general, the results showed that all six of the overarching strategies were viewed as almost equally important to tackle. When it came to ranking actions, the results were not as clear as the Planning Commission’s direction. (See Attachment 2).

In general, Directors were supportive of many of the actions proposed. Recurring themes from comments emphasized the importance of taking a regional approach to homelessness and affordability, concerns about funding and impacts to the City budget, and wanting a better understanding of the root causes of homelessness.

At the work session, staff will present the results of the City Department Directors survey, and get additional feedback from the Planning Commission on prioritization of actions that will be included within the housing strategy. The draft strategy is currently under development and is anticipated to be released for review by October.
## Dot Vote Results from August 8, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create More Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help People Stay in Affordable Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Homeless Services Regionally</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Variety of Housing Choices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlock Supply – Make it easier to build</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize Fed, State, and Local Funding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dot Vote Results from August 8, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

### Short Term Actions and Number of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expand Multi Family Tax Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce Fees for Nonprofits building affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Provide City-owned property for non profits building housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Use County recording fees for homeless services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Set aside higher percentage of general fund for social services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dot Vote Results from August 8, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

### Medium Term Actions and Number of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zoning Changes – reduce minimum lot size, site-design requirements, and density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zoning – update codes to support temporary housing of many types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Require low income to remain low income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reduce private sector fees for building affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Provide pre-approved ADU designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Educate landlords and promote Section 8 housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inclusionary Zoning in designated areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support regional approach to housing levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>City funded infrastructure for infill areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dot Vote Results from August 8, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Actions and Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expand inventory to prevent more people from becoming homeless
Unless affordable housing become the most profitable type of development, it seems unlikely to occur
Work regionally on this issue, Lacey can’t solve homelessness alone
Sustainable funding is key to any successful effort
Target designated areas for MFTE for urban style development

Cutting fees to non-profits and finding city-owned land already in progress. Focus on MFTE

Found city-owned properties, but not all a good fit for housing development

Regional efforts for economies of scale

Increasing general fund for social services will strain existing general fund programming
Comments Summary

- Temporary housing regulations – demand for supportive housing is high
- Reduce fees for private developing only with requirement for affordable units managed by non-profit
- Low demand for ADUs
- Regional coordination needed
Need dedicated funding stream
• Start transition from building and expanding on greenfields to replacing and upsizing old infrastructure
• Inclusionary zoning would be helpful before buildout of MD and HD zones w/ single family detached
• All three actions present challenges – funding
• Caution making development more expensive or difficult