

# GMHB EXHIBIT 216

## 2024-03-20 Planning Commission Transcript

0:02

okay we're live okay good evening and welcome to the March 20 2024 special

0:08

hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike Murphy the chair tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is being

0:15

brought you by Zoom welcome to all and thank you for joining us tonight

0:21

Commissioners please have your microphones turned on for the roll call Allison can you please do the roll call

0:28

all right commissioner here commissioner bazo here commissioner

0:36

Bozman here commissioner GS here commissioner Rish is not here and

0:45

vice chair Raab is also not here yet um and chair Murphy here all right thank

0:53

you it appears that we have a quorum so for this meeting we continue to utilize

0:59

the zoom platform I will do my best to recognize you in order in which hands

1:05

are raised after being recognized you may then ask questions make comments

1:10

Etc uh our first item business is public appearances this is the opportunity for

1:16

anyone to speak to the commission about issues of concern uh Alison is there

1:22

anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the commission no no one signed up for tonight okay that

1:30

makes that uh easy um so our first and only item of special business is the

1:37

Planning Commission agenda Bill PCB

1:42

24-5 comprehensive plan periodic review housing element initial brief welcome

1:50

Adam Zach uh go ahead you're the presenter I was going to just do a

1:56

couple quick introductory remarks um and then we'll hand it off to so just wanted to note that we've got

2:03

mayor nce joining us tonight he was a member of the housing work group and he'll be making a few remarks after Adam

2:10

goes through a short presentation kind of giving us an overview of the process that led up to developing this draft of

2:17

the housing element um and mayor n will speak to some of the work that he's been doing with the state legislature and how

2:23

that ties in with um all the requirements for the housing element and then I think Commissioners Bozman and

2:30

accuse were also members of the work group they um may have some remarks to make as well just on kind of their their

2:36

thoughts on the process um so with that I'll turn it over to Adam he's going to do this short presentation we'll hear

2:42

from the work group members and then we'll dive into more of a detailed overview of the actual

2:48

draft all right thanks Alison may get my share screen

2:54

shared here um see

3:00

all right so as Alison mentioned tonight we'll be taking a look at the housing work group draft of the housing element

3:07

of the comprehensive plan um this is the element that we've been eagerly awaiting

3:15

um through this process we' we've talked about it a few times um at previous meetings and so um we're now to the

3:23

point of review um are looking at the presentation tonight um I'll give you

3:30

some background on where we how we got to where we're at today um and then also

3:37

a quick summary of of the housing element requirements um the things that are set in state law Regional policy and

3:44

countywide policies um and then go over the remaining process and where we're

3:50

going with this um in the future and then as Allison mentioned we'll have some comments from the mayor and from

3:56

the other work group members if they'd like um and then after that I'll walk you through I'll give you a quick kind

4:02

of uh fly by on the um on the element uh so that you're prepared to to provide

4:09

your written comments on the draft um so to take a look at the

4:15

project history we've been um this as you all know the the comprehensive plan

4:21

periodic review has been underway for quite some time um this housing project really started um in the spring of 2020

4:29

22 when we set the comprehensive Plan update uh scope of work um that scope of

4:35

work created a housing work group um to prepare um draft uh amendments to the

4:43

housing element um this was one of the elements of the of the comprehensive plan that we knew going into this update

4:50

was going to require some more uh in-depth amendments as opposed to um

4:56

some of the other elements that we've looked at that have had these kind of more surgical targeted Updates this is

5:02

really we we knew the housing element was going to need a little bit more of an overhaul so we created that housing

5:08

work group um which was composed of three uh city council members and two planning Commissioners um to prepare

5:15

this initial draft um to bring before you um with the intent of kind of getting this getting a vetted Draft

5:22

before you that that's gone through some review um ahead of time um so we started

5:29

uh the housing work group met a few times in the summer of 2022 um but then as uh Commerce and the

5:38

county started uh taking actions related to House Bill 1220 which we'll talk

5:44

about quite a bit uh tonight um and it it became clear that that the housing work was going to expand beyond what we

5:52

had initially scoped and so we paused the housing work group in in November of

5:57

2022 to allow the Department of Commerce to kind of get their guidance together and put uh put it out there what we what

6:04

they were going to expect of us and then also the the um King County needed to um

6:10

make some amendments to the countywide planning policies um specifically to set

6:16

this um growth Target by um income bracket which we'll take a look at in a

6:22

bit here um that was the main thing that the that King County needed to finish before we could really get started on

6:28

the housing element and so all of that kind of came together in the latter part of um of

6:36

2023 uh the final Commerce guidance for some of this work uh was issued in

6:42

August of 2023 so five months ago um and the uh King County updated its

6:49

countywide planning policies to set the housing targets um by um income range or

6:56

affordability range um they set that in the wide planning policies uh in August

7:02

as well and so from there we had these two kind of larger reports that needed

7:07

to be completed um based on the Commerce guidance and um related to this house

7:13

bill 1220 um which changed a lot of the Statewide requirements so from August to

7:20

December staff prepared those uh those reports and provided those to the city

7:25

council in January of this year um those reports reports uh the LCA supplement

7:32

and the RDI the racially disparate impacts evaluation those two reports um

7:38

looked at how much land capacity we have for these housing targets and then also

7:44

completed uh a requirement from House Bill 1220 that the city evaluate its

7:50

housing policies for potential racially disparate impacts and then adopt

7:55

policies during this periodic review to begin to undo those impacts that we may have identified um so that led to some

8:02

of the policies that we'll see in the um in the draft housing element um here

8:08

later tonight so in January the the city council was was briefed on those reports

8:15

which were provided with agenda Bill 6385 so if you're looking for those reports you can find them with that

8:22

agenda bill um one of the things that came out of that with the land Capacity Analysis supplement was that there was

8:29

some additional capacity that we needed to add for multifam and mixed use

8:35

housing um and so when we presented to the city council we asked them for their Direction on the preferred approach to

8:43

addressing that um that small capacity shortfall um the council provided that

8:49

on January 16th they provided that direction to the housing work group and then with that in hand we were able to

8:56

then resume working with the housing work group to start preparing this draft and so from the end of January until um

9:05

last Thursday uh the housing work group was meeting uh met they met five times

9:10

total um to prepare this draft housing element um and um kind of put everything

9:18

together that we'll be taking a look at over the next couple of meetings so that

9:23

that gets us up to very much um current day um here as I mentioned the housing work

9:31

group was a joint subcommittee of Planning Commission and City Council

9:36

Members um there were five members total this was something that was was created

9:41

the housing work group was created in that scope of work um to to do this work here um that we'll be looking at the

9:48

members of the group were Wendy wer um Craig Reynolds and selem n and then from

9:53

the Planning Commission uh K qes and Carolyn Bozman um so they were they were the ones that we were working on this

10:00

draft um for the last month and a half here

10:07

um as you look at the uh the Planning Commission Bill 25 or

10:13

2405 um exhibit one is the housing workg group's draft housing element um so this

10:20

is that's the document that came out of the work group um that was prepared over the course of those five meetings and

10:28

what we really did as we were working through this with the workg group The the work group really focused on

10:34

Crafting those policy amendments or um new policies to satisfy the minimum

10:40

requirements that are set in the state law um the regional policy and then the

10:46

countywide planning policies um as we'll see as we get into it here um the the

10:53

housing element has some of the most complex uh requirements of any element under the growth management act um and

11:00

those those requirements were recently updated in 2021 with that house bill

11:06

1220 um which required um some new things that we didn't have in the

11:12

housing element previously um as so because the housing

11:17

work group really focused on on satisfying uh satisfying those requirements throughout the draft you'll

11:24

see that um the intent of each of these policies is really to meet at the very

11:30

least meet the minimum necessary for each of those requirements in some of the places we exceeded those um the

11:36

minimum but we wanted to make sure that that this draft was really crafted so

11:42

that it require it satisfied all of those state requirements and then as we got close to the end there or by the by

11:49

the time we got to the end the housing work group um last Thursday unanimously

11:54

voted to recommend this draft to the Planning Commission so it's we we spent

11:59

quite a bit of time kind of refining and honing this draft um there was kind of four major

12:08

steps that we used with the housing work group um so the the first step in the

12:13

process was a briefing on those reports that land Capacity Analysis supplement and the racially disparate impacts

12:20

evaluation then we we also provided a briefing staff provided a briefing on the GMA the growth management act

12:27

requirements and the things that had changed with House Bill 1220 and and other um countywide planning policies

12:35

and then also a briefing on the city council Direction um where we were going

12:41

with the with the rest of this this housing work that we had ahead of us

12:46

then the second step was a survey um that we administered to the

12:51

housing work group members to identify their preferred approaches to satisfying

12:58

all of these requirements that we had um we had gone over and so the the purpose

13:03

of that survey was to St was to for a lot of these requirements there's some

13:09

gray area in how you can satisfy those requirements and so with the survey we

13:14

we asked the group to to identify their uh preferred approaches to kind of

13:19

filling in that gray area and and completing those um or not completing uh

13:27

satisfying those requirements so it's that survey really helped us find a consensus on some of these uh kind of

13:34

thornier issues that um that the policies address then at step three um the the

13:43

work group reviewed a preliminary draft that staff prepared based on that survey

13:48

that the housing work group completed um and um and considering

13:54

those minimum requirements um and so the the work group kind of worked through that preliminary draft and refined those

14:02

goals and policies and the text of the introduction um to ensure again that it

14:09

kind of fit with those and aligned with those preferred policy approaches and that they also were satisfying those uh

14:16

minimum requirements and then finally after we had gone through that review um

14:23

there were a couple there was um two meetings of refining those drafts and making sure that um you know we did we

14:30

did a little bit of word smithing with the group to arrive at the recommendation that's before you today

14:37

um it's the housing work group uh process kind of summarized

14:43

there now you'll see you'll also see um exhibit three of the Planning Commission

14:50

bill is this housing planning framework and this is really where you can find um

14:56

we wanted to provide you the Planning Commission with information about those

15:01

requirements for the housing element um because this is one of the more um

15:08

complicated um elements in terms of what the GMA requires and then um at the

15:16

particularly at the county level there's another kind of layer on top of that um that doesn't apply to say like the

15:23

utilities element or Capital facilities um element so a little more complicated

15:29

um and that was again exhibit three you can see a summary of those State Regional and countywide um requirements

15:37

and this will also you'll see a notation in the draft um that ties back to um that

15:46

housing planning framework um so in in throughout the the current draft you'll

15:51

see after some brackets or after a policy you'll see some text in Brackets

15:58

and what that is doing is it's pointing back to that housing planning framework and saying that this this policy is

16:04

directed at this minimum requirement so for example I I put policy 1.5 because

16:11

it was nice and short here um policy 1.5 says take actions to promote healthy and

16:16

safe homes and that's directed back at uh countywide planning policy uh

16:22

requirement 18 so you'll you'll see that in the um in that exhibit 3 um which I

16:29

I don't know the exact text off the top of my head I should have uh pulled that but it was something about healthy and

16:35

safe homes as well so it's it's really like linked uh between that CPP

16:40

requirement and the uh the policy in in the draft so we you can if you're

16:48

curious where something came from in the draft there's probably a citation of where what um there should be a notation

16:56

of where that requirement can be found in exhibit

17:03

3 the other piece of this that uh that we'll be looking at over the next couple

17:08

of weeks is a land use element consistency amendments um so these are changes to um land use policies that are

17:18

necessary to square the land use element with the now with the changes that we've

17:24

now made in the housing element um and these are so

17:29

because we are adopting new policies in the housing element that that relate to housing we needed to update some of the

17:36

policies in the land use element um in addition to those consistency amendments

17:42

there were also some policies uh that were highlighted in the uh racially disparate impacts evaluation that we

17:49

needed to review those policies as part of this process to satisfy that requirement as well um so we did the

17:57

consistency review and and um reviewed those policies that were highlighted by the RDI

18:03

evaluation and that's where these land use element amendments um came from uh

18:10

to simplify the notation of the changes um the strikeout and underline that you

18:17

see in exhibit two in the land use element consistency amendments those are

18:22

showing the changes from the last Planning Commission draft of the land use element um so anything that's

18:30

proposed to be struck or anything new would be um a change from the planning

18:37

commission's draft not the currently adopted draft um and we we just did that

18:42

so that there wasn't otherwise there would be a lot of strikeout and underline it'd be really hard to track

18:48

where where the changes um started um so these are changes additive to that

18:55

previous work that the Planning Commission did um and just like with the housing element

19:02

these land use element consistency amendments were also reviewed by the housing workgroup um and recommended

19:08

um as part of package um of changes and as you the other thing is we

19:16

uh we categorized the different changes to the land use element um to make it a

19:21

little bit easier to see where um substantive changes were proposed so

19:27

you'll see in the draft draft there will be some green highlighting um policy

19:33

well the goals and policies that are highlighted in green those are uh substantive changes so these are

19:40

um more significant uh changes the the goal and policies highlighted in blue

19:47

are the implementation policies and and this is a set of of amendments that's

19:53

proposed to basically just make the land use element have the same implementation

19:59

policies that we have in the H housing element um because those are just kind of General about implementation it it

20:07

makes it a little bit both drafts a little better um to have those um those

20:13

amendments made under goal 29 and then finally the yellow highlighted goals and

20:18

policies um are the minor consistency amendments these are things where the

20:23

policy Direction hasn't necessarily changed but the wording is just

20:29

uh more consistent with with the changes that we've made in the housing element so

20:34

as you go through um the looking at Exhibit 2 those green highlights are

20:40

probably where you want to spend um your most time reviewing um because that's

20:46

where the most significant changes are proposed um so at that point um I would

20:54

field any questions as I mentioned we're uh I I'm planning on walking you through

21:00

the draft um after our um after the housing work group uh folks have had

21:05

their chance to um provide some additional comments um so we will take a

21:11

look at the draft but I'll turn it over to any questions at this

21:24

point great um so I think uh um at this

21:29

point if uh if the mayor's still with us um mayor I think and

21:36

uh take it away yeah excellent well thanks for the opportunity commissioner's chair uh to be here I

21:43

appreciate of course commissioner Bozman accuse your work on the the housing work group it was great to have that

21:49

opportunity to work through some of the stuff that you're going to be digging into um a joint group I wanted to and

21:56

for the record Selen n mayor Mercer Island uh and also gmpc member uh I wanted to

22:02

talk a little bit about the framework of what happened Upstream of all the processes that Adam went through uh when

22:09

House Bill 1220 was passed by the legislature back in 2021 it kicked off a number of uh bureaucratic processes that

22:17

had to occur uh to get us to the point that we're at today uh the first thing that had to happen is that uh Office of

22:23

Financial Management the ofm had to come up with projections of how many homes uh

22:29

the state of Washington needed over the next 20 years they also create an estimate of how many jobs uh the state

22:34

is expected to create over that 20-year Horizon and then they take those numbers and pass them down to jurisdictions at

22:40

the county level to divvy up between the cities and the gmpc the growth management planning Council which is

22:47

advisory to the King County Council is the body that's responsible for diving up those targets am amongst the I think

22:55

39 cities that are in King County or 39 cities and jurisdictions that that get an

23:00

allocation and here to now with the growth management act we've only

23:06

allocated housing and jobs and housing is has always been measured in units and

23:12

a single family house measured the same as a studio apartment they were all treat treated as one unit and House Bill

23:19

1220 came along and said that Washington also has a need for affordable housing

23:25

at different uh area median income bands and that jurisdictions need to plan for

23:30

and accommodate those targets as well and this becomes uh a a Target in

23:36

addition or supplementing your housing Target uh Mercer Island had delivered over from 2006 until the beginning of

23:44

this planning cycle about 1100 housing units and most of those would have been market rate housing units a good number

23:51

of single family homes multif family units in town center outside of town center and the multif family zones and

23:57

then Adu also count as a middle housing component so House Bill 1220 comes along

24:05

and ofm says over the next 20 years Washington State needs a million new homes and half those homes need to be

24:12

affordable at 50% Ami and below so half a million of Washington's new homes are

24:19

going to be severely incom restricted and then another good portion are going

24:24

to be 50 to 80% Ami and so when you get into the materials that you'll be looking at tonight you're going to see

24:30

some pretty God smacking numbers for affordable housing Targets in Mercer

24:35

Island and I want to give a little bit context of how we got to that place so

24:41

in King County when ofm gave us that Target the gmpc stood up a committee

24:47

called the affordable housing committee and the ahc was made up of many electeds

24:53

and uh something called the partners table and this was kind of an equity table of tribal members uh diverse

25:00

community members stakeholders and they rotated people through this mechanism to advise the ahc and ultimately the ahc

25:08

had three options that they came up with and they brought to the gmpc and it was

25:14

should we should we take King County's share of affordable housing and just divide it up prata by population among

25:22

the cities so everybody gets a certain percent of 30% Ami 50% % Ami 80% Ami and

25:31

market rate housing or should we look countywide at what is out there what's

25:37

our inventory of affordable housing who's created any who's created none

25:42

who's created some and then should we just wait it so that it reaches equilibrium at 20 years or should we

25:50

look at the balance of their housing Target so how many units does Mercer Island have left to build in its

25:57

allocation and allocate up to that and ultimately after a lot of debate that

26:03

was the mechanism that they built and so what you're going to see is that Mercer Island in a regular planning cycle would

26:09

have had a requirement to build 1239 housing units and that would have been

26:15

understood to be any housing units we've always said all housing is good housing

26:21

uh what happened is Mercer Island received an allocation of almost all affordable housing units uh the numbers

26:29

are of market rate housing I think is in like 30 or 40 of the 1239 so you have

26:35

almost 1,200 or so affordable housing units many of those at 50% Ami and below

26:42

and what we know with 50% Ami and below is that you need a subsidy to build those units you can't create enough

26:49

incentives that a market rate development can produce those at any yield and you also need density and so

26:56

you're going to see in these materials that we had to do some up zoning in the town center and we're going to have to

27:01

do some up zoning in the commercial office Zone to add multif family because you need you need the medium to higher

27:09

densities to support the 50% and Below Ami units and so as you work through

27:17

this you're G to you're going to scratch your head and say wow there's a lot of policies in here about creating

27:23

incentives to to have incom restricted housing units and there really not much

27:28

talk about market rate housing single family housing middle housing and the reason is that that's not affordable and

27:36

our goal is almost 100% affordable housing and so I know that you know

27:42

there might be an inclination to look at a housing element and say all housing is good housing but Adam and uh and Jeff

27:49

have come up with a I guess a a table that illustrates pretty well the

27:55

barriers to producing the goals that we have and what became clear in in working

28:00

through all the things that we had to work through is that focusing on affordable housing needs to be the goal

28:06

and if we're not talking about that we're talking about a very small fraction of our our Statewide Mandate of

28:13

housing units and that really shouldn't be the focus because those units will naturally get created the other thing to

28:19

think about is that in our town center we produce affordable housing units at a rate of

28:26

10% and that's a trade-off for height so if you go to five stories and you build

28:31

200 units 20 of them need to be affordable and that's in the like 65% Ami range we need units at 50% Ami 30%

28:41

Ami we need shelter beds we need permanently supportive units at 30% Ami

28:46

and so you can understand you're going to need some really significant incentives to try and produce those but

28:51

you will always produce them at a ratio to a market rate housing unit right so maybe you could get to 20% maybe you

28:58

could get to 30% if you really tried you know stacking height and uh you know

29:04

multifamily tax incentives different mechanism together you you might get to

29:10

30% uh and so that's a it's a way to say that what's coming to you is going to be

29:15

stacked with levers and and incentives and tools but they're all around

29:21

creating a very high percentage of affordable housing units U because there

29:26

is such a strong need for the for affordable housing over the next 20 years I would add to that that the state

29:33

legislature has been housing crazy for the last three sessions and we've seen all sorts of bills come through but the

29:39

one that hasn't got through is a to Bill a Transit oriented development Bill and

29:44

we've been uh pretty firm on all Tod bills having some sort of component tied

29:50

to the house bill 1220 jurisdictional targets so if if they're going to upzone

29:56

a half mile radius around a a train station or a bus Rapid Transit it's our

30:02

expectation that they calibrate that to what they did with houseu 1220 and the affordability requirements so uh I would

30:10

I would say keep a strong focus on town center and the fact that even though we're talking about six stories now that

30:17

could go to a calculation of a floor area ratio that we've seen as high as seven or eight which would yield you

30:25

know maybe up to a 15 story building depending on what the set tax and uh some of the daylight planning was and in

30:31

that scenario we would accept nothing less than a 20% affordable housing mandate coming out of a TOD Bill and so

30:39

as you look at what you might do in town center uh you should expect that future legislation out of Olympia would

30:47

probably be calibrated around 20% to get incentives around height in a

30:52

TOD type orientation and that's pretty pretty much all I want to share tonight was

30:58

that context and if you had any questions about any of that Upstream stuff I'd be happy to answer

31:08

them excellent well thanks for the opportunity I I really appreciate being invited yeah thank you

31:22

mayor all right um so Commissioners accuse and boats I don't know if either

31:29

of you um have something you'd like to say to about the housing work group um

31:35

but now now would be a good time to share yeah I had some thoughts I wanted

31:42

to share Adam um I I want to thank the mayor for coming tonight and sharing all

31:48

that background I think it's incredibly important to our work to understand that um most of what we've done here is

31:54

mandated um it's not optional and um I also want to thank the planning staff um

32:01

and the mayor and council members uh Reynolds and Waker um council member wer

32:07

was the chair of our committee and ran an extremely efficient process it was hopefully a model for how we can work

32:14

forward together folks were expected to come prepared and and get it done and the um staff just really prepared and uh

32:22

excellent and concise document for us to look at so um I just want to express my

32:28

gratitude to the the mayor council members and staff and um uh enjoy enjoy

32:34

the document I'm sure we'll have some fun

32:41

discussion Carolyn chime in yeah uh well

32:47

I was very pleased to participate in the housing work group and the staff and Adam and particular did such a terrific

32:53

job to provide us with um really excellent drafts and and informative materials so much appreciated and the

33:01

schedule is very tight but we always had time to review and comment prior to uh

33:07

recommending our referral to the commission so I think we've met the legislative requirements you know uh as

33:15

as I understand them and to update our comprehensive plan for the 2024 cycle

33:21

you know there'll be more coming after the after the end of 2024 but uh what we have to do in 2024 think we have

33:29

met so I really look forward to hearing the input of of the other Commissioners and um you know I will try my best to

33:36

try to contribute to explaining you know why the housing work group might have uh made a particular decide on certain

33:42

language um in in the case of a certain policy for either the housing or the land use

33:48

elements okay okay Adam I think it's back to you

33:55

yeah um great um let me share my screen

34:01

um we'll start with the housing element here a quick quick walk

34:07

through um so the unsurprisingly starts with an introduction um we tried to keep

34:14

this introduction really focused um through the draft again just really pointing at at um tried to keep it all

34:22

all killer no filler in the in the introduction here so it's really directed at um the specific requirements

34:31

um for uh for the housing element and this table one is one of the more

34:37

important pieces of the introduction here um this is the um these are the

34:43

targets that we've been assigned by uh King County that uh mayor niece

34:48

referenced um for um our total housing growth this First Column here or the

34:53

second column here and then each of these uh sub quent columns to the right

34:59

are the different housing needs at different income levels um at that

35:05

were're required to plan for and and as uh maror n pointed out um you know EV so

35:12

these three columns here are everything that's more than 80% of the area median

35:17

income so these are for households earning near or more than um the uh

35:24

median income these would be like our Market rate units as you can see these are uh that's  
32 of our

35:33

1239 um housing targets so um that works out to about 2% of of the total um so

35:41

that's why again much of the focus as we get into the later stages of the element

35:47

is really going to be on these uh these lower income units um because that's

35:55

um where most of our housing need um as allocated by the county has um has

36:01

fallen um some of the other things that you'll see here there's a permanent Supportive Housing or

36:08

psh um that's part of our less than 30% Ami or lowest income uh bracket and what

36:16

the permanent support of housing is is that's a housing type where um there's

36:22

uh there are Services provided on site so it's it's not quite like a like a

36:29

homeless shelter um but it's it's extremely low income housing um where

36:35

maybe there's there's some other services provided on site so that that's a

36:40

slightly thing than like just a regular apartment that um that has a reduced

36:46

rent and so our housing Target differentiates between permanent Supportive Housing and non-permanent

36:51

Supportive Housing um the other kind of special housing type um is this

36:57

emergency housing um this target is kind of separate from our other housing

37:03

targets and emergency housing is that like shelter space um so whether we're

37:09

whether it's for um you know uh domestic violence shelter or a homeless shelter the

37:17

emergency housing is that like temporary transitional type of housing so it's

37:23

it's slightly different than a normal um like what we would call like a dwelling unit where it has a kitchen and a

37:29

bedroom and a bathroom and um it's it's more uh it's just a different housing

37:34

type um so that's this emergency housing need over here so once we've in the draft here

37:42

once we've articulated what our housing needs are the next section talks about how what capacity we have to accommodate

37:51

that housing need um this really refers back to that land Capacity Analysis

37:56

supplement um that we talked about earlier and some of the actions that we're going to take

38:02

to um address the housing capacity um this this paragraph here talks about um

38:10

the the up zoning that mayor nce uh referenced where we'll be looking at

38:15

through this process we'll be looking at adding height to some of town center and

38:21

then also uh adding some U multifam capacity in the commercial office Zone

38:27

which is that area um around the former city hall building um the most of the

38:36

work to make those changes to increase that capacity is going to be an

38:42

implementing um code Amendment and that's something that we'll look at once we've finished um with the housing

38:49

element we'll then take a look at the code Amendment um probably in the summer

38:55

or um well either way before we before we complete the comp plan update we have

39:00

to look at that implementing um ordinance so that will be coming as

39:07

well um from there after the capacity discussion there is the section called

39:14

adequate provisions and this is um mayor n talked about a barriers U looking at

39:20

some of the barriers and what we need to do to overcome the barriers for um

39:26

Housing Development um affordable housing development and that's what this table two is really directed at so it

39:32

provides some information about the share of existing housing units and whether or not there's a likelihood um

39:40

that a barrier exists um and then talks about the actions that are spelled out

39:46

in the in the goals and policies this final column here um these are the

39:51

actions that get spelled out in the element that we're going to take to overcome those potential barriers so as

39:57

you look at this table here that's how this kind of connects with some of the other um pieces of the element is this

40:06

is this is saying that we've we've identified a place that we need to take some action and then here are the

40:12

actions that we're going to take and then that becomes then those goals and policies later um in in the draft so

40:19

that's this final column here um and this is another thing that

40:24

is um evaluating the barriers and um

40:29

identifying those actions that you'll take to overcome those barriers that's something that's spelled out in the in

40:35

the GMA um in those requirements that were added by House Bill 1220 so this is

40:41

a a key part of our um compliance uh with that um that requirement that

40:47

documentation requirement so moving from from there

40:53

from the adequate Provisions table um the intro the introduction touches on on the racially disparate impacts and

40:59

summarizes that uh racially disparate impacts evaluation and then another

41:04

piece that we haven't really talked about yet is this displacement risk um requirement so one of the things that

41:10

house bill 1220 added to the the um the requirements for the housing element is

41:18

that cities need to identify places that may have an elevated risk of displacement uh what sometimes is called

41:25

gentrification or uh getting you know priced out as development occurs um so

41:31

we need to identify those places where that where that risk is uh present or

41:36

there may be an elevated risk and then we need to identify policies to um to

41:43

address that displacement risk and and um not necessarily completely eliminate

41:49

it but we have to do something to reduce and mitigate the the displacement risk

41:54

so that's discussed in this section of the introduction um you'll see some maps in

42:00

here that were pulled from that RDI evaluation um and um basically showing

42:07

um perhaps unsurprisingly that that compared to the four count County um

42:14

area um King Pierce Snohomish and kitap counties um Mercer Island has a

42:22

relatively low displacement risk um but within within the city there a couple of

42:27

areas that are that are mapped out here where there's some displacement risk because there's older buildings that are

42:34

probably more affordable um and they're also um older multifam units um and so

42:42

we just need to um identify those areas that may have an elevated risk and then we have some policies later in the

42:49

element to address that displacement risk um so then moving from there you

42:56

can see the map of the areas um the final section of the introduction is pointing to or

43:04

connecting the that introductory text with the goals and policies that follow

43:09

um just kind of spelling out how what does all of that mean and how does that filter into um the goals and policies so

43:18

then um we start with oh it's a little too far in um then we start with our overall

43:26

housing goals and policies actually why don't I pause there if there's any questions on the introduction before I

43:33

keep uh

43:38

rolling okay you Adam for uh context uh because this Ami issue seems

43:47

to be a major driver of everything um what is the area median

43:54

income that that currently that that's referring to do we know um I haven't

44:02

committed it to memory It's tricky because the area median income um

44:09

is partially dependent on the size of your family so if you have four people

44:15

in a household your area median income is uh no that's only true for I'm sorry

44:23

I misspoke I don't remember exactly what the Ami is is um but I'll look it up

44:28

for next time and make sure that I've got that um that number for you great

44:34

thanks but I think it's roughly in the \$90,000 a year range

44:40

roughly um and and also the Ami is um when we're

44:49

talking about area the area of area median income is King County so it's not

44:55

um City

45:02

specific um all right um moving on to the goals and policies um so the first

45:09

section of goals and policies is um our

45:15

overall housing strategies so this is the um the most like General spelling

45:22

out of the approaches that we'll be taking um to address housing in the

45:28

housing element um so it spells out this first policy here is really just

45:35

outlining here are the um the different sections of goals and policies later in

45:41

the in the element and these are the ways that we're going to be accommodating our growth it kind of

45:47

starts at this really high level um the the second policy here um is

45:55

defining what these different income segments um what high income moderate

46:01

income low very low and extremely low income all um mean relative to um the

46:08

Ami and those are those are segments that are actually spelled out in the RCW

46:13

in the um in the GMA so for example low

46:18

income is a household that earns um below 80% um so up to 80% um um down to

46:28

50% of the Ami um and that that range for low income for the phrase low income

46:36

is is set in the GMA so we're we're just echoing that here in 1.2 and I I see a a

46:42

hand up at this point yeah Adam just a quick question on

46:47

1.3a I was trying to figure out is moderate density is that code for Middle housing is that what that I've seen it

46:54

used otherwise places in the same place and I was just curious yeah so the the GMA specifically

47:00

uses that phrase moderate density um that combination of words and and it is

47:06

more or less uh town home duplex Triplex middle housing yeah that's I thought

47:14

um and and 1.3 um it's a good segue this policy is really um articulating the the

47:23

general approach that we'll take to each of these income segments um and and

47:28

essentially it's saying we're going to do um we don't have to do as much for

47:34

high income housing but we're going to do a lot for those lower income households um so that's spelled out in 1

47:40

three and this is a good uh spot to to point out the notation that I talked

47:46

about on those minimum requirements so you see at the end of 1.3 there are there's this bracketed

47:53

text um that's referring back to exhibit three that housing planning framework so

47:59

you can see what minimum requirements um policy 1.3 is directed at um so as

48:06

you're going through the draft and reviewing it this weekend um or um when

48:12

you get a chance um you'll see you'll see the that notation and that'll help

48:17

you kind of refer back to that um and and you can see where where those

48:22

different policies came from It ultimately when we when we move forward with the draft um that bracketed text

48:29

would come out we're not going to keep those references in it's just for your reference as you

48:35

review um so 1.4 um is again a really high Lev list

48:43

of those actions that we're going to take um or the things that we want to

48:49

ensure are in our neighborhoods or have a we have access to in our neighborhoods um this is derived most of

48:57

this list is actually derived from uh countywide planning policy so we use that as kind of the the framework there

49:03

for 1.4 um the the next several policies um we

49:12

have this healthy and safe homes that came from the countywide policy planning

49:17

policy in in 1.5 um and then 1.6 is creating a

49:23

connection with the climate action plan uh we kind of just just wanted to point to that we're that that's where when it

49:30

comes to housing the climate action plan is really outlining our strategy um and

49:36

then 1.7 and 1.8 um those

49:42

are some create that's creating some connection to our later racially

49:48

disparate impacts uh related uh goal and policies in um under goal three uh that

49:55

we'll get to um but kind of pointing to that we want um everyone to to have a

50:01

place here um in Mercer Island um then 1.9 is is directed at

50:10

specifically that we want to where we're increasing our housing

50:15

choices that those are approximate to um employment and high-capacity Transit

50:20

that's another um big one particularly for the Puget Sound Regional Council we

50:26

haven't talked a lot about psrc um tonight but they're a regional um

50:33

transportation planning organization um which is um they will

50:39

review our comprehensive plan to make sure that it's consistent with their Regional plan  
um and particularly for um

50:48

their review for transportation related uh goals and policies so the psrc is is

50:55

another layer of review that we'll have here um let's see um the next couple of

51:03

policies just round out this first general approach um 1.10 is is pointing

51:10

to um that adus primarily will be looking at

51:15

um as addressing our moderate to lowincome household uh housing needs um

51:22

that adus are because of their price point are probably not um not going to

51:28

yield us a ton of like extremely low 0 to 30% Ami um

51:34

housing um and then policies 111 and 112

51:41

um this is where we created that policy Direction around um that implementation that we

51:47

were talking about increasing the capacity the housing capacity in town center and the commercial office zones

51:55

um so 111 and 112 are are giving that general direction um that

52:01

we're how how we're going to go go forth and do that that piece of it and again

52:07

the the implementing ordinance will come back to the Planning Commission once we're finished with the housing element

52:15

here the next goal um is is one of the bigger pieces of this housing element

52:22

and that's goal two and it's directed specifically at affordable housing um and how we're going to it's outlining

52:29

the strategies we're going to take to increase those housing units um for

52:35

households that earn below 80% of the Ami um so those lower income

52:42

households um the uh the first one here is talking

52:47

about maintaining that close to high capacity Transit so 2.1 is directed at

52:53

high-capacity Transit uh 2.2 is directed at addressing those cost

53:01

barriers and this is a a little bit higher level where it's um it's

53:07

directing uh a review of our development standards and finding ways to make it

53:13

easier to build these um uh these units and um making it so that you um so that

53:23

we have more capacity for those units uh with the intent that um simplifying or

53:29

streamlining that permit review process could reduce some of the costs

53:34

associated with affordable housing development um and then um finally

53:40

looking at some programs and Partnerships that we can use to decrease

53:45

the cost of building those affordable units um 2 three is looking at uh

53:52

decreasing the barriers and promoting access to affordable home ownership ship um so we we didn't want to lose sight of

54:00

I think a lot of times when we're talking about um affordable housing we're

54:06

thinking of rental housing um but 2.3 is directed at that we also want to be

54:12

thinking about um homeownership um as well

54:17

um two four um is directed at that moderate density so

54:24

like the middle housing and and stating that we're um that we're going to use moderate

54:31

density to increase affordable home ownership for moderate income households

54:37

or home ownership opportunities I should say for for those moderate um income

54:42

households um because that's kind of the um that that's the best housing type or

54:49

that is the housing type that can accommodate those households the best um

54:55

pricewise um 2.5 is looking at it 2.5 outlines all of

55:03

the strategies the incentives that we're going to be looking at um for increasing

55:09

our affordable our income restricted units um so these are the the units that

55:15

um are most likely to serve those uh those households below 50% Ami um so

55:23

there's a laundry list of those incentives here and these incentives um this list of incentives actually was uh

55:31

one of the things that we spent um some time discussing with that housing Sur or the housing work group survey that we

55:37

talked about um so the housing work group went through and and picked out these these incentives from a list of of

55:44

things that we could uh we could look at doing um so that's what policy 2.5 is is

55:51

outlining all of those um incentives for income restricted housing

55:58

um one of the other things that came out of the um housing work group survey um

56:05

is uh these policies 2.6 and

56:11

27 um and those came from that housing work

56:16

group survey and that's looking at finding ways to close some of those funding gaps so um they direct the city

56:23

to evaluate those potential Revenue sources and then also take a look at a fee andl

56:29

program and what a fee andl program is is a a program where you allow

56:35

developers to um instead of constructing affordable units they pay um they pay a

56:42

fee instead um and that fee then would go into a local housing fund um so those

56:49

are some of the mechanisms that we have to help kind of close some of those uh

56:54

those funding gaps for um new affordable

57:02

units um the 2.8 is also um directed at um

57:10

closing some of that um basically it's directed at uh Gathering those resources and

57:18

distributing them to um to the extent that the city can um to fund new Housing

57:25

Development affordable housing development and then

57:30

2.9 um is looking at this is another one

57:36

um kind of combining with this fee and L program uh 2.9 would would be to

57:43

evaluate whether the city can of uh can or wants to Institute some kind of

57:50

inclusionary zoning um where um in

57:55

exchange for for a certain amount of density developers would be required or not in  
exchange in certain zones

58:02

developers would be required to perfor provide a certain amount of affordable housing in  
those new like multif family

58:10

developments um we would need to um in order to do that we would need to do an

58:15

evaluation of the um of quite a few different things to figure out um

58:21

whether that was possible but that P pairs really well with a fee and loop program because then developers then

58:28

basically have a choice of whether they want to pay the fee or develop the units um so we combined that in that was

58:36

another one that came from that housing uh the housing work group survey um 210 and

58:45

211 are directed at a regional Coalition for housing or Arch um they're our

58:52

regional partner that uh we work with we're a member City Within Arch um and

58:58

they uh they manage uh a lot of our affordable units on the island here that

59:05

um we have already um and they're a really great resource uh regionally for

59:11

um providing affordable housing and Regional coordination is kind of one of the things particularly the countywide

59:17

planning policies are really directed at um is creating more regional response to

59:23

this um significant housing needs uh throughout the

59:29

county um so that's where 212 and 213 are also um about part creating

59:37

Partnerships um and finding meeting with those folks that may know what we need

59:43

to do in order to produce more or find um not produce more but

59:50

um set the stage for more permanent support of Housing Development or

59:55

extremely low low income housing development um so these last two policies and two uh under goal two are

1:00:02

really directed at those Partnerships um and finding new ways to um to amend the

1:00:09

code to make that um a more likely uh thing for to get

1:00:16

developed um sa before you move on to the RDI uh

1:00:23

issue um is there any

1:00:28

material uh that you've looked at regarding the fee and loo program

1:00:35

and are are there any in existence now or or you know being started up

1:00:44

and what does that is there any sense as to what that really looks like and then

1:00:50

finally the last question would be following on Marin's um

1:00:56

you know issue comments how does the city get

1:01:01

credit for you know having essentially built a lowincome

1:01:08

unit or whatever um in such a program

1:01:13

has any of that stuff been looked at at this point yeah so

1:01:18

the aan L program I can't think of a specific jurisdiction off the top of my

1:01:24

head that's instituted one of those but it's a it's it's a relatively common uh

1:01:31

approach to um funding these kinds of projects

1:01:37

typically with with that you have to use the money from that fee andl

1:01:43

program to then fund projects within your jurisdiction so it's not like with

1:01:49

a fe andl program we wouldn't necessarily be able to like take that money and then build the affordable

1:01:55

units in in South Seattle or something like we we have to build them here um so

1:02:00

in theory that would be how the city would then get you know credit for those units is that they'd have to be built

1:02:07

here eventually um so I mean that's that's all part of

1:02:13

the evaluation process too because you have to also know like what are you charging for that fee

1:02:20

in L right like how much is a is an affordable unit worth and those kinds of things um

1:02:26

so it's it's a it would be a a bigger project like on a three to four year

1:02:32

time frame instead of a next year kind of thing uh

1:02:39

Chris uh yeah I guess you know and looking at the incentives for affordable

1:02:44

housing you know there's you know stay bear with me just a sec there there's a a point where we talked to them the

1:02:50

comprehensive plan about trying to encourage Green Building Materials and you know it occurs to me

1:02:56

if we did something that required more Green Building Materials one incentive for affordable housing could be relieved

1:03:02

from those requirements um you know in that context and I guess I'm thinking that maybe

1:03:09

that's a design standards issue and it's kind of premature here but I just wanted to raise it in case there was something

1:03:16

to be done in the context of the housing element that would you know sort of leave that open as a as a

1:03:23

possibility yeah there might be so it's a really interesting idea like

1:03:30

that that's that is the the Carin stick or a a potential keratin stick that

1:03:36

doesn't exist now um so we could in

1:03:42

theory if you wanted to take a look at that this 2.5 might be a place where you could include that I I might

1:03:49

say it would be useful I think to generalize a little bit more um so so

1:03:56

maybe it's relief from other design requirements or something like yeah something along those lines because

1:04:02

there's then we can kind of a as we as we undertake those other kinds of

1:04:08

requirements like if we're amending our design code we could think about building in that that incentive like as

1:04:15

we'd have the policy direction to do that um a lot of times with this um I

1:04:21

mean we we've talked about this with other elements like finding that right elevation is always kind of tricky

1:04:26

because we want to like have it be specific enough that we know what we're talking about but Loose enough to where

1:04:34

we can implement it as needed at the time being so that would be that's very local thank

1:04:42

you all right there's a lot to digest under goal two um if you could only read

1:04:49

one set of policies that's probably the spot to do it if you're if you're time

1:04:55

con cuz there's that's really like the meat of this this element I mean there's a lot of important stuff in the rest of

1:05:01

this but goal two and its attendant po policies are really the

1:05:06

um the heavy part of the element here um

1:05:12

this next section under goal three um is no less important um it's the the

1:05:19

section directed at the racially disparate impacts um so this is a new

1:05:24

requirement under house Bill 1220 um we have to um the the requirements are that

1:05:32

the city um both evaluate the Pol existing policies for potential racially

1:05:39

disparate impacts and then adopt specific policies to begin undoing those

1:05:44

impacts that you've identified um that you can see the full evaluation in that um the RDI evaluation

1:05:52

which again that was with agenda Bill 6385 five um if you want to dig into

1:05:57

there's 32 exhibits with tables and Maps there's a lot of information in there um but

1:06:05

what we what we essentially found in that RDI evaluation is that um the the

1:06:11

impacts identified were really that there was um a lack of affordable units

1:06:17

um and that was falling disproportionately on um uh our bipo

1:06:24

population um and and that there was a just a an in increased level of cost

1:06:32

burden there so um these policies are directed at at undoing some of that and

1:06:38

then also creating a system kind of moving forward um that we can avoid

1:06:44

having disparate impacts in the future so you'll see um you know this policy 31 is directed

1:06:51

to that first impact that I talked about where there was uh increased displacement risk and  
and a higher cost

1:06:59

burden um and then um these later these last three policies 3.3 3.4 and

1:07:08

3.5 are directed at that future piece of it of finding ways to avoid establishing

1:07:17

policies in the future that may um create those um impacts and so 3.3 is

1:07:24

looking at creating partnership ships um to find ways to um promote those

1:07:32

outcomes those more Equitable outcomes um 3.4 is a requirement for all of our

1:07:40

future public participation plans that we adopt um with with a um adopt four

1:07:47

actions to implement this element we need to include some kind of statement about how that public participation plan

1:07:54

will be directed at um reaching those um impacted communities and then finally

1:08:02

um but seeking those more Partnerships and dedicating resources to eliminate

1:08:09

those disparities um to access in housing um I see another Chris

1:08:20

uh real quick question I was when it talks about undoing identified ratio

1:08:26

desparate impacts is the focus on the requirement only on the impacts caused

1:08:32

by the current regulatory regime we're not trying to undo the impacts of red lining and the history of discrimination

1:08:39

on Mercer Island just on what we what we're dealing with now is that right or does it go back further than that I was

1:08:45

I was a little confused about that basic question yeah so the the way that the GMA requirement the 1220 requirement is

1:08:54

it doesn't specify by uh time Horizon the the intent so

1:09:02

um those other things that happened 50 60 80 years ago are kind of fall under

1:09:11

this umbrella there's only so much we as a local jurisdiction can do um to undo

1:09:16

some of those and that I think that's why the 1220 requirement this this

1:09:22

racially disparate is that we need to take things to be begin to undo those um

1:09:28

those impacts so um the these steps here

1:09:33

of creating those Partnerships ensuring that our public participation plans have those like

1:09:39

components to it should help begin to undo those things um that were

1:09:44

identified in the in the RDI evaluation But to answer your first question there

1:09:49

wasn't a specified time Horizon for that evaluation

1:09:56

and it seems as though the focus as I looked at the um RDI

1:10:03

evaluation didn't go back you know even though the the build didn't specify seemed like the focus was more

1:10:09

contemporary than going back to you know the some of the the horrific practices

1:10:16

of the middle of the 20th century yeah um so the the data analysis

1:10:22

in the RDI evaluation was a little a little bit more focused on today

1:10:30

um Mercer Island is fortunate in that it didn't incorporate until the middle 60s

1:10:36

and so it maybe dodged some of the worst things that happened before that um but

1:10:44

the the focus was more on what we could do today

1:10:52

yes um all right moving to goal four um

1:10:58

so as I mentioned as we were looking through the introduction um one of the new requirements

1:11:04

was um to address displacement um and

1:11:10

establish anti-displacement uh policies so policies to help control and reduce

1:11:18

the um displacement risk um that happens that may occur as development occurs

1:11:25

oras the zoning regulations change um so go four is really directed at that

1:11:31

um so the first one the first policy here 4.1 actually came from this is

1:11:38

another one that was derived from the um housing workr survey where um and and

1:11:44

that's a direction to create um an inventory of our naturally occurring

1:11:50

affordable housing um and our other affordable housing units because we don't actually currently have um that

1:11:59

that good of a an inventory of those types of housing units uh we

1:12:06

know we have a pretty good idea of where the like income restricted permanently

1:12:12

affordable units are but some of those other affordable housing types um don't exist and so first we want to kind of

1:12:18

identify where those um where those units might be the the next policy is is uh taking a

1:12:26

look at um some of the um tenant protections

1:12:32

that are available um and evaluating those so these are tenant protections

1:12:37

are um things that help uh tenants stay

1:12:42

in units um as the building might sell or as uh

1:12:49

rent goes up um so one of the current tenant protections

1:12:55

that we actually currently have in in our code and we could look at expanding is this

1:13:01

um oh sorry actually that's a different uh policy but the sorry the uh tenant

1:13:08

protections listed here are an advanced notice of a rent increase um relocation

1:13:14

assistance when um that would be when an apartment building sells and converts to

1:13:20

condos or um is redeveloped for a different um development and then also

1:13:27

the right of first refusal um so that would give uh tenants the option of of

1:13:32

purchasing the unit um when it converts to like condominiums or if it's going to

1:13:39

be sold um and then 4.3 is really requiring that

1:13:49

as we look at changing in zoning um that we need to evaluate what that might do

1:13:55

to the um to the displacement risk so 4.3 is directing that study um requiring

1:14:03

um that we um that we do that analysis and um what we need to look at um when

1:14:11

evaluating that displacement risk and then

1:14:19

um finally 4.4 is just tying back in this uh evalu from

1:14:26

4.3 um 4.4 is saying that and whenever we are making a policy or regulatory

1:14:32

Amendment um that we need to make some kind of findings that um that

1:14:38

displacement risk has been reduced and or mitigated so this is just a requirement that um again it doesn't say

1:14:45

we have to find that it was eliminated but we have to find that we took some kind of action um to to reduce or

1:14:53

mitigate displacement RIS

1:14:58

risk the next section of goals and policies uh goal five is looking at our

1:15:06

regulations so most of our like regulatory policies are going to be

1:15:11

found in the land use element um but we had a couple of strategies that specifically talked about streamlining

1:15:17

the um the permitting process for housing units and so we wanted to um tie

1:15:23

that together here under goal five the first policy here is um to take a look

1:15:30

at uh specifically our multifam development standards to find potential

1:15:35

um amendments to um make it easier to permit the multifamily development and

1:15:43

streamline some of the review um our multif family development standards um

1:15:49

currently are um could probably use an update and so

1:15:54

this is giving uh some direction on how to do that update then

1:16:01

5.2 um is directed at that moderate density again or like middle housing um

1:16:08

specifically duplexes triplexes and town homes are called out in 5.2 and that

1:16:13

comes from specific directly from the GMA requirement um for moderate density

1:16:20

um housing so when you see those those three and 5.2 that's that's where that

1:16:25

came from then 5.3 is directed at um anticipating our our work on middle

1:16:33

housing that will come up um next year um when we're implementing House Bill

1:16:39

1110 um that requires a certain um certain things for uh middle housing so

1:16:46

we're 53 is basically just saying that we're going to comply with the state law

1:16:52

um then the last two under the residential regulations here 5.4 and 5.5

1:16:59

are directed at adus and and talk about

1:17:04

um the um tailoring those Adu development standards to possibly find

1:17:12

some ways to um increase the number of adus that are available for um some of

1:17:18

our affordable housing needs um so that's five 54 and 55 um it also this is

1:17:26

also another one where House Bill 1337 which we'll be implementing next year um

1:17:32

requires some things here so 54 is is directed at that

1:17:38

um the final section here is goal six these are our implementation goal and

1:17:44

strategies or goal and policies um so you'll see this is

1:17:49

basically outlining a process by which we will implement this the element so so

1:17:55

every two years um we will put together an implementation strategy that outlines

1:18:01

what we'll be doing from this element um and we'll be Prov providing that uh a

1:18:09

report at the same time to the city council about how implementation has been going and then one of the the

1:18:16

pieces here um that's unique to this process is uh

1:18:21

6.3 um this talks about an implement mation progress report at the fiveyear

1:18:27

Mark um after this periodic review and that's actually a new requirement that

1:18:33

was also added by um House Bill 1220 the state and County will be involved with

1:18:40

um a fiveyear check-in um basically to see how we're doing in accomplishing our

1:18:48

um housing element goals and policies um and then the final the final

1:18:54

policy here is talking about how we will provide those resources for

1:19:00

um and and respond to our limited resources for implementation of the element so this  
these last four policies

1:19:08

here are really outlining our um our process for making this not just a a

1:19:14

bunch of words on a page but actually like something that happens in the real world so

1:19:22

um that concludes my walkth through of the element um are there any questions

1:19:28

at this point

1:19:33

D um not a question as much as maybe a comment or a flag for my commissioner

1:19:40

friends um Chris when you asked the question about um incentives um and talked about  
you know

1:19:49

the idea of potentially um waving certain green buildings

1:19:55

incentives uh what struck me and what I think I connected the dots around um was

1:20:02

sometimes we have designed standards and and things in place to help improve the overall quality of our new products um

1:20:11

housing buildings whatnot um in the last five years I've

1:20:17

been approached by three different lowincome residents occupying to facil

1:20:24

ities in places I I won't announce here but they've had great concerns about the

1:20:30

quality of the living situation that they're in um whether it was the materials that were used that were

1:20:37

potentially contributing to making some of the residents sick um and it just dawn on me that when we try and make

1:20:44

those tradeoffs sometimes we open the door to creating an environment for

1:20:49

people that's just not healthy or not good or or it results in an outcome that

1:20:54

we didn't intend but it makes it a lot easier in our current system to promote and so I think I want

1:21:02

to ask us like and in in some ways that's an unintended uh racial or economic impact

1:21:10

to lower income people when we remove the higher standard and allow lower

1:21:15

standards to be applied to where they live and so I think that's something I just want to flag for us now and in the

1:21:20

future as we think through when we implement those kinds of strategies to ensure that people of all strata can

1:21:29

live in a healthy environment and and that we find a way to impact

1:21:40

elsewhere that is a good point um

1:21:46

having yeah having lived on busy roads or like near um environmental hazards like I

1:21:54

I've had had that experience before yeah um let's see so let me

1:22:04

share um yeah let me share my screen I'll give you a quick walk

1:22:13

through so next up just quickly I'll touch

1:22:19

on land uh the land use consistency um

1:22:25

amendments just so you can see kind of where we're uh where these are um what

1:22:31

these look like here so as I mentioned these green highlighted policies are um the

1:22:40

substantive amendments um these three policies and two goals um are the

1:22:48

substantive amendments and you can see the track changes the uh ~~strikeout~~ underline here again that's from this is

1:22:56

tracking the change from the previous Planning Commission um draft and not

1:23:02

from the existing um uh the existing adopted uh land use

1:23:10

element and for the most part these are streamlining the um streamlining the

1:23:20

goals and policies that um are highlighted here um

1:23:25

155 is a new policy that wasn't in the either in the Planning Commission draft

1:23:32

or in the um the adopted draft of the Landes element and 155 is getting at

1:23:39

some of the ideas that were um taken out of these other policies it's kind of

1:23:44

reformulated into 155 so you can see kind of where that um where that came

1:23:50

from here um then moving moving on just again

1:23:55

to touch on this real quick um the blue highlighting is these are more or less a

1:24:02

complete change to the implementation policies from the land use element um

1:24:08

but they're primarily just to make it match those implementation policies from the housing element so you'll see um

1:24:15

these are pretty much the same almost verbatim uh from one to the other um

1:24:21

just to have a consistent uh process uh across elements

1:24:27

here and then finally um you'll see the simple text amendments here highlighted

1:24:33

in yellow these are more or less they don't necessarily change the policy Direction they're just some minor

1:24:39

changes to the wording to make it more consistent with the how we've written

1:24:45

the other policies um in the housing element and make sure that they're um

1:24:50

consistent throughout um so that's the land use element

1:24:56

amendments um then let me just share one more thing

1:25:04

with you um and then I think we we'll be wrapping up

1:25:10

here um so I just wanted to touch on the schedule uh moving forward um we are uh

1:25:17

on a bit of a a tight timeline here um so you have the dra now um we're asking

1:25:26

for comments by this Monday um March 25th um comments on this first draft and

1:25:32

then next Thursday or next Wednesday when we meet on the 27th we can look through those review those comments um

1:25:40

on this first draft and and start refining the draft um and we're all of

1:25:45

this is working towards concluding our review on April 10th um so we can if

1:25:52

there's something else that comes out we can we can make sure that we get it um

1:25:57

get it finished by April 10th um and this is so that we can we can have a

1:26:03

draft together and ready to go um when we have the community Workshop that

1:26:09

we're planning in May so we need to kind of get all this wrapped up so that we can um we can stay on schedule with the

1:26:16

kind of overarching project um moving forward um so that is our upcoming

1:26:25

schedule um now I will turn it over for any other

1:26:33

questions uh Carolyn yeah um Adam is it possible for

1:26:40

you to give us documents that are really easy to edit or put comments in I've got

1:26:46

kind of spoiled there on the housing work group with those ways of commenting so

1:26:52

easily yeah I can I can provide you with a Word document so when we when we were

1:26:58

with the work group we that where I sent you the link and you could edit the

1:27:03

document that way um because of the structure of the Planning Commission and the open public meetings act we can't

1:27:10

really do that here um but I can give you a Word document that you could edit on your own um okay well um one thing I

1:27:17

want to ask um I think sometimes when I've had a Word document if it still has

1:27:23

the lines numbered let see can uh I'm not quite

1:27:29

sure I can that that actually works is it does it work I mean maybe I'm just

1:27:35

thinking of making a Word document and then having all those those numbers on the left you can't copy and paste

1:27:42

anything it just it I'm not okay yeah sometimes that can be tricky or with a PDF too it can be really it can line

1:27:49

numbers can kind of make it funky that's maybe what I'm thinking of yeah tomorrow I'll I'll send you a Word document

1:27:56

tomorrow uh and I'll try to simplify the format of the document too so this will

1:28:02

be the kind where you can put in your strikeouts and underline but you can also make a comment in the margin

1:28:07

explaining something okay and it'll be just your copy not the group's copy that everybody's working from and yeah oh I

1:28:15

see so just your own copy okay yes thank you

1:28:21

work all right any any other questions for me um this

1:28:27

concludes I'm I'm finished with my my sple tonight so

1:28:33

um okay thank you aan yeah thank you Arn

1:28:39

I assume that's an old hand yeah that is an old hand I'm I'm done asking my question yeah

1:28:46

okay so uh if anyone else wants the uh word versions just let Adam know and he

1:28:54

can uh send those to others as well um with that I think it's time to move

1:29:01

on to other business uh Allison I believe you have a

1:29:08

report yeah uh I'll just keep it very brief tonight um Adam just flashed up on

1:29:13

there the schedule for the next few meetings so we'll be back next week to go through comments and then we've got

1:29:19

the two meetings in April the 10th and the 17th um and we're going to keep

1:29:25

Ching along with this element um we'll be bringing back some of the cleanup items for the land use element um

1:29:31

related to climate that we talked about the last meeting um and then we're aiming for May 1st is the um open house

1:29:40

the com comprehensive Plan update openhouse with the community so we're starting to plan for that as well um I

1:29:46

believe you've all received a calendar invite for it so just make sure and save that date and we'll be coming back to

1:29:52

you um when we get a little closer to to that event with some information about kind of the structure and the activities

1:29:57

that will be available for the public to engage in there and that's all I've got

1:30:04

okay um planned absences for future

1:30:13

meetings hearing none we get to go home

1:30:19

early uh the next regular meeting is scheduled for next Wednesday as Alison

1:30:24

said the 27th at 6:00 p.m. there being no other business to come before the

1:30:30

Planning Commission the time is now 7:35 p.m. and the meeting is adjourned as a

1:30:37

reminder to Commissioners please stay online until City staff has terminated

1:30:42

the broadcast good evening and thank you for joining

1:30:50

us

English (auto-generated)

All

From your search

From Mercer Island Council

Meetings

Politics News

Related

For you