

City of Medical Lake
124 S. Lefevre Street – City Council Chambers
Planning Commission Meeting & Public Hearing
March 27, 2025, Minutes

NOTE: This is not a verbatim transcript. Minutes contain only a summary of the discussion. A recording of the meeting is on file and available from City Hall.

1) CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

- a) As the Commission does not currently have an elected Chair or Vice-Chair present, the City Planner, Elisa Rodriguez called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm, led the Pledge of Allegiance, and conducted roll call.
 - i) Commissioners Twohig and Veliz were present via Zoom, Commissioners Munson and Mark were present in person.
 - ii) Commissioner Mayulianos requested an absence due to an emergency. Motion to approve made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Munson, carried 4-0.

2) ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

- i) Amendments to agenda:
 - 1. Move item 6a Vote for Chair and Vice-Chair after item 2) Additions to Agenda
 - A. Motion to approve change made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Munson, carried 4-0.
 - 2. Motion to approve agenda as amended made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Munson, carried 4-0.
- ii) Vote for Chair and Vice-Chair
 - 1. Ms. Rodriguez explained that Commissioner Mayulianos will remain as Vice-Chair for now and that whoever is voted in as Chair can serve for just this meeting or another vote can be taken at the next meeting.
 - 2. Motion to elect Commissioner Munson as Chair made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Twohig, carried 4-0.

3) INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS

- a) City Administrator, Sonny Weathers, gave a synopsis of the topics on the agenda and importance of process. A request for an extension of the decision on LU 2024-025 violates MLMC 17.34.110(b). A recommendation must be made within forty-five days. Any decision must be made based on information that is currently on record. The record is closed so no further comment(s) can be considered. Any comments related to the Ring Lakes proposal tonight will not be accepted. Commissioner Munson affirmed that the city has worked hard to follow protocol in this.
- b) Tammy Roberson, Medical Lake resident – shared about the NY Times article she emailed to commissioners. Asked questions of city staff regarding wetlands and critical areas/SEPA. Ms. Roberson's speaking time ran out and Commissioner Munson made a motion to give an additional two minutes. No second was made, motion failed.

4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 27, 2025

- a) Motion to approve made by Commissioner Twohig, seconded by Commissioner Mark, carried 4-0.

5) STAFF REPORTS

- a) none

6) SCHEDULED ITEMS

- a) Change of date for April 2025 meeting
 - i) Ms. Rodriguez explained that she would be out at a conference during the regularly scheduled meeting in April and requested to move it to either the week before or after.
 - ii) Motion to move the April meeting to April 17th made by Commissioner Munson, seconded by Commissioner Mark, carried 4-0. Commissioner Twohig noted that he would be unavailable to attend on

that date.

- b) Comprehensive Plan Update
 - i) Ms. Rodriguez shared that work on the project is continuing and a schedule will be provided soon with the sections that will be addressed along with public engagement opportunities. The state will likely allow for an additional six months for completion, moving the deadline from June 2026 to December 2026.
- c) Decision on LU-2024-25 Application for Ring Lake Estates
 - i) Ms. Rodriguez gave a presentation. See attached.
 - ii) Commissioner Munson thanked Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Weathers for shepherding the process. Discussed concurrency regarding sewer systems. Discussed applicant's decision to not continue the public hearing at the last commission meeting. Commissioner Mark noted that of the six required criteria, four were not met. Commissioner Twohig commented on developer's lack of addressing water issues. Commissioner Veliz shared the same concerns and recommended denial. All commissioners agreed.
 - 1. Motion to recommend denial made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Veliz, carried 4-0.
- d) Downtown Park Name
 - i) Motion to table to the next meeting made by Commissioner Munson, seconded by Commissioner Mark, carried 4-0.
- e) Design Standards
 - i) Motion to table to the next meeting made by Commissioner Munson, seconded by Commissioner Mark, carried 4-0.

7) **PUBLIC HEARING** – None

8) **COMMISSION MEMBERS' COMMENTS OR CONCERNS** - None

9) **INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS**

- a) Tammy Roberson, Medical Lake resident - continued comments from earlier and questioned Ms. Rodriguez on why additional comments were not posted to the city website regarding the LU 2024-025 review. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the city was not obligated to post every comment received as the general public is not the review body. That role belongs to the Planning Commission, and they were provided with all documents. Ms. Roberson stated that she had been told by a commissioner that any questions regarding city-owned wetlands should be directed to the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Weathers responded that that information is incorrect and that information on wetlands is held by a combination of city departments. Any citizen that has questions regarding city-owned wetlands should contact City Hall and they will be put in contact with the proper department/person.

10) **CONCLUSION**

- a) Motion to conclude the meeting at 6:18 pm made by Commissioner Mark, seconded by Commissioner Twohig, carried 4-0.

Roxanne Wright

Roxanne Wright, Administrative Assistant

April 17, 2025

Date



Application LU 2024-025 Preliminary Plat for Ring Lake Estates

1



Process

- Determination of Completeness
- Notice of Application/SEPA Determination
- Comment Period
- Public Hearing
- PC Recommendation
- CC Decision/SEPA MDNS (confirm, revise, withdraw)
- Appeal Period
- Final Plat

2



3



4

Application

- **Preliminary Plat:** Density, Lot/Block/Street Layout, Infrastructure
- **Planned Unit Development:** Reduced Lot size, Reduced Right-of-Way width
- **Critical Areas Review:** Impact of development on Wetlands and Habitats






5

Approval Criteria

- Public facilities and services can meet the demand created by the development.
- The development meets density and design standards set out by the zoning code.
- The development adequately addresses the need for stormwater, streets, transit, potable water, sanitary sewer, parks, schools, etc.
- There is no net loss of wetlands or their function.

6

Concurrency

-  **Sewer:** Collection zone is at capacity
-  **Water:** Water system has capacity
-  **Transportation:** Need to work with WSDOT and Collector Arterial needed for Green Gate replacement
-  **Stormwater:** More information needed to determine capacity of system
-  **Solid Waste:** Covered by contract

7

Request #1:

Reduce Right-of-Way width from 50' to 38'

Reduce Roadway width from 32' to 30'

Benefits the developer, but not the City or future residents.

Request #2:

Reduce Lot Size from 6,000 sf to 5,000 sf

Reduce Lot Width from 60' to 50'

Creates more impervious surface in an area that has stormwater and water table concerns.

STAFF RECOMMENDS DENIAL

Planned Unit Development

8

- A. Avoid Impacts
- B. Minimize Impacts
- C. Compensatory Mitigation
- D. No Net Loss
- E. Consistency with General Purpose
- F. Performance Standards

Five wetlands identified on site

Department of Ecology suspects 4 others

More information needed

STAFF RECOMMENDS DENIAL

Critical Area Review

9

- Density
- Lot Size
- Street and Block Layout
- Right-of-Way
- Utilities/Water/Sewer/Stormwater

Several issues with overall plan

*Preliminary Plat cannot be separated
from Planned Unit Development and
Critical Area Review*

STAFF RECOMMENDS DENIAL

Preliminary Plat

10

Action: Make a Recommendation to City Council

- **Recommend Denial:** Based on proposal as of today and findings of fact in the staff report.
- **Recommend Approval:** Provide explanation of how the approval criteria are met.