

CITY OF NORTH BEND  
CITY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL WORKSTUDY NOTES  
**March 22, 2016 – 1:30 p.m.**  
Cedar River Watershed Education Center, 19901 Cedar Falls Road SE, North Bend, WA

Mayor Hearing called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Councilmembers Brenden Elwood, Alan Gothelf, Trevor Kostanich, Ross Loudenback, Jeanne Pettersen, Jonathan Rosen and Martin Volken were present.

**Staff Present:** Mayor Ken Hearing, City Administrator Londi Lindell, Public Works Director Mark Rigos, and Community & Economic Development Director Gina Estep.

**Common Meeting Objectives**

Council engaged in an exercise to determine their objectives for the meeting. Mayor Hearing noted his objective for the meeting was to come together as a group with the end result being a well-functioning Council. Councilmembers listed the following objectives for the Special Workstudy:

- Councilmember Elwood
  - (i) Operationalize our terms “Rural, Small Town, Preserve, Enhance, Etc.”
  - (ii) Reach Alignment on our “Vision Statement and Brand Statement” Based on the above statement.
  - (iii) Discover commonalities and areas of/for opportunity with respect to our Grand Vision: i.e. Do we have it all? To create a strong narrative that Council can write and stand behind as we share our future.
- Councilmember Gothelf - Make sure our code matches our vision.
- Councilmember Kostanich
  - (i) To come to a team consensus on vision (next 15 years) for development in North Bend.
  - (ii) Single family focus but full UGA zoning also important.
- Councilmember Loudenback
  - (i) Everyone leaves alive.
  - (ii) Feeling as though they have been heard.
  - (iii) Understanding the complexities of changing zoning and codes and the downstream effects on current and future residents of North Bend.
- Councilmember Pettersen
  - (i) Common vision for future growth, including plans for review and rewrite of residential codes – LDR, HDR, CLDR.
  - (ii) Compare our codes to other cities.

- Councilmember Rosen
  - (i) Identify amount of growth needed to satisfy our existing infrastructure deficiencies (roads, water, sewer, parks, etc.) and then determine amount of growth necessary to meet our ongoing responsibilities (police, fire, labor, etc.).
  - (ii) Rewrite our entire zoning codes.
  
- Councilmember Volken - Create a cohesive strategy on how to deal with the growth pressures that does not stand in conflict with the agreed upon Brand and Vision for our Town. This strategy should ultimately provide a solid tool for development decisions.

### **History of Residential Land Use Regulation**

City Administrator Lindell and Mayor Hearing discussed the history of residential land use regulations in North Bend including that Council had been good stewards of protecting the rural character of North Bend by preserving over 800 acres of park and farm land in partnership with Snoqualmie through Tollgate and Meadowbrook Farms. They also discussed the 10 year development moratorium and Great Recession that resulted in little or no development in North Bend and how that contrasted with the incredible amount of development activity in the last few years. The Mayor and Administrator also discussed how Councils have changed over the last decade from “property right” and “anti-regulation” Councils who strongly favored allowing persons to control growth on their property to a more neutral Council who believed in reasonable regulation to insure growth matched the citizen’s vision for maintaining the rural character and small town feeling of North Bend. Council discussed the history of the residential zoning in North Bend and the concerns they had based on what they see getting built.

### **Compare Home Purchase/Community Vision**

Council provided the following input regarding why they each purchased their home in order to determine what features citizens might value in the North Bend environment:

- (i) Councilmember Loudenback – Price, location and proximity to work relevant to Puget Sound region, attractive area, semi-rural;
- (ii) Councilmember Volken – Proximately to outdoor recreation, wanted to walk and ride bicycle to town, views;
- (iii) Councilmember Rosen – Small town rural, “Mayberry”, price;
- (iv) Councilmember Elwood – River/Mountain, felt like Bozeman Montana where he grew up, proximity to urban services;
- (v) Councilmember Kostanich – Walkability, community, close to outdoor recreation;

- (vi) Councilmember Gothelf – Rural, felt like childhood neighborhood, price, small town vib, community; and
- (vii) Councilmember Pettersen – Water, near a city, scenic views, small town, hiking.

### **Vision Workshop – Visioning Work Exercise**

Council engaged in an interactive word rating session designed to draw out the common adjectives for the key elements of the Community Vision of what it means to them to preserve the rural character, natural beauty, and small town scale of North Bend. The following words received large consensus from Councilmembers as follows:

#### **Preserve Rural Character**

- Large Areas of Open Space
- More Space Around Homes
- Lots of Green Areas
- A Small Population
- A Small Town Feel

#### **Preserve Natural Beauty**

- Protect Rivers
- Preserve Nature Views, Mountain Views
- Mt Si and other Mountains
- Forests
- Undeveloped Ridges
- Open Fields
- Valleys, Lakes, Open Space
- No human pollution, clean air
- Trees

#### **Preserve Small Town Scale**

- Walkability
- Low Density
- Vibrant Downtown
- Know they neighbor
- Safe
- Quiet
- Connected to Trails
- Friendliness

Mayor Hearing recessed the meeting at 3:15 p.m. for a short break.

The meeting was called back to order at 3:30 p.m.

## **Vision Workshop – Map Exercise**

Councilmembers and Mayor Hearing paired up and drew an “ideal neighborhood” and after completion each group presented it as follows:

Councilmember Loudenback/Mayor Hearing – Whole town, river through town, equestrian, hotel, lots of recreation, connected trail system, lots of greenery, active recreation in town, parks and recreation connected, Minimum Lot Size: 8,000 to 10,000 sq ft.

Councilmembers Gothelf & Elwood – Winding, wide roads, cul-de-sacs, mixed lots sizes, setbacks varied, low light pollution, sidewalk on one side of street, centralized park, 15-20 feet between homes, connected trails to other neighborhoods, 33 to 38 feet wide roads. Main roads could be wider. Rolled curb street standard. Lot size 8,500 and up to 1 acre in varied size.

Councilmembers Pettersen & Kostanich – Natural environment providing buffering and trail connectivity. Architectural diversity, custom building, varied setbacks. Large setbacks, space between and around houses, 1 to 2 story mixed homes, tree preservation, evergreen gateway, trail connections, fire pit, barbeque. Minimum lot size 15,500.

Councilmembers Volken & Rosen — varied lots sizes. Winding road with communal focal point in the middle of the neighborhood, homes orienting to the views, trails over sidewalks, intersecting trails, and neighborhood business serving that little area, land dictated the development. Protect view preservation and no cookie cutter homes. Minimum Lot size 10,000 to 20,000.

## **Common Vision Directs Code Change**

The following common aspects were identified as a result of the map exercise and Council directed CED staff to work with CED Committee to come up with a work plan to move code amendments forward to address the following:

- Winding roads and wider roads were preferred by Council.
- Most Council preferred larger lot sizes than currently exists in the City’s Low Density Residential zone and wanted minimum lot sizes of 8,000 to 20,000 outside of the downtown core.
- Trails connecting the neighborhoods.
- Integrated parks with social features such as fire pits and barbeques.

- Setbacks
  - Varied Setbacks
  - Larger Setbacks between houses
  
- Architectural diversity
  - No cookie cutter
  - Mix of two story and one story homes
  
- Protect Views –
  - Orient homes to the views of mountains, rivers and natural features
  
- Infill development – ensure new two story does not block view for existing homes.
  
- Tree preservation
  
- More Significant Variation in Lot Sizes Desired - varied sizes within the neighborhood.
  
- Break up Low Density Residential – More Diversity
  
- Sidewalks – sidewalks on one side and/or no sidewalks. Landscape buffer of 10’ on major arterials on ROW.
  
- Architectural diversity.
  - No cookie cutter houses.
  - Vary styles of houses in a plat.
  
- Height limits. Some Council were interested in discussing reducing the maximum height of 35’ to a lower number to better meet Council’s goal of preserving the rural character. Height diversity was also desired - a mix of 1 and 2 story homes.
  
- No multifamily in single family or LDR zones

**Adjournment**

The workstudy adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

Kenneth G. Hearing, Mayor

---

Gina Estep, CED Director