

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

January 5, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner
Vice Chair Perkowski
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Esselman
Commissioner Moss

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Services
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning and Community Services
Brian Lee, Associate Planner, Planning and Community Services
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Planning and Community Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Kaje

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wagner called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Wagner, Vice Chair Perkowski and Commissioners Behrens, Esselman and Moss. Commissioners Broili and Kaje were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission agreed to change the order of the study items. The Development Code Amendments would be presented prior to the Comprehensive Plan Update. The remainder of the agenda was approved as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Markle did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 17, 2011 were approved as amended. The minutes of December 1, 2011 were also approved as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

STUDY ITEM – DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the purpose of the proposed Development Code Amendments is to bring the regulations in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan and State rules and to respond to the changing conditions and/or needs of the City. He advised that the purpose of the study session is to introduce the proposed amendments, entertain questions from the Commission, gather public comments, and develop a recommended set of Development Code Amendments for the public hearing.

Mr. Szafran advised that the Commission's desk packet includes an addendum to the packet they received on December 23rd. It also includes a public comment related to a proposed amendment. Staff introduced and explained the proposed amendments and the Commissioners responded as follows:

- Mr. Szafran advised that staff is proposing to withdraw all the proposed amendments related to the Critical Areas Ordinance.
- Ms. Markle referred to the proposed amendment for Section 20.30.770.D.7 and explained that civil penalties can accrue quickly (up to \$25,000 in a single year) if a code enforcement issue is not resolved. The City Attorney has noted that civil penalties are typically reduced significantly for property owners who eventually comply with the code. However, rather than basing the reduction on the staff time used to address the code issue, he recommended the City identify a set percentage that would apply to all civil penalty reductions. As currently proposed, the Director would have the ability to reduce the civil penalties to 20% of accrued penalties, which can still be a significant amount in some cases.

Commissioner Behrens asked if the 20% reduction would become mandatory or could the City waive or charge less than 20% of an accrued penalty. Ms. Markle answered that the proposed code language would not allow the City to reduce accrued civil penalties to less than 20%. She suggested that another tool (extension of the notice and order of compliance) could be used more often for property owners who are working with the City and making progress. This would avoid accrual of civil penalties for situations that are beyond a property owner's control.

Commissioner Moss suggested the language could say "up to 80%," which would allow for less substantial reductions for some situations. Ms. Markle said the City Attorney has advised staff

to be completely consistent and fair. There would have to be a standardized reason for a lesser reduction. The proposed language is intended to treat all property owners the same.

Chair Wagner asked if the City Attorney's office tracks hours associated with enforcing the notice and order. Ms. Markle answered affirmatively and added that the property owner would be responsible for all reasonable attorney fees incurred to enforce the notice and order. Commissioner Behrens asked if this would include both City Attorney and outside attorney fees, and Ms. Markle answered affirmatively.

- Mr. Szafran explained that the proposed amendment to Section 20.40.400 would prohibit on-site metals and scrap recycling (Item D.4) and would allow on-site sales by appointment only (Item F). He explained that because the code already allows on-site service by appointment, there would be no additional impact from allowing sales by appointment, as well. In addition, proposed changes to Item J would allow a home-based business to have a small sign without a permit.
- Commissioner Behrens referred to Section 20.40.400.E and recalled that the Commission previously concluded that the City should be consistent and not treat business uses differently than residential uses. He asked if there is a history of home-based businesses in the City creating significant parking problems. Ms. Markle said the City has received parking complaints. Because home-based businesses in single-family residential zones are limited to 25% of a structure, Commissioner Behrens questioned the need to impose additional on-site parking requirements that could result in additional impervious surface. He also pointed out that businesses in commercial zones are allowed to use on-street parking to meet at least a portion of their parking requirement.

Chair Wagner asked staff to describe the types of complaints that have been raised related to parking. Based on the number and types of complaints, the Commission could consider a potential amendment.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that tractor trailers are not prohibited from parking on residential streets. If the City allows residential property owners to park tractor trailers in front of their homes, home-based businesses should be allowed the same opportunity. Again, he emphasized the need for consistency. The regulations should be clear, necessary and equitably enforced city-wide.

- Chair Wagner referred to Section 20.40.400.A and questioned if the 25% floor area limitation is fair and equitable given that some structures are much larger than others. She asked staff to provide more information about what this limitation is intended to restrict and if it is the best way to accomplish the intent.
- Commissioner Behrens referred to Section 20.40.400.H.1 and asked how the City would regulate dual-use vehicles. For example, a property owner could use a vehicle for both personal and business uses. He asked staff to provide feedback at the Commission's next meeting to address this issue.

- Mr. Szafran advised that staff is proposing to remove “home occupations” from Table 20.30.040. As proposed, home occupations would no longer require a land-use permit. Instead, the City would rely on the business licensing process to track and regulate these uses. Commissioner Moss noted that the title of the section does not match the titles found on the table, itself. She also suggested it would be helpful for staff to provide language from SMC 5.05 to give the Commissioners clear information about what the business license requirements are.
- Mr. Szafran advised that staff is proposing to withdraw the proposed amendment to Section 20.30.100.
- Mr. Szafran said staff is recommending that Section 20.30.353 be clarified. The word “existing” seems to indicate that existing uses may develop or redevelop without a master plan permit in place. The new language makes it clear that a master plan permit is required for any action on any of the City’s campus zones. Ms. Markle noted that there is a statement at the bottom of Table 20.30.040, which states that administrative appeal authority is not provided for Type A Actions, except those that are not categorically exempt from environmental review. This statement applies to the entire table.
- Mr. Szafran said staff is proposing to delete “group homes” from the index of Section 20.40. The proposed amendment would also strike Section 20.40.390 because the City does not regulate group homes.
- Mr. Szafran announced that staff is recommending that the proposed amendment to Table 20.40.120 be withdrawn.
- Mr. Szafran advised that Sections 20.40.495, 20.50.260, 20.50.330, 20.50.420, and 20.70.020, would be amended to correctly reference “The Engineering Development Manual.”
- Commissioner Behrens asked if the language in Section 20.40.495 would apply to privately-owned recreational vehicles that are parked on private property. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively and noted that no changes are being proposed to this section, except to correctly reference The Engineering Development Manual. Commissioner Behrens suggested that the opening statement in this section should be clarified. Mr. Szafran agreed to review the language to make sure it is clear and cannot be misinterpreted. Vice Chair Perkowski suggested that the words “per year” be added after “two weeks” to clarify the time limit further. Chair Wagner noted that Section 20.40.495.B allows two occupancies per year.
- Commissioner Behrens referred to Section 20.40.495.H and asked if a recreational vehicle would be allowed to use a solar generator, which does not create noise and are used to recharge storage batteries.
- Ms. Markle advised that the proposed amendment to Section 20.70.020 would transfer the authority to establish an Engineering Development Manual from the Planning and Community Development Director to the Public Works Director. This is consistent with Chapter 12.

- Mr. Szafran said the proposed amendment to Section 20.20.016 would change the definition for “multifamily dwelling.” As proposed, multifamily dwellings would include townhomes, apartments, mixed-use buildings, single-family attached and more than two duplexes located on a single parcel. He explained that the intent of the multifamily design standards is to provide amenities that benefit a larger number of people living within a development. However, staff believes that requiring common open space on small developments limits potential and is unneeded as duplexes often provide private open space such as decks and patios. He provided pictures to illustrate how the proposed change would be applied.

Commissioner Behrens asked staff to identify how the proposed new definition for multifamily dwelling would impact both developers and the City. Mr. Lee said he does not anticipate the City would be negatively impacted by the change because the multifamily standards are set up to provide recreational and open spaces for larger developments. Most developers of small lots would likely prefer to construct single-family, detached units, but the limited amount of space often requires that the units be attached. If the City added a requirement to provide a certain amount of open space, the development potential would be further reduced. It does not make sense to require a small duplex development to provide a play area when it is not even known if children will live in the units.

Commissioner Behrens asked what would prohibit a developer who owned several adjacent lots from submitting two applications for short plats on adjacent properties rather than a formal-plat application for the combined property. Mr. Lee answered that the code does not prohibit this type of action. Chair Wagner pointed out that the proposed amendment would not change this potential.

Commissioner Moss requested a definition for the term “tot lot.” Mr. Lee said there is currently no definition for “tot lot.” However, it is a common term the City uses to refer to children’s play areas. While the City requires that a certain amount of space be set aside for a “tot lot,” there is no requirement that there be play equipment, etc.

- Mr. Szafran referred to the proposed amendment to Section 20.40.210.D, which adds “detached” before “accessory dwelling units.” As proposed, detached accessory dwelling units (ADU) could be no larger than 50% of the living area of the primary residence, but this limitation would not apply to attached ADUs.

Chair Wagner said that in a previous discussion about frontage improvement requirements, the Commission discussed the scenario of a small house, with a larger ADU. She suggested that the proposed code amendment could restrict someone from replacing an existing structure to the full lot coverage allowed. Mr. Szafran provided some examples of ADUs that were recently approved. To address the question raised by Chair Wagner, he explained that the current code allows a property owner with a home that occupies 17% of a lot to construct an addition that maximizes the 35% lot coverage limitation. The proposed amendment would not limit how the inside of the structure is split up.

Chair Wagner asked if the intent is to limit the number of people living within a single-family residential envelope. Ms. Markle said the City cannot preclude ADUs based on the current code, but they are limited to 50% of the living area of the primary residence. She suggested there are likely numerous other situations where a property owner wants to convert a daylight basement into an ADU, but they have to be creative to meet the 50% requirement. Staff proposed the amendment to find out whether the community cares if an attached ADU is more than 50% of the main unit. She emphasized that staff is not currently proposing that detached ADUs greater than 50% of the primary residence be allowed. However, staff is open to feedback from the Commission.

Commissioner Moss asked if the code would allow a property owner to live in the ADU and rent out the main living space. Ms. Markle said the property owner can live in either unit, but the property owner must live on the lot. Commissioner Behrens asked how the City would enforce this requirement. Ms. Markle said it is enforced on a complaint basis, and it is very difficult to prove. She noted that when an ADU is approved, it is recorded on the title that one of the units must be owner occupied.

Commissioner Behrens referred to a letter the Commission received about a problem a property owner has had with an adjacent ADU. Given the number of comments he has received, he said it does not appear to be unusual for the property owner to not live in either of the units. There must be a reasonable solution to this problem rather than waiting for a citizen to complain.

Commissioner Esselman asked if a detached ADU must have a separate address so it can be easily located in emergency situations. Ms. Markle said she would research and provide a response at a future meeting.

Commissioner Behrens asked how the City would keep the new structure in scale with other houses in the neighborhood if the City allows a property owner to build an attached ADU that is twice the size of the existing house. Mr. Szafran cautioned that the City does not regulate scale. The current code allows large additions to existing small homes as long as they meet the height, setback, hardscape and lot coverage requirements. This would be allowed regardless of whether or not the structure is divided into a primary residence and ADU.

- Mr. Szafran referred to new draft language for Section 20.40.600, which is intended to clean up subjective language in the code such as “encourage” and “believes.” The amendment also better spells out requirements for in-kind replacements, modifications, and additions of new wireless antennas.
- Mr. Szafran advised that the amendment to SMC 20.70.150.D.3 refers to fire and building codes for address displays.
- Mr. Szafran reviewed that the proposed amendment to SMC 20.70.320 would require a property owner to upgrade or install frontage improvements based on the requirements adopted in the Transportation Master Plan and the Engineering Development Manual. The amendment would also require full frontal improvements for development consisting of more than one unit on a

single parcel. Commissioner Behrens asked if the language would apply to ADUs. Ms. Markle answered that ADUs do not have to meet the dwelling count requirements.

- Mr. Szafran referred to the proposed amendment related to A-board signs in North City. Currently, all commercial zones, except North City, allow one portable A-board sign per property. The Economic Development Manager has asked that the code be amended to allow them in North City, as well. Chair Wagner asked if there are current enforcement issues related to A-board signs, and Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively.

Chair Wagner clarified that, although the public would be invited to comment on the proposed Development Code Amendments, this is a study session and not a public hearing. The study session is intended to allow the Commission an opportunity to become more informed about what would actually be presented as part of the public hearing. Citizens who want their comments to be included as part of the public hearing record should submit written testimony in advance of the public hearing or provide oral comments at the public hearing.

The Commission recessed at 7:58 p.m. to allow the Commissioners an opportunity to review the items in the desk packet. The meeting reconvened at 8:10 p.m.

Chair Wagner asked the total number of adults allowed to live on a single residential property. Ms. Markle answered that the code allows up to 8 unrelated adults in each dwelling unit (primary and ADU), but the property owner would be required to live in one of the units.

Commissioner Behrens referred to Ms. Markle's written comment that "the City of Shoreline does not currently have design review requirements for single-family residences, attached or detached. As such, there is no requirement to design an addition or a new detached structure so it is integrated with the existing structure." He observed that this was the crux of a recent complaint related to ADUs. He questioned how this issue could be resolved without design review requirements. Ms. Markle agreed the City could regulate single-family design, but doing so would require a significant amount of work to implement.

Public Comment

Carry Kovacevich, Shoreline, said she and her husband have lived in the Briarcrest Neighborhood of Shoreline for the past 15 years. She reported that she also attended the City Council meeting on January 3rd and the Council of Neighborhoods meeting on January 4th. She noted that the Commissioners received a copy of the letter and materials she submitted to the City Council, as well as the response she received back. She emphasized that she is not opposed to ADUs because they are very valuable opportunities for residents. However, they should be careful about their potential negative impacts such as scale, sunlight, parking, density, transient rental population and compliance.

Ms. Kovacevich provided photographs to illustrate the disturbing scale of an ADU in her neighborhood. Her home is located on a fairly short street where there are currently six or seven rentals. She summarized that the transient rental population does not improve property values, and most of the people that own the properties do not even live in Shoreline. She expressed concern about allowing

attached ADUs of unlimited size. The ADU in her neighborhood is a 2-story split level unit attached to a small Cape Cod house in front. The Cape Cod house is now the ADU, and the new two-story unit blocks sunlight for the neighbor to the north. The ADU unit has three bedrooms, yet only one off-street parking space is required. She questioned where the six to eight people who could potentially live in the units would park. She said her most recent handout talks about how kids in the neighborhood have to walk around cars parked along the street because there are no sidewalks. She concluded that the proposed code language does not address the significant problems associated with ADUs.

Arthur Peach, Shoreline, said he also attended the Council of Neighborhoods meeting on January 4th. He reminded the Commission of all the hard work that went into the Southeast Shoreline Neighborhoods Subarea Plan. The goal of the subarea plan is to keep the higher densities to the outside along the transit corridors for easier access. He cautioned that if they eliminate the size ratio for attached ADU's they may end up creating more density in the neighborhoods, which they are trying to preserve. He summarized that it important to follow up on the subarea plan since many of the residents spent a great deal of time on it.

Commissioner Behrens asked Mr. Peach to share his suggestions for resolving issues related to ADUs. Mr. Peach recalled that one option discussed during the subarea plan process was locating ADUs on corner lots so that parking could be provided on either side. However, this offers property owners on corners a privilege that is not enjoyed by other property owners. He noted that the housing stock in the Briarcrest Neighborhood is aging, and some have been revitalized. He suggested there should be a process for reviewing projects to ensure they meet the subarea plan's goals for transitional zoning. He noted there have not been a significant number of complaints about ADU's based on the current code, and he is opposed to the proposed amendment that would eliminate the size restriction for attached ADUs. He suggested that staff contact surrounding jurisdictions to find out how they regulate ADUs.

Mr. Peach asked if properties are counted individually for tax purposes once they are subdivided. If so, a subdivided property would result in more tax revenue than a single property with an ADU.

Laethan Wene, Shoreline, said he was present to speak on behalf of people with disabilities. He voiced concern that a proposed amendment could eliminate the ability for group homes to locate in the City. People with disabilities depend on these housing opportunities.

Ryl Anderson, Shoreline, said she is the captain of her neighborhood's block watch group. She said she supports code language that allows group homes to be assimilated into the community. However, her block watch group is concerned because the use is not regulated adequately. They are particularly concerned that one group home in their neighborhood may have been converted to a type of half-way house that resulted in juvenile delinquency issues. She suggested that neighborhoods should be notified of group homes so they can better understand what is taking place.

Ms. Anderson said the neighborhood block watch group is concerned about allowing a maximum of 8 unrelated adults to live in a single dwelling unit. One house has a suspiciously high turn around, and they are concerned that it may be housing illegal immigrants. She suggested this issue should be addressed further. Ms. Markle invited Ms. Anderson to contact the Planning and Community

Development Services Department regarding her concerns and suspicions. Once contacted, the City would investigate the situation and report back to Ms. Anderson.

Mark Plummer, Shoreline, said he can understand citizen concerns about eliminating the size restrictions for attached ADUs. However, he reminded the Commission that the City allows development to occur within certain height restrictions. As far as sunlight, they live in the State of Washington. Kids will continue to walk in the street to get around cars because the City does not have an adequate sidewalk system. He suggested the City require homeowners and developers to provide sidewalks in neighborhoods so people have a safe place to walk. He noted the City currently does not require people to maintain their properties so people can walk as close to the curb as possible. Chair Wagner commented that the Commission has discussed the issue of sidewalks on a number of occasions, and the Transportation Master Plan has prioritized sidewalk development.

Chair Wagner welcomed Deputy Mayor Eggen to the meeting.

STUDY ITEM – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Chair Wagner referred the Commissioners to the items that were received via email regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Commissioners indicated they had an opportunity to review the items prior to the meeting.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 2006, and the State Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates that the plan be updated periodically. The target for King County cities was moved to June 30, 2015. However, the City Council's direction is to incorporate the Vision Statement that was adopted in 2009 into the Comprehensive Plan in 2012. She reviewed that the Vision Statement imagines what the City will be like in 20 years and identifies 18 Framework Goals, which should be considered when updating the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Redinger said the current Comprehensive Plan is approximately 300 pages, and the City Council has directed staff to make it more sufficient and easier to understand by relocating the analysis sections (background information) to a separate document. Staff also identified policies that could be removed because they are redundant to policies contained in other elements, obsolete or outdated, regulatory and too detailed for a general guiding document, background information, and/or superseded by local, state or federal regulations.

Ms. Redinger said the update will also include additions due to updated GMA or other requirements, to insert policies to promote the Vision Statement, and to add policies to achieve consistency with adopted functional master plans (i.e. Transportation; Surface Water; Parks, Recreation and Open Space; and Shoreline Master Plans). Additions would also be made to incorporate the Sustainability, Housing and Economic Development Strategies and the Subarea Plans that were recently adopted.

Ms. Redinger announced that over the next several months, the Commission would review two elements of the Comprehensive Plan Update per month in study sessions with staff. In addition to supporting

analysis, the packet for each element would consist of the proposed revisions in strike-through/underline format with comment boxes or color coding to identify the policies that are obsolete, redundant, superseded, etc. They will also receive a clean copy of the proposed changes for both the policy and analysis sections.

Ms. Redinger said it is important to identify a process that allows the most effective public involvement. Staff has discussed the option of a speaker series, followed by a reception period to allow public comment. Other options include open houses before Commission meetings to allow for community discussions, presentations at the Council of Neighborhoods and other community meetings, a presentation as part of a civics class at the public schools, a web page specifically for the Comprehensive Plan Update, articles in *CURRENTS*, a distribution list and public hearings.

Ms. Redinger said staff is proposing study sessions at the each of the Commission's first monthly meetings from February through June 2012, with speaker series on the Wednesday before the first Commission meeting of each month. The draft schedule is as follows:

- February – Community Design and Parks
- March – Utilities/Capital Facilities and Transportation
- April – Natural Environment and Land Use Map
- May – Housing and Economic Development
- June – Land Use and Land Use Map.

Ms. Redinger advised that in order to complete the update by the end of 2012, the State Environment Protection Act (SEPA) review and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will need to be done in June through September. It is anticipated that the Planning Commission will conduct public hearings, deliberate and make a recommendation to the City Council by the end of October so that the update can be reviewed and formally adopted by the City Council by the end of December.

Chair Wagner reminded staff that the entire Comprehensive Plan Update would be adopted as a single package, and the Planning Commission will conduct three months of study sessions prior to the appointment of new Commissioners. Ms. Redinger said staff will discuss the potential turnover that could occur midway through the process. If it is very important to have the update adopted by the end of 2012, the City Council should keep in mind that newly appointed Commissioners will need to have a baseline understanding of Comprehensive Plans, land use, etc. Chair Wagner suggested the City communicate to potential applicants that it would behoove them to start attending Commission meetings so they are prepared to participate in the process as soon as they are appointed.

Chair Wagner suggested that the speaker series presentations be recorded and made available to the public via the Comprehensive Plan Update website. Ms. Redinger agreed that would be appropriate, if possible. She shared a preliminary list of potential speakers and invited the Commissioners to share their ideas, as well. Chair Wagner suggested staff contact Robin McClelland, who previously recommended a particular speaker.

Commissioner Behrens recommended that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board should be invited to provide feedback regarding the parks element. Ms. Redinger commented that the

Commission and City Council are very familiar with the language in the recently adopted Transportation, Parks and Surface Water Master Plans, and staff intends to incorporate policies from these documents into the Comprehensive Plan. The goal is to maintain consistency. She suggested the Board could review the proposed update to the park element at their January 26th meeting and provide feedback to the Commission prior to their meeting on February 2nd.

Chair Wagner recommended the Commission consider conducting a special workshop, if necessary, to update the new Commissioners on what has transpired to date. Ms. Simulcik Smith noted that she requested the City Council make new Commissioner appointments by the third week in March. This would allow a week to schedule a new Commissioner orientation before the Commission's first meeting in April. Chair Wagner recommended that staff suggest to City Council that the appointments be made earlier, if possible.

Public Comment

No one in the audience expressed a desire to provide comment during this portion of the meeting.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle referred to the 2012-2013 Planning Commission Work Program, which was distributed to each Commissioner. She recalled that the Commission last reviewed the document at a joint meeting with the City Council, which was prior to the layoffs the Planning and Community Development Services Department experienced. As a result, some of the tasks have been removed and/or adjusted. Most of the light rail planning has been pushed out to 2013 and 2014, and Subarea Plans for the Richmond Beach and Ballinger Commercial Areas have been eliminated altogether. She suggested that this new schedule may have some impact on the Comprehensive Plan amendment docket, as well.

NEW BUSINESS

2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the City Council has directed that the following items be docketed and on the work plan for the Commission to review in 2012: Updating the City's Comprehensive Plan and amending LU 43 by adding student housing to the Shoreline Community College Campus as an approved use. Ms. Markle added that four additional amendments were submitted after the Staff Report was sent out and are related to the Point Wells Subarea Plan. Staff has briefly discussed the proposed amendments to determine whether or not the City has the necessary staff resources to analyze the pros and cons. They will present their findings to the City Council, who will ultimately determine the final docket. She clarified that the Commission is not being asked to provide input at this time on whether the amendments have merit. Instead, they should share their thoughts on the implications the proposed amendments could have on the staff and Commission's work programs.

Vice Chair Perkowski clarified that all four of the new amendments came from the same applicant (Save Richmond Beach). Ms. Markle answered affirmatively. Vice Chair Perkowski asked if Save Richmond

Beach gave any indication on whether the proposed amendments were meant to be considered as a group or in any particular priority. Ms. Szafran answered no.

Commissioner Behrens asked if Save Richmond Beach has provided an indication of exactly what they want amended. Mr. Szafran said they have presented the exact language they would like incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, but staff has not analyzed the resources that would be required to implement the proposed amendments. Staff will provide additional information to the City Council, and they will make the final decision about whether or not the amendments should be included on the 2012 docket.

Chair Wagner said the first amendment would address the level of service (LOS) at various intersections to make it consistent with other parts of the City's adopted LOS. The second amendment was to evaluate whether or not there could be alternative access, which would change the basic assumptions in the traffic study about how traffic would impact Shoreline if an alternative access were provided. The third amendment was to amend the capital facilities element related to water and sewer. The fourth amendment requested validation of information that implies that the area is classified as a seismic hazard due to liquefaction. She said she does not see any of the proposed amendments as overly complicated and time consuming.

Mr. Szafran said that addressing LOS standards and traffic modeling can be a complicated and expensive process. Chair Wagner said she does not believe that Save Richmond Beach is asking for additional traffic modeling. The proposed amendment would change the expectations of what the developer would have to model as compared to what is currently required. As an example, Ms. Markle said staff would need to evaluate whether the City or the developer would be expected to bear the expense of bringing an intersection to LOS C if the proposed amendment were adopted.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None of the Commissioners provide reports or announcements during this portion of the meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the January 19th agenda includes a public hearing on the Shoreline Master Program and a discussion on the proposed tree code amendments. A public hearing on the proposed Development Code amendments has been scheduled for February 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
January 5, 2012

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS: 0:52

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 1:00

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 2:28

STUDY ITEMS:

Development Code Amendments:

Staff Presentation: 4:05

Recess: 59:01

Reconvene: 1:10:50

Public Comment: 1:15:40

Comprehensive Plan Update

Staff Presentation: 1:33:30

Public Comment: 1:55:46

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 1:55:56

NEW BUSINESS

2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket: 1:57:30

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 2:09:45

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 2:10:00

ADJOURNMENT