

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Heidi Costello](#)
Cc: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Julie Underwood](#)
Subject: Fwd: Code amendments
Date: Thursday, July 11, 2013 8:37:04 PM

Heidi -

Can you update the green folder for miscellaneous development code to include this final e-mail from Will? Thanks

Debbie Tarry
Assistant City Manager
City of Shoreline
(206) 801-2212

Begin forwarded message:

From: Will Hall <whall@shorelinewa.gov>
Date: June 26, 2013, 1:30:41 PM PDT
To: Debbie Tarry <dtarry@shorelinewa.gov>
Cc: Carolyn Wurdeman <cwurdema@shorelinewa.gov>, Steve Szafran <sszafran@shorelinewa.gov>, Rachael Markle <rmarkle@shorelinewa.gov>, Julie Underwood <junderwood@shorelinewa.gov>
Subject: Re: Code amendments

Thanks. I think 20.50.500.e.6 needs to be reworded to be clear that it is not mandatory since 20.50.500.e says "required".

My thoughts on 20.50.020 are not just related to drainage, but also to resource/energy consumption (as commissioner Wagner pointed out) and also to form and compatibility. I do not think we should allow detached SFR on lots smaller than 5,000 sf, or 8 du/acre. If we want higher density detached housing, then we should bring back the final (never adopted) cottage housing code recommended by the planning commission in 2008. I'm not sure I would support it, but at least that code addresses neighborhood compatibility and scale issues. I do not want to try to accommodate much of our future growth by packing in detached homes on 3,000 sf lots. I would rather have attached housing with more useful open space and trees. So for now, I am not inclined to change the lot coverage to facilitate detached units in R12. I may propose pulling that amendment.

Will Hall
Shoreline City Council
Sent from a mobile device

Debbie Tarry wrote:

Will -

Here are responses to your questions. We will include in the Green Folder for Monday night.

Debbie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Szafran <sszafran@shorelinewa.gov>

Date: June 26, 2013, 9:56:25 AM PDT

To: Debbie Tarry <dtarry@shorelinewa.gov>

Cc: Rachael Markle <rmarkle@shorelinewa.gov>

Subject: RE: Code amendments

20.50.020 – The Planning Commission also questioned this amendment based on drainage concerns. The Commission worried that drainage standards would go down because so much of the lot would be covered by impervious area. Staff explained that no matter what type of housing was placed on the lot, drainage standards would not change. The current code language favors attached SFR, duplexes, and townhomes by regulating building coverage and hardscape differently (greater building potential) than detached SFR. One alternative may be to change the use table to disallow detached SFR in the R12 zone if the intent is to encourage attached/duplex/condo type housing in the R12 zone.

20.50.400 – This amendment had very little discussion at the Planning Commission. Generally, the PC thought it was a good idea to encourage the trade-off of permeable pavement for a reduction of parking spaces.

20.60.040 – Again, this amendment got very little attention at the PC. The proposed amendment was generated by the City Attorney's office to clean up the language in this section. The way it reads now is that a water provider can disapprove a permit based on fire flow or water availability. Approval or denial of a permit is the City's responsibility with input from outside agencies and not the other way around.

20.40.240 – Yes, the code section also applies to cats. Staff agrees that the wording is confusing. Council may suggest breaking up the language. For example, The minimum lot size for large livestock is two acres. Each animal is required one-half acre for the animal's occupancy.

20.50.500 – The new #5 and #6 were meant to be permissive and not mandatory.

From: Debbie Tarry
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 9:03 AM
To: Rachael Markle; Steve Szafran
Cc: Carolyn Wurdeman
Subject: Fwd: Code amendments

Rachael and Steve - can you prepare a response by Friday morning?

Debbie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Will Hall <whall@shorelinewa.gov>
Date: June 26, 2013, 8:26:12 AM PDT
To: Rachael Markle <rmarkle@shorelinewa.gov>
Cc: Debbie Tarry <dtarry@shorelinewa.gov>, Carolyn Wurdeman <cwurdema@shorelinewa.gov>
Subject: Code amendments

Most of the code amendments look fine to me. I would like a little more information, including alternatives, pro/con, and any planning commission concerns, on the following ones. I read the attached planning commission minutes and did not see much discussion of these issues.

20.50.020

20.50.400

20.60.040

Also, On 20.40.240, I have just a couple questions. The requirement that unaltered pets kept outside be on a leash or in a confined area (240.3.c) would apply to unaltered cats, right? Would the wording of the second part of 240.5.a read better as "for each animal, one-half acre minimum of area..."? It just reads funny to me as is.

The new language proposed for 20.50.500.e.6 is unclear to me. Is it permissive or mandatory?

Will Hall, Councilmember
City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133
206-373-1630