



PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

AGENDA

Thursday, June 19, 2014
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber • Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Ave North

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00
2. ROLL CALL	7:01
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:03
a. May 15, 2014 Planning Commission Retreat Draft Minutes	
b. Minutes from May 1, 2014	

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.

5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:05
6. STUDY ITEM	7:10
a. Hazardous Management Plan Update	
• Staff Presentation	
• Public Comment	
7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	7:55
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:05
9. NEW BUSINESS	8:06
10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:10
11. AGENDA FOR JULY 10, 2014 SPECIAL - PUBLIC HEARING	8:15
a. July 3 meeting cancelled	
b. Light Rail DEIS Public Hearing	
c. Hazardous Management Plan Update Public Hearing	
12. ADJOURNMENT	8:20

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236

This page intentionally blank

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF RETREAT MEETING

May 15, 2014
6:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Scully
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Moss
Commissioner Strandberg

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Debbie Tarry, City Manager
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Craft (excused)

WELCOME

Rachael Markle welcomed commissioners to the meeting, invited them to start eating and explained that Lisa Basher would be facilitating the meeting. She then turned it over to Ms. Basher who introduced City Manager Debbie Tarry

CITY MANAGER VISION

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, described her 'Vision' as the City Manager. Ms. Terry explained that, as the City Manager, it is her responsibility to provide clear direction on organizational priorities; manage the City's resources and set clear expectations for staff. She reviewed that the City Leadership Team is made up of City's department directors who are accountable to accomplishing the City Council's goals and work plan within their Departments. The department directors will work with managers and supervisors to develop the critical leadership skills needed to accomplish the long-term needs of the City.

Ms. Basher said she appreciates that the City Manager is very transparent and keeps staff up-to-date about what is going on by providing weekly updates. Chair Scully suggested that the weekly updates be forwarded to the Planning Commission, and Ms. Basher agreed to do that.

Chair Scully commented that in the years he has worked with City staff, he observed that there are very few conflicts and everyone seems to work well with each other.

Commissioner Moss noted that Ms. Tarry, Ms. Markle, Mr. Cohen and Mr. Szafran have been with the City for a number of years. She thanked them for their support and willingness to provide the Commission with what they need to work for and with the citizens.

ICE BREAKER

To get to know each other better, the Commissioners participated in an ice breaker exercise.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES

Ms. Markle introduced Ann MacFarlane, Jurassic Parliament, who was present to make a presentation regarding parliamentary procedures. Ms. MacFarlane provided brief history of Roberts Rules of Order, which started as a pocket manual to provide guidance on how to conduct public meetings but has been subsequently altered to become long and complicated. She said the purpose of her presentation is to distill the manual to make it more assessable and easier to implement. She explained the following types of organizations:

- **Accountability Hierarchy**
- **Voluntary Association**

Ms. MacFarlane explained that leaders of voluntary associations have three different types of duties:

- **Manage or Administer**
- **Lead**
- **Preside**

Ms. MacFarlane reviewed the “Six Principles of Meetings,” created by Jim Lockrie, a Canadian Parliamentarian:

- **The majority must be allowed to rule.**
- **The minority have rights that must be respected.**
- **Members have a right to information to help make decisions.**
- **Courtesy and respect are required.**
- **All members have equal rights, privileges and obligations.**
- **All members have a right to an efficient meeting.**

Using a role play situation to further illustrate the motion process, Ms. MacFarlane reviewed the eight steps for a motion and how motions can be amended or referred to committee.

1. A member makes a motion.
2. Another member seconds the motion.
3. “Presider” states the motion.
4. Members debate the motion and amend it if desired.

5. “Presider” states the motion again and calls for a vote. The “presider” must call for the negative or the vote is not legitimate.
6. Members vote on the motion.
7. “Presider” states the results of the vote, whether motion passes or fails, and what will happen as a result of the vote.
8. “Presider” moves on to the next item of business.

Ms. MacFarlane concluded her presentation by stressing the importance of each member taking full possession of her/his powers as a Commissioner. She closed with the following quotation from Tao Te Ching, which outlines her wish for the Commission, “The best leader is one whose existence is barely known. Next best, is one who is loved and praised. Next best is one who is feared, and worst of all is one who is despised. If you fail to trust people, they will not prove to be trustworthy. Therefore, guide others by quietly relying on Dao and when the work is done, the people will say, ‘we did this ourselves.’”

The Commission inquired if Ms. MacFarlane would be available to speak to other groups, such as neighborhood associations. Ms. MacFarlane answered affirmatively and encouraged Commissioners to contact her if they have parliamentary questions.

DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK

- **Packets**

Ms. Basher requested feedback about the timing and content of the Commission Packets. It was discussed that some Commissioners pick up paper copies of the packets and others access the information via the City’s website. The Commissioners agreed that the current timing for the packets works well. Commissioner Moss asked that attachments that are germane to a topic of discussion be made available to Commissioners in paper form instead of simply a link to where it can be found on line.

- **Administrative Support**

Ms. Basher advised that the Information Technology (IT) Department now requires that passwords for City accounts be changed every three months. She agreed to meet with Commissioners individually to help them access and use their City accounts. She reminded the Commissioners not to use their personal email addresses for Planning Commission business, as it can create problems if someone makes a public records request. It is best to have all emails related to Planning Commission business in the City account.

The Commissioners requested that staff provide a wallet-sized card with the staff and Planning Commissioner’s phone numbers. Ms. Basher agreed to provide the cards at the next meeting.

- **Training**

Mr. Cohen asked the Commission for feedback on whether the training opportunities provided throughout the year by the City are sufficient or if they would like more. The Commission said they appreciate the information about training opportunities that is provided by staff.

- **Staff Reports and Analysis**

Ms. Cohen requested feedback about whether the Staff Reports and Analysis provided for each agenda topic have been adequate for the Commissioners to make informed decisions. Chair Scully said it would be helpful for staff to involve the Commission earlier in the process for issues that will require more debate. He requested that staff notify the Commissioners of upcoming discussions as early as possible and provide as much information as possible to get them thinking. The remainder of the Commissioners concurred and suggested that information could be provided as part of the Director's Report. It was also noted that Facebook, Nextdoor and other websites are excellent sources for additional information and community feedback.

- **Additional Study Sessions for Complex Issues**

The Commissioners expressed concern that when a study session is held just two weeks prior to a public hearing, staff does not always have an opportunity to provide all of the answers to the Commission's questions prior the public hearing. The Commissioners requested that there be a second study session prior to each public hearing to allow the staff to follow up on questions from the initial study session. It was discussed that if the Commissioners feel they need more information or more time to absorb the information before making a recommendation, they could also continue the public hearing to a date certain and no additional notice would be required. They discussed how this new process would be helpful for items coming before the Commission in the coming months.

- **Scheduling Gaps and Meeting Content**

Director Markle recognized the importance of keeping Commission meeting dates consistent, but she also wants to respect the Commissioners time. Although the Commission's agenda for the next several months is full, she asked them to share their thoughts about cancelling meetings if there are no substantial items for the agenda. Mr. Szafran pointed out that when light rail station area planning gets underway, it may even be necessary to have additional meetings.

The Commissioners agreed that meetings should be cancelled if there are no substantial agenda items. However, it was noted that agendas could be filled with items on their "parking lot" agenda or preliminary study sessions on items that are scheduled to come before them in the future. For example, staff could present their research on various tools that might be considered during the light rail station area planning process such as affordable housing, housing choices, and neighborhood character.

- **Director's Report**

Director Markle reminded the Commission of their earlier request that she provide information to the them as early as possible regarding things that are happening in the City, particularly those that

pertain to the Planning Commission's work. Commissioner Moss said she would also be interested in learning what is going on at the State and regional levels that might influence the Commission's work. It was noted that much of this information is available in the report that is published weekly by the City Manager.

- **Feedback for Chair**

The Commission expressed support for informal meetings, with the exception of public hearings, where more order and structure is needed.

- **Tour of 145th Light Rail Station Area**

The Commission discussed that tours are often helpful to add context to their future discussions, and they particularly noted that a tour of the 145th Street Light Rail Station Area would be helpful in the near future. It was also suggested that a tour of developments that illustrate different types of housing opportunities would be helpful as they begin discussing housing choices and neighborhood character. Perhaps the staff could create an inventory of current developments the Commissioners could visit on their own.

The Commission agreed that it would be helpful for staff to provide periodic updates related to projects such as the Community Renewal Project, which do not come before the Commission for review but have a significant impact to the community.

REVIEW ACTION ITEMS

Ms. Basher reviewed the action items from the meeting as follows:

- Reset the appointments for Planning Commission on the Outlook Calendar.
- Bring wallet cards with contact information for Commissioners and staff to the next meeting.
- When training meetings are held, an Outlook invite instead of an email should be sent out with the heading, "Training Opportunity."
- Have an additional meeting between the first study session and the public hearing.
- Use the option to defer the public hearing if there are more questions, and bring a calendar to schedule the deferred hearing to a date certain.
- Provide updates on "hot button" issues as part of the Director's report.
- Assist Commissioners in resetting passwords for their City accounts.
- Rather than cancelling meetings, agendas could be filled with items on the "parking lot" agenda or preliminary study sessions on items that are scheduled to come before them in the future.
- Schedule a tour of the 145th Street Station Area, good and bad cottage housing developments, and current projects that are being developed.
- Provide updates on the Community Renewal Project.

TRIVIA BREAK

The Commission participated in a game of Shoreline trivia.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Keith Scully
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Please note: There is no audio available for this meeting.

May 1, 2014
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Scully
Vice Chair Craft
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Moss
Commissioner Strandberg

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Montero

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Chair, Keith Scully, 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 Scully, Vice Chair Craft, and Commissioners Malek, Maul, and Strandberg. Chair Moss arrived about 20 minutes after Roll Call. Commissioner Montero was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 17 were not yet available to be approved. They will be approved at the next regular meeting.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Scully reviewed the rules for public comment. No one was signed up for general public comment.

STUDY ITEM: UPDATE ON POINT WELLS TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR PROCESS

Staff Presentation

Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager, introduced himself and explained that the purpose of his report was to update the Commission on the status of the Point Wells Transportation Corridor Study. He explained that members of the Commission were welcome to interrupt to ask questions or ask for clarification throughout his presentation.

Mr. McKinley reviewed that the proposed development, while being under the purview of Snohomish County, will have a severe impact on traffic throughout the Richmond Beach area since there will be no other way to access Point wells from any other direction. He acknowledged that residents of the community have expressed great concern for the impact that a development of this scope will have on the community. He explained that early on in the process, it was decided that the best way for the City to have input and influence on the BSRE project to mitigate traffic concerns was to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with BSRE. The MOU established a process to develop a Transportation Corridor Study funded by the developer and the City. Following completion of the TCS, the data, in conjunction with a development agreement, will be used to inform decisions on the DEIS, mitigation, phasing, the traffic cap (set at a maximum of 11,587 ADT) and future potential annexation plans.

Mr. McKinley described the TCS process and meeting schedule explaining that there were 7 public meetings held from mid-February to mid-April and that the purpose of these meetings was to hear from the community about transportation issues and concerns and then develop mitigation relating to proposed development at Point Wells. The final meeting presented design options resulting from the feedback given by residents. He mentioned that about 500 residents attended the seven meetings and provided a variety of feedback from concerns over traffic and diversion, pedestrian and bike safety, parking, quality of life, pollution and an overall change to the character of the neighborhood brought about by such a large development. Mr. McKinley described specific concerns about the 196th / 195th 'Triangle' and Richmond Beach drive.

Next steps will include additional analysis, finalization of mitigation package leading to a public open house tentatively scheduled in late summer or early fall, followed by City Council action early fall 2014. Following Council Action the TCS results will be submitted to Snohomish County for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). .

Public Comment

Delores Jensen, George Mayer, and James Joke, Shoreline, all spoke against development at Point Wells citing safety concerns and pointing out that the Point Wells site has been designated a corrosion and slide prone zone. Delores recalled the recent events in Oso as an example of what happens when hazards are disregarded in favor of development. They agreed that the development will have a tremendous

impact on the character of their neighborhood and that the amount of traffic coming through the neighborhoods will overburden the roads.

Tom McCormick, Shoreline, expressed concern about Staff's statement at the meeting that the City has "joined hands" with the developer on the Transportation Corridor Study, and commented that joining hands with the developer was at the expense of Richmond Beach residents. He urged the Commission to resist efforts to raise the 4,000 trips per day traffic cap for Richmond Beach Drive that is contained in the City's Point Wells Subarea Plan, noting that 4,000 daily trips is about seven times the current traffic volume. He also requested that the existing pedestrian crosswalk at the intersection of Richmond Beach Road and 23rd Ave NW be improved when traffic increases.

STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPEMENT CODE AMENDMENT BATCH

Staff Presentation

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, began by explaining that the amendments to the Development Code are processed as Legislative decisions. The Planning Commission is tasked with reviewing the amendments and forwarding a recommendation the City Council. He gave a brief review on the purpose of development code amendments. Amendments serve to bring regulations into conformity with the Comprehensive Plan; to respond to changing conditions or needs of the City; and to comply with State Law. In many cases amendments are also necessary to reduce confusion, clarify existing language, respond to local policy changes, update references, and eliminate redundant or inconsistent language.

Mr. Szafran said this batch of 31 proposed amendments were brought forward by Director Markle and staff with one exception, which was introduced by the Seattle Golf Club whose representatives are in attendance to provide information about their proposed amendment and to answer questions. He outlined that the format of the discussion will be to go over each amendment and talk about its purpose, discuss any feedback the Commission might have, and determine if the Planning Commissioners need any additional information or analysis on the proposed amendments. He indicated that the amendments begin on page 14 in the Commissioners packets. Changes to the amendments suggested by the commission will be considered and there will be an opportunity to go over the amendments again in a Public Hearing in the coming weeks.

Amendment 1 - 20.10.050 Roles and responsibilities - Mr. Szafran explained that this amendment catches the code up a change that was implemented three years ago that shifted oversight on quasi-judicial matters from the Planning Commission to the Hearing Examiner. The Commission had no comment on this change.

Amendment 2 - 20.20.012 B definitions - This amendment clarifies the definition of a Binding Site Plan. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 3 - 20.20.16 D definitions - This corrects an error where the code incorrectly refers to the Department by it's former name. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Commissioner Moss requested that staff do a keyword search on the department name throughout the code to correct all instances.

Amendment 4 - 20.20.40 P definitions - This amendment seeks to clarify the difference between a public agency or utility office and a yard. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 5 - 20.30.040 Ministerial Decisions - Type A - This amendment provides for additional noticing requirements for when multiple homes are built on one lot. This addresses an issue that was recently brought to our attention. The Commission asked several clarifying questions about this amendment but no changes were proposed.

Amendment 6 - 20.30.045 - Neighborhood meeting for certain Type A proposals. Continues applying additional noticing requirements to mitigate potential impacts to residents.

Amendment 7 - 20.30.060 Quasi Judicial decisions - Type C - Removes street vacations from the table as it is regulated elsewhere in State Law and SMC Title 12. Commissioners had no comments or questions about this amendment.

Amendment 8 - 20.30.120 Public notices of application - This amendment adds necessary public comment periods related to the Shoreline Master Program into the appropriate section of the code. Commissioners had no comments or questions about this amendment.

Amendment 9 - 20.30.370 Purpose - This amendment deletes condominiums from the subdivisions section of the code. Condominiums are not subdivisions of land - they are a type of ownership and the City does not regulate forms of ownership (Condominiums, apartments, rental homes). The Commission had some clarifying questions related to what constitutes a subdivision verses multiple units on one lot. The Commission did not suggest .

Amendment 10 - 20.30.380 Subdivision categories - A condominium does not necessarily need a Binding Site Plan unless parcels of land are actually being created. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 11 - 20.30.390 Exemptions (from subdivisions) Justification - The Code currently lists uses that are exempt from the subdivision section based on State Law. This amendment seeks to delete these exemptions since it is in State Law and subject to change. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 12 - 20.30.480 Binding site plans - Type B action - Section A is not written well and seems to imply and either/or method of review when in fact the word "may" means the review could be done in whatever way is appropriate depending on the circumstances. This language clarifies how the City may review Binding Site Plans. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 13 - 20.30.680 Appeals - Correcting an error that incorrectly states that the Hearing Examiner does not review Type C actions. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 14 - 20.40.130 Nonresidential Uses - This amendment adds Daycare Facilities II as a permitted use in the R-6 and R-8 zones with additional criteria (P-I means permitted with additional criteria) the additional criterion is explained in the 20.40.320 amendment. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 15 - 20.40.140 Other Uses - combining public agency/yard and Public Utility office/yard in the use table and making them a Special Use in the R-4-R12 zone.

Amendment 16 - 20.40.320 Daycare facilities - amendment 16 seeks to allow Daycare II in R-4 and R-6 zones if they are proposed within existing facilities such as churches and schools. Commissioner Strandberg pointed out that there seem to be inconsistencies to the two amendments and the tables illustrating them that relate to Daycare II facilities. Mr. Szafran will look at the code and try to address these contradictions.

Amendment 17 - 20.40.480 Public Agency or utility office & 20.40.490 Public Agency or utility yard. Staff proposes requiring a Special Use Permit to locate in a residential area without any indexed criteria. This will allow staff to impose conditions that are appropriate for the site in which one of these uses will go or deny the use if the stringent criteria for a Special Use Permit are not met. This will allow staff to be flexible and allow projects to fit into existing residential areas. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 18 - 20.40.600 Wireless telecommunication facilities/satellite dish and antennas - corrects an error in a table changing the acronym CUP to SUP. The Commission had no questions or comments about this change.

Amendment 19 - 20.50.020 Dimensional requirements. This amendment fills a gap in exception number 8 of Table 20.50.020. R18 should also be included in the exemption along with other multifamily zones above and below R-18. The Commission had no questions or changes.

Amendment 20 - 20.50.090 Additions to existing single-family house - Standards. The City allows a home owner to make additions that are non-conforming to setbacks as long as the addition is the same height as the existing height of the house. If a home owner wants to add on to a home horizontally as well as vertically, then the portion of the addition that is higher has to meet current setbacks. For example, if an existing home is 3 feet from the side property line, the owner may extend the home as long as the home goes not closer than 3 feet from the property line. If the owner wants to add a story onto the addition, the second story must be stepped back to meet the existing side yard setback requirement of five feet. Mr. Szafran and Mr. Cohen answered multiple questions about this amendment, and the Commission did not suggest any changes. Director Markle also pointed out that the Commission is free to recommended additional changes to the amendments before them. Commissioner Moss suggested that Figure 20.50.090 (A) be drawn proportionately or to scale to better illustrate the 60% of existing facade.

Amendment 21 - 20.50.240 Site design (Commercial Code Amendments)

A.4 - The term "town center" was missed in the last commercial code consolidation amendment. It is no longer a separate subarea from the remaining commercially zoned property and should be deleted but included under "commercial development".

C.1.b. This would require commercially zoned buildings to have 12 ft ceilings, which would make it difficult for the floor plates to match with the remainder of the building ceiling heights. Mr. Cohen stated that this is too stringent of a requirement for commercial developers and shouldn't be a requirement.

Commissioner Maul made a case for maintaining the 12 ft ceiling at street level requirement. He also suggested possibly a 4-6 ft height bonus for buildings that have 12 ft ceilings on the ground floor. After debating this point, Staff agreed that it would be a good idea to look at surrounding jurisdictions code and see what their commercial design requirements are. Also staff indicated that the 12 ft ceiling height could be reduced to 9 ft through and Administrative Design Review (ADR) process.

C.1.c - The current code is too inflexible and would not include windows below 30 inches in height or windows above 10 feet in height. A building with a full glass facade and doors would be penalized unnecessarily.

F.1 - the existing standard does not take into consideration mixed uses. A mixed use that is 90% multifamily with a 10% commercial would have a huge public place based on the lot size plus the multifamily open space. Based on current development proposals this standard is improbable to meet. the proposed amendment allows the multifamily open space and the public place requirement to be on the same site and proportional to each use.

G.1.c - Environmental equipment such as solar panels cannot be screened to perform as desired. It is logical to exempt such equipment from this code section.

Amendment 22 - 20.50.310 Exemptions from permit - Mr. Szafran explained that this is the amendment brought forward by Seattle Golf Course (SGC) to allow for a more streamlined process for maintaining and repairing golf courses in Shoreline. He explained that these activities are ongoing and so frequent that it is inefficient for them to apply for a permit each time. Many surrounding jurisdictions exempt golf courses from these activities. In the past the Director has issued a 5 year permit allowing SGC to perform these maintenance activities with conditions. The proposed amendment requires golf courses to maintain a minimum tree retention percentage of 35% and conform to the City's regulations when making decisions about their grounds.

Chair Scully pointed out that this agreement would essentially give the Golf Club 'carte blanche' to do whatever they want. His concern is not only how they would decide to use that freedom, but also that it might set a precedent for other large properties wanting to have the same decision making freedom to the detriment of the environment and possibly public safety. There is nothing built-in to the amendment

to define what is 'normal and routine maintenance' and he is hesitant to move forward without such limits being written into the amendment.

Commissioners also were curious about the properties on which the Parking Lot and the Clubhouse occupied, and if they would also be exempt from permitting requirements. Mr. Cohen indicated that those properties were different parcels and therefore not covered by this amendment.

Another element included in the amendment would allow for the Golf Course to stockpile organic materials for use or recycling on a golf course in excess of 50 cubic yards. Both Commissioner Moss and Commissioner Strandberg wondered about the implications of this as it does not specify where this 'material' is to be stored; will it be screened; or how the environment will be protected from runoff. Questions also arose from the Commission regarding the extent of grade change that would be allowed as a result of this amendment.

Amendment 23 - 20.50.440 Bicycle facilities - Standards. SMC 20.50.440 was amended in 2013 to provide for more long-term bicycle parking; however there has been feedback from developers indicating that the new standard is difficult to meet with other development standards. Shoreline's standards are among the highest in the region and the highest in suburban cities. This amendment is intended to make bike parking standards less cumbersome for developers while still making sure ample bike space is set aside. The merits of this amendment were discussed and debated. Commissioner Moss expressed concern that .5 per studio was not enough to handle the volume of a growing community of bike riders. She also commented that family sized apartments with 30 more bedrooms could generate the need for more bike storage. Commissioners discussed whether realistically it's fair to provide the heavy bike parking and storage requirements in a suburban area since most people are reliant on cars. Adding Light Rail could bring more residents that bike and will be less dependent on car travel but in recent years Shoreline hasn't seen much growth in this population so it doesn't make sense to have such a high requirement if it's not being used.

Amendment 24 -20.50.532 - Permit Required, Amendment 25 - 20.50.550 Prohibited Signs, & Amendment 26-20.50.590 Nonconforming Signs. The intent of these amendments is to prohibit installation of new electronic changing message or reader board signs in existing, non conforming signs in zones where electronic changing message or reader board signs are prohibited. An exception is proposed that would allow for replacement where the electronic changing message unit is legal nonconforming. Previously installation of these digital signs in existing cabinets was treated as a copy replacement. This has allowed for installation or replacement of digital signs without review and sometimes in signs which exceed the current maximum sign area size for the zone.

Amendment 27 - 20.50.600 - Temporary Signs. Current temporary sign standards do not provide a means for non-residential uses in residential zones to temporarily advertise events or programs. A board signs are prohibited as are electronic message centers in residential zones. As currently worded it is not clear whether temporary signs could be considered for approval under a Temporary Use Permit or Administrative Design Review. This change allows use of banners for schools and churches comparable to what is allowed without permit in commercial zones. Separate provisions for signs without a permit are available for home occupations, adult family homes, and daycares under 20.50.540 (J) Government

agencies are allowed to install incidental signs without limits under 20.50.610 (D) which is commonly used by public schools, but this provision is limited to two (2) square feet for all other incidental signs.

Commissioner Moss expressed concern that these restrictions don't allow for schools which can take up entire blocks and therefore would only be allowed to place one sign if they are advertising an upcoming school event or activity. She reasons that they should at least be able to have a sign on each street frontage surrounding the block that the school occupies.

Amendment 28 - 20.80.240 Alteration - the City adopted the International Building Code in 2004 and this code amendment reflects the updated code.

Amendment 29 - 20.80.310 Purpose. / Amendment 30 - 20.80.320 Designation, Deliniation, and Classification.

RCW 36.70A.175 requires that the wetlands are to be delineated in accordance with the manual adopted per RCW 90.58.380. RCW 90.58.380 states the Ecology must adopt a manual that implements and is consistent with the 1987 manual in use on Jan 1, 1995 by the Army Corps of Engineers and the US Environmental Protection Agency. If the corps and the EPA adopt changes or a different manual is adopted, Ecology shall consider these changes and may adopt rules implementing them.

This is what Ecology has done with WAC 173-22-035. The proposed amendments to 20.80.310 and 20.80.330 mirror the language. However, 20.80.330 doesn't need to include the language that all wetlands meeting the designation criteria are designated as critical areas. SMC 20.80.310 already does this. There is no need to repeat the language in 20.80.330 since this is where buffers are regulated.

The amendments delete the identification/delineation phrase in 20.80.310 and 20.80.330 and move it into 20.80.320 and change that title to "Identification, Delineation, and Classification." this keeps "Purpose" being just Purpose and then creates a new section for the other aspects.

Amendment 31 - 20.80.330 Required buffer areas - brings the code to compliance with WAC 173-22-035.

Mr. Szafran concluded his presentation.

Public Comment

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission, and the public comment period was closed.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle announced that there would be a Joint meeting with Council on May 12th to discuss 145th street Light Rail planning. She asked the Commission clerk if she was able to determine who would be there. Ms Basher indicated that 5 people had said they could make it and that she was still waiting to

hear back from Commissioner Strandberg. Commissioner Strandberg indicated that she did not yet know if she could make it.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business to discuss.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business scheduled on the agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no committee reports.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Ms. Basher indicated that there will be a retreat on May 15 and because of this the Planning Commission meeting will start at a different time, 6:00 pm. The Commissioners will be served dinner and Ms. Basher will be in touch with them about food options. Mr. Szafran indicated that the retreat will still be held in Chambers, however it will not be up at the dias but in a more informal room setup. Chair Scully asked if staff needed any suggestions on agenda items and staff responded that the agenda was pretty much set. Director Markle clarified that even though the agenda is set we are always open to suggestions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Keith Scully
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission

This page intentionally blank

 Planning Commission Meeting Date: June 19, 2014

 Agenda Item

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
DEPARTMENT: Planning & Community Development
PRESENTED BY: Gail Harris, Emergency Management Coordinator

<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing	<input type="checkbox"/> Study Session	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Only
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

INTRODUCTION

The goal of the City of Shoreline Hazard Mitigation Plan is to identify and recommend projects and programs that when implemented, would eliminate, minimize, or otherwise mitigate the vulnerability of the people, property, environmental resources, and economic vitality of the community to the impacts of future disasters. These identified projects and programs are termed "mitigation initiatives" and constitute the principal component of the plan. The fundamental purpose of the plan is to guide, coordinate, and facilitate the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and individuals participating as they seek funding, authority, or other resources necessary for implementation of mitigation initiatives. After a review of the Planning Commissions Duties and Responsibilities under, 2.20.060 B, namely, "The planning commission shall review land use management, shoreline management and environmental protection ordinances and regulations of the city and make recommendations regarding them to the city council", it was determined that because this plan does deal with land use management we are asking for your review. In 2004, the City of Shoreline formally adopted their first Washington State and FEMA approved Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Plan was a five year plan and it was renewed in 2009, expiring this year, 2014. The City must have an up to date FEMA approved Hazard Mitigation Plan in order to receive any-post disaster funding to help recover loss after a significant event that impacts our community and to apply for pre-disaster mitigation grants.

BACKGROUND

The 2004 Plan identified 28 mitigation strategies. All 28 have been accomplished in the intervening five years. The 2009 plan had 26 mitigation strategies for the City to focus on and we completed them as well. In 2013, we joined a King County wide initiative to have a King County Hazard Mitigation Planning effort and each jurisdiction have an annex to their plan. To prepare the Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City signed on to participate in a Pre-Mitigation Planning Grant with Tetra Tech to do the King County Hazard Mitigation Plan to include all jurisdictions and special purpose districts that wanted to participate. The scope of work included developing all elements of the plan, coordinating efforts with City stakeholders and key agencies, and submitting the plan to the State/FEMA.

Approved By:

Project Manager _____

Planning Director *Rh*

6.a Staff Report

This update includes a review of work done to implement the 2009 Plan, an evaluation of new information as to the current hazards we face as a city and experience gained in recent events that impacted the City. Examples of those events include the severe winter snow and ice storms in January 2009 and January 2012. This Annex identifies 16 Mitigation Strategies that we will be working toward in the next 5 year period.

Additionally, per the requirements from FEMA on the development and renewal of the Plan, opportunity for public comment was required. The city hosted a well attended Community Meeting in September 2013, did an online survey, and has had a link to the draft plan on the City's Web site for public review and comment. Finally the Plan has received extensive review by City staff and the Emergency Management Council.

This update focuses on the City's risk assessment, which described the risks that the City is likely to experience from hazardous events. Sixteen specific strategies are identified that the city should focus on in the next five years to mitigate these risks to community members. Maintenance of this plan lies with staff working with all of the other participating agencies as outlined in the plan. In addition the city uses the Shoreline Emergency Management Council as a stakeholder group to update them as to our progress on these strategies. The Emergency Management Council was established as a community based multi-disciplined administrative group, under the direction of the City Manager, to implement the emergency plans and policies established by the City Council.

The sixteen mitigation strategies identified in the plan to be implemented of the over the next five year period are listed below. More specific discussion of the strategies is found in the full plan available at City Hall and on the City's web site.

Hazard mitigation action plan matrix							
Applies to new or existing assets	Hazards Mitigated	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Included in Previous Plan?
SH-1 —Continue to maintain compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program. This will be accomplished through the implementation of floodplain management programs that, at a minimum, will meet the minimum requirements of the NFIP, which include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement of the adopted flood damage prevention ordinance, • Participating in floodplain identification and mapping updates, and • Providing public assistance/information on floodplain requirements and impacts 							
New and existing	Flood	2,4,10,12	Public Works	Low	Surface Water Utility Fund	Ongoing	No
SH-2 - The City of Shoreline City Hall facility, which is approximately 4 years old, doesn't have an alternate power supply. The City will be researching funding opportunities and will endeavor to have an alternative power supply in place by 2016.							
New	All Hazards	1, 3	Central Services	700,000.	CIP and other	2016	No

<p>SH - 3 - Continue to do public education outreach to our neighborhoods using the "Map Your Neighborhood" tool so ensure communities can take care of themselves and those who live around them during a disaster event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Neighborhood Associations • Utilize CERT members to assist in this outreach • Use materials from the "What to Do to Make it Through" and "Take Winter by Storm" Campaigns. • Identify those homes within the neighborhoods that have vulnerable or isolated populations living in them, specifically the Adult Family Homes and Boarding Homes. • Utilize Social Media and Emergency Alert Systems to communicate preparedness and emergency messaging 							
Existing	All Hazards	6, 8, 11	Community Services Division (CSD)	Low	General and Grant funds	Ongoing	Yes
<p>SH - 4 - Continue to ensure operational readiness of the Emergency Operations Center and establish the backup EOC in a new location at the Washington State Public Health Lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify technologies that will support communications internally and externally at the EOC • Reduce the noise level in the EOC by moving the Communications Team to a new location and researching sound proofing technologies. • Establish a floor plan, communications plan, and technology issues for the back-up EOC • Activate the EOC at least once a year for an exercise and activate the back-up EOC once it is established at least every 2 years. 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 3	CSD	Med	General and Grant Funds	EOC by end of 2015 and back-up EOC by mid-2016	No
<p>SH - 5 - Salt Water Park Pedestrian Bridge Repair - replacing the decking and improving the structural integrity of the only access to Richmond Salt Water Beach Park. This bridge is the only way to access the beach and it crosses the Burlington Northern Railroad lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides safe crossing for public access to the beach • Provides safe access for first responders to fight fires on the steep slopes and provide for rescue operations associated with medical emergencies and landslides. 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 3, 5	Parks	300,000.	CIP	2015	No
<p>SH - 6 - Storm water pipe replacement program - replace aging storm water infrastructure throughout the city.</p>							
Existing	Flooding, Earthquake	1	Public Works	5.28 million	Surface Water Utility	2019	No
<p>SH - 7 - Surface Water Basin Planning - identify drainage, water quality, and habitat issues within specific drainage basins, and prioritize mitigation strategies.</p>							
New and Existing	Flooding, Severe Weather	1, 5, 7, 8, 12	Public Works	730,000.	Surface Water Utility	2016	No
<p>SH - 8 - City of Shoreline will consider participating with Community Rating Systems for communities who participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).</p>							
Excising	Flooding	6, 8	Public Works	Low	General Fund	2016	No

SH-9 — Study the feasibility of replacing the aging Hidden Lake bridge on 10th Ave NW that is built on a ravine as its structural sufficiency rating is at a point that will require replacement soon. We will need to seek opportunities for funding the project.							
Existing	Earthquake, Landslide	1, 5, 8	Public Works	150,000.	Roads Capital	2015	No
SH-10 — Begin implementing strategies identified in the City of Shoreline Climate Action Plan.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the new water utility, consider rate structures or incentives for customers to encourage water conservation • Utilize zoning and permitting methods to concentrate new growth in proximity of services and transit. • Identify opportunities for habitat improvements to reduce the urban heat island effect and support carbon sequestration in City open spaces. 							
New and Existing	All Hazards	1, 2, 4, 6, 10, 12	Public Works & Planning	High	Funding unknown	2019	No
SH-11 — Require new development to be designed and constructed to reduce or eliminate flood damage by requiring use of Low Impact Development techniques as required under the existing City Code.							
Existing	Flooding	2, 4, 10, 12	Planning & Public Works	Low	General Fund	Ongoing	No
SH-12 — Implement updated international building and residential codes.							
New	Flooding, Earthquake	2, 7, 10	Planning	Low	General Fund	2016	No
SH-13 —Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase, or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with properties with exposure to repetitive losses as a priority.							
Existing	All Hazards	5,7,9	Planning & Public Works	High	FEMA Grant funding, local match	Long-term	No
SH-14 — Continue to support the county-wide initiatives identified in this plan.							
New and Existing	All Hazards	4,6,11,12,13, 14, 15	City	Low	General Fund	Short term	No
SH-15 —Actively participate in the plan maintenance strategy identified in this plan.							
New and Existing	All Hazards	4,6,11,12,13, 14, 15	KCOEM City of Shoreline	Low	General fund	Short term	No
SH-16 - Integrate the Mitigation Plan findings into planning and regulatory documents and programs.							
New and existing	All	2,10	Planning	Low	Local Budget	Short Term	No

PROPOSAL & ANALYSIS

This plan has been approved by the Washington State Emergency Management Office of Hazard Mitigations and has been given tentative approval by FEMA. Final FEMA approval will come after the City Council adopts the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

A recommendation is not required at this time. Staff welcomes questions and feedback on this introduction to the proposed plan update. A Public Hearing is scheduled before the Planning Commission on July 10th, which will include a formal presentation by Tetra Tech, the consultant. Following the Public Hearing the Planning Commission will be requested to make a formal recommendation to City Council.

LINKS

King County Hazard Mitigation Plan 2014 Draft
City of Shoreline Annex to the Plan Draft