

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Will Hall](#); [John Norris](#); [Rachael Markle](#)
Cc: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Heidi Costello](#); [Steve Szafran](#)
Subject: RE: Dev code amendments
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2014 9:50:52 AM

Will -

Here are responses from your questions regarding the proposed code amendments:

1. It was the Department and Planning Commission's intent to include governmental services within the definition. Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy. The proposed amendment should read: Public agency office/yard or Public Utility office/yard. This proposed language will capture both public utilities and other governmental services such as City Hall. I will suggest an amendment to the proposed language in 20.40.140 to include Public Agency Office/Yard or Public Utility Office/Yard.
2. Staff and Planning Commission also agreed that some maintenance activities such as replacing bunker sand and aerating fairways are fairly benign activities that should not require a permit. The fact is the golf course generated such large quantities of sand and soil that they do trigger a permit under our current code. The golf course is subject to NPDES requirements under the City's NPDES permit.
3. Bicycle Parking. Staff used the Comprehensive Neighborhood Parking Study prepared by the City of Seattle and input from developers in Shoreline to recommend the revised bicycle parking ratios. The proposed parking standards mirror what is currently required in more urban areas of Seattle such as Capitol Hill and Ballard.

Debbie Tarry
City Manager
City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

-----Original Message-----

From: Will Hall
Sent: Monday, July 07, 2014 9:44 PM
To: Debbie Tarry; John Norris; Rachael Markle
Subject: Dev code amendments

I will be out of town on vacation on July 14 so I will miss the meeting. Here are my only comments on the proposed code amendments.

1. Regarding public utility office, if we are defining "public utility office" then it makes sense to only include public utilities within the definition, but It looks to me like the proposed definition would exclude governmental services other than utilities. I would read the original definition to include school offices or state offices. I think the placement of the word "or" in the existing definition would apply it to any government office and to any utility office. So I think the original language appeared to define two distinct terms, "public agency" and "utility office." That has different meaning if the scope of the word public is changed, and it is read, "public agency" and "public utility office." I think it was the former. I would ask staff to look at this again. I am fine narrowing the scope of the utility portion to public, although I don't see why we would regulate PSE differently from SCL.

Regarding the golf course, I would be fine exempting some of the activities that are unique to a golf course, such as replacing bunker sand or adding and aerating fairways. These are similar to routine landscaping that is exempt for anyone. Regarding vegetation management plans, we've been down that road before. One full round was before I was on the planning commission, so sometime before 2004. I recall the former planning director (Tim, not Joe) telling us hat it did not work well. Then the commission worked on it along with CAR in 2004 or 2005. I thought we had good language, but enforcement was a concern. I proposed language requiring that the city be given access to the

reserves at any time for inspection and enforcement. I recall their attorney (Eglick) opposed that requirement and the legislation did not pass. He has told me since that they would support a requirement allowing the city to have access, but I don't have any recent knowledge of their position. Given other priorities, absent a clear and broadly supported consensus approach, which I do not currently see, I would not support adding it to the work plan at this time. Even when the station area plans are done and even if resources were unlimited, this is an issue that could consume huge effort and still not yield consensus. I would also be curious if there are any NPDES permit requirements that could come into play with some of the proposed exemptions.

I don't really like using a term for both a document and a process (binding site plan), but if it works for staff, I won't object.

Typo in amendment 6, "units" should be "unit".

Regarding 24, I think I do not want to allow expansion of nonconformity. That is, I would support even being more restrictive than the current code or the proposed amendment. I believe cities like Shoreline, near the urban core, must accommodate our growth in multifamily developments, not by expanding single family homes, and I do not want expansion of nonconformities negatively impacting neighbors who are supposed to benefit from setbacks on adjacent properties.

I'm not really keen on reducing bicycle parking. Would want to hear more and think more and consult with bicycle experts. Has staff done that?

I wrote these comments after reading the amendments but not the full record. If my points are addressed therein, please let me know where to find them. I have no comments on the other amendments.

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