

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

October 15, 2015
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Scully
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Moss-Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Craft
Commissioner Maul

CALL TO ORDER

Chair 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 and Commissioners Malek, Montero, Moss-Thomas and Mork. Vice Chair Craft and Commissioner Maul were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 17, 2015 were adopted as revised.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: 2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Chair Scully reviewed the procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Growth Management Act (GMA) limits the review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to no more than once per year. To ensure that the public can view the proposals within the citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket (or list) of amendments that may be considered. The Planning Commission made a recommendation to the City Council on the docket on March 19th, and the Council set the actual docket at their June 15th meeting. This year's docket includes one privately-initiated amendment and nine City-initiated amendments. He reviewed each as follows:

Staff Presentation of Amendment 1

Mr. Szafran advised that **Amendment 1** would add language to the introduction section of the Comprehensive Plan that outlines a public participation process. Currently, this section contains a citizen-participation element that contains one goal and eight policies. An audit by the Washington Cities Insurance Authority revealed that the City's Comprehensive Plan should develop a more specific citizen participation plan. The language outlined in the proposed amendment emphasizes the involvement of the broadest cross section of the community when the City initiates a Comprehensive Plan update or other large planning projects. The proposed program includes a visioning process, public meetings (including at least one public hearing), Planning Commission involvement in the public forum, and a communication program (advertisements, contact with interest groups, community workshops, press releases, and outreach to agencies and groups).

Commissioner Montero noted that Item 4 of the proposed language talks about the Planning Commission being involved as the host at public meetings. He asked if these would be regular Planning Commission meetings or separate meetings. Mr. Szafran said it could be either, but the intent was to have separate meetings. There is not a one-size-fits-all approach to every project, so the process could be amended depending on the project. Large projects may need a separate meeting to solicit comments. Chair Scully said this would be similar to the Commission's approach for the 145th and 185th Station Subarea Planning processes, where Planning Commissioners were present, but the meetings were organized by staff.

Commissioner Mork requested clarification on the issue of "public standing." Chair Scully referred to letter from Wendy DiPeso regarding this issue and explained that "standing" is the legal doctrine that allows a person to sue. In the context of land use, there are different requirements, depending on what statute you are trying to bring a suit under. The GMA has a participation standing that says if you participate in the process by providing public comment, then you can sue if you do not like the result. The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) has different standards, as do other ordinances.

Public Testimony on Amendment 1

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was present to represent the Shoreline Preservation Society. She referred to a letter she submitted prior to the meeting, which voiced concern that a 1998 Final

Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is referenced as a basis for the proposed amendments when the City, at a recent a process before the Growth Management Hearings Board, contended that the 1998 FIES was irrelevant. The City cannot say it was irrelevant pertaining to the planned action ordinance but relevant in this case. If the old FEIS is no longer relevant, the City needs to do a new one that is up to date before the Comprehensive Plan is updated. The Society also believes the City has failed to document the environmental conditions properly. The State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) checklist that was done for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) repeatedly stated “this is a non-project action and does not apply.” In other words, the City is trying to get out of having to do the analysis by stating that it is a non-project action. She summarized that the society believes the FEIS was inaccurate, and the City needs to go back to the drawing board and comply with SEPA. Ms. Way noted that the City also failed to adopt some environmental documents into the process. According to SEPA, this needs to be done at the earliest point possible in the environmental process. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 19711-055 states, “The SEPA process shall be integrated with agency activities at the earliest possible time to ensure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values to avoid delays later in the process and seek to resolve potential problems.” She said the society believes the City needs to be more thorough in this regard.

Ms. Way said the Society is glad that the City has decided to improve the public process, but the language needs to be more specific. Rather than just calling for public outreach, the language should identify specific ways of doing the outreach. She recalled that during the 185th Street Station Subarea planning process, the general public was not really aware of what was being proposed. There were so many versions and changes that it was difficult to follow the proposal. In an effort to better inform the public, the society suggests the City implement a citizens’ academy model. She recalled that in the early days of Shoreline, the planning academy was quite helpful in helping citizens understand the process. This model would result in a core of citizens who have a clear understanding of the processes.

Ms. Way noted that staff is proposing to postpone amendments to the Parks Element of the Comprehensive Plan until 2016. She pointed out that the whole rezone process and planned action ordinance has now allowed developers to vest, but there is no opportunity for them to pay impact fees to fund the new parks. That means there will be no funding for new parks to address the density that is going to come. She suggested the Comprehensive Plan needs to address how additional parks will be funded so the City can grow according to the plan.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 1

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD AMENDMENT 1 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that she supports the proposed amendment, but would recommend some grammatical changes to clarify its intent.

Chair Scully referred to a letter submitted prior to the meeting by Wendy DiPeso’s, which suggest some changes to “standing.” He explained that “standing” is established by the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and has been interpreted by the courts over the years. It is a well-developed, legal doctrine.

While he does not disagree that it is a difficult concept for the public to understand, he cautioned against recommending a change to the doctrine as outlined in the RCW. Although it is not always perfect, the doctrine is predictable and people know what they need to do to get their comments on the record and bring a lawsuit. If the City creates its own definition, it would be subject to the interpretation of the courts anew. While he agreed with some of Ms. DiPeso's thoughts, he did not think it would be wise to recommend this change now.

Commissioner Montero clarified that Ms. DiPeso appears to be recommending a Comprehensive Plan amendment that would not be in order until next year. The amendments being considered in 2015 had to be submitted prior to the last day of 2014.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas suggested that perhaps the City could provide a printed description of public meetings and what is meant by "standing." This document could be available to citizens prior to public meetings and via the City's website and would provide greater clarity.

Chair Scully referred to Ms. DiPeso's request to amend the draft public participation plan to include a 30-day waiting period, after the City Council comes up with a final proposal with all the amendments, to allow the public to comment. He referred to the 185th Street Station Subarea planning process, noting that the hearing before the Council started with the public commenting on a Planning Commission recommendation and some alternatives. Following the hearing, the City Council made significant modifications, and the end product was much different than what the public had commented on in the hearing. A 30-day waiting period would allow the public an opportunity to comment on the final product, but it could also result in a "never-ending process." He said he has not come to a personal conclusion on what the right approach is.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas agreed with Chair Scully's concern that the end product is sometimes very different than the document the public was invited to comment on. While there is merit to having a 30-day waiting period, she felt it would need to be restricted to just one time. Commissioner Mork questioned if the Commission could make this change given that it was not advertised as part of **Amendment 1**. Chair Scully said that, as per direction from the City Attorney, the Commission could move to recommend an amendment to include Ms. DiPeso's proposal. However, he cautioned that the Commission has not had sufficient time to consider the proposed change, and staff has not offered policy language.

Commissioner Mork asked if staff has the ability to augment the requirements. For example, if there is a feeling that there may not be enough public knowledge of the changes the City Council is making, does staff have the ability to put more information on the website or take other steps that are not specifically spelled out in the Comprehensive Plan but might help in this circumstance. Chair Scully did not believe that Ms. DiPeso's recommendation could be addressed without a code change. Director Markle suggested that, rather than implementing a specific 30-day waiting period, the Commission could ask staff to write a policy to the affect that there should be a delay in between the time the Planning Commission puts forward their recommendation and when Council makes their final decision if substantial changes are proposed. If a requirement to delay for 30 days were desired, then the appropriate place for that would be in the process section of the Development Code. Commissioner

Moss-Thomas agreed that the concept would be better addressed in the Development Code rather than in the general public process outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Montero expressed his belief that it would not be appropriate to attach a 30-day waiting period to every land use, zoning and Comprehensive Plan amendment that comes before the City Council. He suggested that, in their letter to the City Council at the end of 2015, the Commission could ask them to consider this issue in 2016. Commissioner Malek pointed out that the public already has a process for communicating with the City Council prior to their making a decision. It falls to the public to follow the agendas to ensure they are present to comment as appropriate. Commissioner Moss-Thomas observed that sometimes the City Council has discussions over several meetings following a hearing, and significant changes are made prior to adoption of a proposal. There is currently no process that allows the public an additional opportunity to comment on the changes. She felt the issue needs further thought and consideration, and agreed that a transmittal letter to the City Council would be appropriate to voice the Commission's concerns and ask that the issue be addressed in 2016.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 1 BE AMENDED BY CHANGING THE THIRD SENTENCE IN ITEM 1 TO READ, "A DRAFT "VISION" WILL BE EVALUATED FOR CONSISTENCY DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN AS THE COMMUNITY IDENTIFIES PRIORITIES AND SUGGESTS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES, WHICH WILL BE UPDATED ACCORDINGLY. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas voiced concern that the language, as written, is not clear on the community's role in identifying priorities and implementation strategies. Mr. Szafran said the intent is to work with the public to identify priorities and suggest some implementation strategies. He agreed that the proposed change would make the intent clearer.

THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED (3-2), WITH COMMISSIONERS MALEK AND MONTERO VOTING IN OPPOSITION

Commissioner Moss-Thomas requested clarification of the last sentence in Item 7. Mr. Szafran said this is consistent with the City's current process for logging in public comments.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 1 BE FURTHER AMENDED BY CHANGING ITEM 8a TO READ, "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CITY-INITIATED PROJECTS IN CITYWIDE NEWSLETTER (CURRENTS). UPDATE THE COMMUNITY ON PLANNED MEETINGS, WORKSHOPS OR OTHER SIGNIFICANT EVENTS THROUGH ARTICLES ON TOPICS RELATED TO THE PLAN AND A REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY." THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Chair Scully said he believes a citizen's academy is a great idea, but felt the concept needs further planning. Rather than building the concept into the Comprehensive Plan, perhaps the City could offer

the academy on a once-a-year basis. He recommended the Commission encourage staff to pursue the concept further.

THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Staff Presentation of Amendment 2

Mr. Szafran advised that Amendment 2 would copy the three new land use designations adopted in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan into the Land Use Element. He explained that the subarea plan included three land-use designations: SA-1, SA-2 and SA-3. The SA-1 designation encourages transit-oriented development in close proximity of the future light rail stations and is intended to support high-density residential, office and commercial uses; and the MUR-70' zone is considered conforming to this land use designation. The SA-2 designation is intended to provide a transition from the SA-1 designation and encourage higher densities along arterials and increased housing choices; and the MUR-45' zone is considered conforming to this land use designation. The SA-3 designation provides a transition between SA-1 and SA-2 to the lower single-family designations. It encourages medium-density housing with opportunities for commercial along arterial streets, and the MUR-35' zone is considered conforming to this land use designation.

Chair Scully summarized that staff is also proposing to alter the proposed amendment to remove the I-5 and 145th Street areas for the time being. Mr. Szafran explained that because the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan has not been adopted, there are no land-use designations to apply at this time.

Commissioner Malek asked if the Commission would be missing any opportunities to analyze cross traffic between the two perspective stations (145th and 185th Street Stations). Mr. Szafran confirmed that the proposed amendment would not impact the Commission's future ability to address this issue. Chair Scully clarified that the proposed amendment is housekeeping.

Public Testimony on Amendment 2

No one in the audience indicated a desire to speak regarding Amendment 2.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 2

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD AMENDMENT 2 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF, INCLUDING THE DELETION OF REFERENCES TO I-5 AND 145TH STREET. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff Report on Amendment 3

Mr. Szafran said Amendment 3 would add language to the Comprehensive Plan to identify the Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program (LCLIP) as a potential funding source for public improvements. He said staff is recommending that this amendment be withdrawn, as the current

Comprehensive Plan already contains goals and policies that are adequate to move forward with a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program if the Council chooses to do so.

Public Testimony on Amendment 3

No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment on this item.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 1

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENT 3 BE WITHDRAWN. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff Report on Amendments 4, 5, 6 and 10

Mr. Szafran explained that Amendment 4 would amend Policy LU47, which states, “Consider annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the existing southern border of the City.” He reviewed that the City is currently engaged in the 145th Street Route Development Plan (corridor study) and is actively pursuing annexation of 145th Street. Based on the City’s work plan, actual annexation will not occur until 2016 or later, and the corridor study will not be completed until the first quarter of 2016. Because the outcome of the study will help formulate any potential recommendations, staff is recommending that this docket item be carried over to the 2016 docket.

Mr. Szafran advised that Amendment 5 is related to the Point Wells Subarea Plan. Staff anticipates that the Richmond Beach Traffic Corridor Study will be completed in 2015, but any recommendations coming out of the study will not be considered by the City Council until at least 2016. Staff is recommending that this amendment be carried over to the 2016 docket.

Mr. Szafran explained that Amendment 6 would add goals and policies to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element based on policies identified in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. Much of the work related to this amendment will occur as part of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan update that will take place in 2016. Therefore, staff is recommending the amendment be carried forward to 2016.

Public Testimony on Amendments 4, 5, and 6

No one in the audience indicated a desire to speak regarding these amendments.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendments 4, 5 and 6

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO DELAY AMENDMENTS 4, 5 AND 6 UNTIL 2016. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mork asked the reasons for deferring Amendment 6. Mr. Szafran said the City will be working with the Parks Board and the community to determine the process of locating new park space, not only within the new 185th Street Station Subarea, but citywide. This discussion will include park impact fees, ratio of parks to people, etc. Most of the work will be completed when the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan is updated in 2016 or 2017. Commissioner Mork referred to Ms. Ways' earlier point that postponing the amendment would result in the City missing out on the ability to collect fees. Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if a park impact fee program could be adopted by the City Council in 2016 if it is not addressed in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update. Director Markle answered that the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan identifies park impact fees as a potential strategy, and there may be some generalized language elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan about how to fund future parks and maintenance of existing parks.

Commissioner Malek asked if it is possible to implement a park impact fee program that is retroactive and requires previous developers who would have sustained an impact fee to be accountable if a park impact fee program is adopted in the future. Director Markle answered that the City cannot charge a latecomers fee for something that is not yet planned for. Commissioner Mork suggested the Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council that a park impact fee program be adopted in 2016. Mr. Szafran explained that the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan must be updated by 2017, so the work will be done in 2016. There is a budget line item to hire a consultant to assist in this project in 2016.

Chair Scully summarized that, as discussed earlier by Director Markle, a Comprehensive Plan is not needed in order to impose park impact fee. He said he has never heard of a bar on a park impact fee because it is not specifically called out in the Comprehensive Plan. The Development Code must implement the Comprehensive Plan's general policies.

THE MOTION CARRIED AS PRESENTED.

Staff Report on Amendment 7

Mr. Szafran explained that Amendment 7 would remove a portion of Westminster Way from the City's designated truck route map in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). He advised that the City Council adopted the Aurora Corridor Pre-design Study, which contained 32 points that provided guidance on the design of the Aurora Corridor. Point 17 included the direction to close Westminster Way north of 155th Street. Staff has worked with the State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration to declassify this portion of Westminster Way, which was approved by both entities and is no longer considered a truck route by those agencies. Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if the reference map in Attachment 4 illustrates the current baseline. Mr. Szafran said Attachment 4 identifies the current truck route, and not the recommended revision. As proposed, the red line between 155th Street and Aurora Avenue North would be deleted.

Public Testimony on Amendment 7

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was present to represent the Shoreline Preservation Society. She understands that Amendment 7 has been through quite a bit of consideration and WSDOT and the

Federal Highway Administration has been consulted. However, she pointed out the City still hasn't worked out the details of the problems associated with implementation of the development that has already been proposed. In the meantime, she pointed out how difficult it already is for trucks to access the area. She questioned the rush to eliminate this truck route.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 7

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD AMENDMENT 7 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Scully pointed out that right turns are permitted at 155th Street, and the City has studied whether or not trucks can safely make this turn. Mr. Szafran agreed and said it was analyzed again with the Community Renewal Area (CRA) Planned Action that was recently approved. Commissioner Moss-Thomas noted that, due to all of the construction on Aurora Avenue North, not a lot of trucks are choosing to use this route because there are a number of alternatives. Other than local deliveries, there will not be a substantial number of trucks that are impacted. The proposed amendment would bring the City's map into consistency with WSDOT and the Federal Highway Administration.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff Report on Amendment 8

Mr. Szafran explained that Amendment 8 would adopt Level of Service (LOS) standards for transit, pedestrians and bicycle. It would amend Policy T-44 regarding LOS standards in anticipation of adopting LOS standards for pedestrian and bicycles in the Development Code and evaluation of and potential new multi-modal LOS standards in the future. He advised that the current LOS standards only account for motor vehicle travel, and amending the LOS standards to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities is also needed to support Goals T II, T III and T IV of the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Testimony on Amendment 8

No one in the public indicated a desire to speak regarding Amendment 8.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 8

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD AMENDMENT 8 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff Report on Amendment 9

Mr. Szafran said the purpose of Amendment 9 is to make it clear that if and when development occurs at Point Wells, the City will work towards adoption of interlocal agreements, not only for the jurisdictions of Woodway, Edmonds and Snohomish County, but all other service providers that may serve the site in the future.

Public Testimony on Amendment 9

No one in the audience indicated a desire to speak regarding Amendment 9.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 9

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD AMENDMENT 9 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Staff Report on Amendment 10

Mr. Szafran reviewed that Amendment 10 calls for studying the requirement of adding a Volume/Capacity (V/C) ratio of .90 to all collector arterial streets in the City. The work anticipated to evaluate the V/C Ratio includes updating the Shoreline Transportation Model that was used during the last Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update in 2011. Staff recommends that this work be included in the work done to update the City's TMP in the second half of 2016 and be considered as part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket.

Chair Scully requested more details about the event that led up to staff's recommendation to continue Amendment 10 to the 2016 Docket. Mr. Szafran said there was a private amendment to cap the Average Daily Trip (ADT) limits on local streets to 1,500 and collector arterials to 3,000. Staff expressed concern about putting a hard cap on ADT limits, and they questioned if it would even be legal. The City Attorney recommended against the proposed amendment, as well. This discussion led to Amendment 10, which calls for a study of the concept.

Chair Scully said his understanding is that the citizen (Mr. McCormick) who presented the original amendment later amended his proposal on June 15th. The basis of the staff's recommendation is that there has been inadequate time to analyze the amended proposal. Mr. Szafran said that is accurate based on the City's work plan. Chair Scully asked if Mr. McCormick has commented on the staff's recommendation to continue the amendment to the 2016 docket. Mr. Szafran said he was notified of the staff's recommendation, but he has not commented to the Planning and Community Development department.

Public Testimony on Amendment 10

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was present to speak on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society. She said the society previously spoke in favor of Amendment 10. She believes the issue has already been studied in detail, and the community near Point Wells needs to have some support from the City. The amendment needs to be adopted so there is a rule in the Comprehensive Plan that they can rely on with regard to potential development. Richmond Beach Road should not be inundated with an enormous number of cars each day. She would like the Planning Commission to stand up for the community and move the amendment forward in 2015. Imposing a reasonable level of traffic on this route would benefit the entire City.

Planning Commission Deliberation and Recommendation on Amendment 10

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT AMENDMENT 10 BE DELAYED UNTIL 2016. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Montero said he believes the concept outlined in Amendment 10 is complex, and what the correct percentage should be will require the help of a consultant. The Commission is not qualified to make this decision now. Chair Scully pointed out that Amendment 10 calls for studying the concept, not necessarily adopting it.

Commissioner Mork asked why staff is recommending that the amendment be delayed if it simply calls for studying the concept. Director Markle said it has not been decided whether or not money should be spent to study the V/C Ratio at .90% for the entire City. She further explained that the City uses the V/C Ratio for intersections, but the proposed amendment would apply the concept to non arterial and collector arterial streets citywide. This approach may have unintended consequences in that the City may find that some roads are at capacity, and development would be precluded where the City has already agreed it should occur. A good bit of analysis is recommended before the City Council makes a decision on whether the concept should perhaps even be studied.

Commissioner Malek said he supports the study and believes it is critical. Rather than simply using the standard ADT approach, the City should consider ways to analyze the traffic flow. The Point Wells property is being developed out of character with its initial intent. Regardless of the fact that they had prior vesting status, there is no other example of urban industrial, urban center, or even urban village in a place that is so remote from true multi-modal transportation. He expressed his belief that the traffic from Point Wells would impact the entire City.

Chair Scully said the proposal represents a significant change in how road capacity is evaluated. Director Markle is correct that the City must carefully study the issue and consider the unintended consequences. However, the City Council agreed that the concept should be studied. If Amendment 10 is passed on to 2016, it becomes an excuse not to start work until next year, 2017. He emphasized that it appears the Commission wants the study to start as soon as possible.

Chair Scully summarized that Amendment 10 does not fund a study or say what the study will entail. It simply establishes a broad policy saying that the City wants to do the study. If the amendment is delayed, the City won't have generalized direction to move forward with the study until the 2016

Comprehensive Plan Amendments are adopted a year from now, which means it would not take effect until 2017. Commissioner Montero pointed out that staff is recommending that the study move forward as part of the City's update to the TMP in the second half of 2016 and considered part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Docket. Commissioner Malek voiced concern that postponing the amendment would delay the study even further. Amendment 10 does not insist on a study or even proscribe a timeline for the study. It just says the City wants to do the study.

THE MOTION FAILED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Scully closed the public hearing on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Commissioner Malek requested an update on the Point Wells Development. Director Markle said staff is still working with Blue Square Real Estate on the assumptions made for the transportation study, itself; and Snohomish County just released its comments on the transportation analysis done for the EIS. Staff will review Snohomish County's response to the study, but the City's progress is on hold until it receives answers to their questions about the information that was used in the study. Commissioner Malek suggested that the available information be forwarded to the Point Wells Subcommittee for review, and Director Markle agreed.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle reported that on October 12th, the City Council received an award from the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association and the Planning Association of Washington in recognition of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. The project was cited as an outstanding example of good planning in Washington. The jurists specifically commented on the broad-based public improvement process, the phased zoning, the different housing options, and how the subarea plan will work with the City's overall Comprehensive Plan. Jurists also stated that the plan would be seen as an example to other jurisdictions across the State on how to tackle difficult decisions around growth over the next 20 years. She congratulated the Planning Commissioners, who played a tremendous role in the design of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan.

Director Markle reminded the Commissioners of the joint City Council/Planning Commission dinner meeting that is scheduled for November 16th at 5:45 p.m. in Room 303.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

No unfinished business was scheduled on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if the City has funds for interested Commissioners to attend the American Planning Association's one-day event on Comprehensive Plan History and the Future, which is scheduled for November 13th in Tacoma. Director Markle indicated that the City could pay the registration fee for interested Commissioners to attend the event.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Montero announced a meeting on October 21st at 7:00 p.m. at the Innis Arden Club House to discuss the Point Wells Development. He said both he and Commissioner Malek plan to attend.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran said the November 5th agenda will include a study session on Development Code amendments that revolve around how the City will permit Sound Transit development.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas suggested the Commission also have a discussion on November 5th relative to the topics they want to bring forward at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting on November 16th. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Keith Scully
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission