

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 7, 2008
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

Commissioners Present

Chair Kuboi
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Kaje
Commissioner Piro
Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Steve Cohn, Planner, Planning & Development Services
Renee Blough, Acting Planning Commission Clerk

Guest

City Councilmember Doris McConnell

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Hall
Commissioner Perkowski

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kuboi called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Kuboi, and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Kaje, Piro, Pyle and Wagner. Vice Chair Hall and Commissioner Perkowski were excused.

Chair Kuboi recognized City Councilmember McConnell, who was present in the audience.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tovar said he would like to spend some time discussing the potential process for creating a vision for Shoreline, as well as what the Commission's role might be. Mr. Cohn advised that it would also be appropriate for the Commission to spend some time talking about the upcoming retreat.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 17, 2008, were accepted as corrected.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

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

STUDY SESSION ON PERMIT REGULATIONS FOR REGIONAL BUSINESS (RB) ZONE

Mr. Cohn recalled that there has been a great deal of discussion about the residential densities permitted in the RB zoning district. In order to provide staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council more time to consider alternative regulations, the City Council adopted a moratorium and interim development regulations on May 12, 2008, which limit development of residential complexes to a maximum density of 110 dwelling units per acre. The moratorium would expire on November 11, 2008; and by that date, the City Council would have to either adopt permanent regulations for the RB zone or extend the moratorium by up to six more months. He advised that when the memorandum to the Commission was written, it was staff's expectation to work with them to place permanent regulations on the books before the moratorium expires. However, staff has reconsidered their approach.

Mr. Tovar suggested instead of taking action to propose modifications to the RB zone, the Commission could recommend the City Council extend the moratorium for another six months. He noted that staff has spent a significant amount of time gearing up for the visioning process that will start this fall, which involves a significant amount of community outreach. Staff believes it would be helpful to have the vision in place before making recommendations regarding density and standards for RB zones. If the moratorium were extended for an additional six months, the interim regulations will continue till next spring.

Mr. Tovar expressed his belief that if the Commission were to proceed with a review of permanent revisions to the RB zone at this time, the public would likely raise issues during the public process related to the ultimate goal or vision for Shoreline. One of the shortcomings of the existing vision in the Comprehensive Plan is that it does not contemplate or discuss in any way the sustainability strategy, the comprehensive housing strategy or the economic development strategy. The new vision would not be in place in the Comprehensive Plan for several more months.

Staff recommends the Commission not begin discussions regarding the final RB text language before the visioning language has been adopted in the near future. He suggested that after the staff presentation of the materials they prepared for the hearing, the Commission could provide direction as to whether

they want to move forward with a hearing this fall or convey a recommendation from the Commission to the City Council that they extend the moratorium by six months.

Commissioner Kaje inquired if extending the moratorium would impact any pending applications. Mr. Tovar said staff has held a pre-application conference with the developer of the Sleep Aire site on Aurora Avenue for a mixed-use development. They are aware of the interim regulations. Because no final application has been submitted, the project would be vested under the interim regulations.

Chair Kuboi asked if a formal action would be required for the Commission to direct staff to recommend the City Council extend the moratorium an additional six months. Mr. Tovar answered that if the Commission supports the staff's recommendation to extend the moratorium an additional six months, it would be helpful to make a formal recommendation to the City Council. It would also be helpful for the Commission to provide feedback on the current draft language after the staff presentation.

Commissioner Broili said that at some point, he would like staff to provide clarification about the differences between the Commercial Business (CB) and RB zones. He questioned why a single commercial business zoning designation would not suffice. Mr. Tovar said the two zoning classifications were in place prior to the City's incorporation. There is no distinction between the uses allowed, but the CB zone does have a cap on the density allowed, and the RB zone had no density cap before the interim regulation. There are also slight differences in building height and lot coverage. Mr. Cohn added that the RB zone is the most intensive commercial zone in that it allows 65-foot building heights and a wide variety of uses (retail, residential, and quasi-industrial uses). The main difference between the RB and CB zones is that before the interim regulation, the RB zone did not have a cap on maximum density. But effectively, density was still limited by the setback and parking requirements.

Mr. Cohn recalled that there have been ongoing discussions about the RB zoning designation over the last several months. As a result of these discussions, staff believed there was good reason, at least on an interim basis, to place a cap on density. Staff looked at the likely potential for residential uses in the RB zone and given the current parking requirements and market conditions, they came up with a likely range of development of 90 to 120 dwelling units per acre. Perhaps a very good design could result in as many as 140 dwelling units per acre. He referred to a list of recent and proposed developments for the RB zone, which identifies a range between 90 to 140 dwelling units per acre. However, he noted that the development proposals for complexes with the larger densities have not been permitted at this point.

Mr. Cohn advised that on May 12th staff discussed the proposed moratorium and the concept of creating a maximum density standard for the RB zone. Several members of the City Council suggested that the Commission consider the concept of establishing a base density of 48 dwelling units per acre, with a potential to achieve greater density through incentives that provide public benefit. Staff's conceptual proposal establishes a base density of 48 dwelling units per acre for the RB zone, as well as identifies minimum standards for development. In order to achieve a base density of 48 dwelling units per acre, multi-family developments throughout the City would be required to provide recycling space, bicycle racks, and plug-ins for electrical cars. If a developer wants to develop to a greater density, staff suggests the Commission consider a system that would allow increased density for projects that provide

additional public amenities, similar to the regulations adopted for the Planned Area 2 zoning in Ridgecrest.

Mr. Cohn further explained that as proposed, in order to achieve 100 dwelling units per acre, a development must be a mixture of uses and no reduction in parking would be allowed other than provisions for shared parking. He noted that residential property owners adjacent to RB zones are concerned about overflow parking, so staff believes it would be appropriate to create a reasonable parking standard for these zones. The developer would also be required to construct underground parking. To achieve 150 dwelling units per acre, a developer would also have to meet certain “green building” standards and provide affordable housing.

Mr. Cohn said staff considered modifying the transition requirements, but concluded that the current requirements, adopted earlier in the year, do a good job of providing transition between single-family homes and the taller and higher intensity use. However, staff is suggesting the Commission consider the idea of creating a new transitional zoning district that would be applicable in certain parts of the City where the current RB zoning designation may not be appropriate. In staff’s view, a more appropriate zone might be something like a “Professional/Residential zone that would allow only multi-family residential (at a density that is less than the maximum permitted in RB) and office uses. It might be instructive to think about a height limit, as well.

Mr. Tovar clarified that regardless of whether the Commission decides to move ahead with detailed RB regulations or not, staff believes it would be appropriate to proceed with the concept of identifying parcels that are now zoned RB that should be zoned to a lower transition zone and move forward with public hearings in October or November. He cautioned that there are many different parcels in the RB zones. Most of these properties touch onto Aurora Avenue, but some do not. Some of them are more associated with other uses that are far less intense than the RB zone allows. He suggested there could be between six to ten properties that would fit this description.

Commissioner Piro said he would find it beneficial for the Commission to review where the City is currently as far as meeting their Growth Management Act targets. Mr. Cohn pointed out that new target numbers would be available in the future, and that is another reason why the Commission may wish to postpone their work on the RB zone for the time being. In five or six months, staff will have a better idea of what these target numbers will be, but they won’t be finalized for about another year. At this time, they know that the current growth target is roughly 2,000 dwelling units, and the City is on target to meet that requirement. However, given the Vision 2040 document that was just adopted, the new target numbers will likely be significantly higher.

Commissioner Piro cautioned that the RB zones throughout the City are critical parts of the community, not only in terms of meeting the growth management obligations but to also meet other goals associated with creating a more vibrant City in the future. He said he welcomes the staff’s sound advice to consider the RB zoning issue at a slower and more deliberate speed. What they do with the RB zoned properties will be critically important on a long-term basis.

Commissioner Kaje requested that staff provide additional clarification about why they are proposing that the Commission move forward with the concept of creating a new transitional zone but postpone their work on changes to the RB zone until after the visioning process has been completed. He suggested that the same reasons that apply to staff's recommendation to postpone further work on the RB zone could also be applicable to the transitional zone concept. Mr. Tovar clarified that staff has specific problematic parcels in mind for which it would be very difficult to write regulations that would be equally applicable. If they don't deal with this issue for six or eight months, staff would have the task of trying to draft regulations that apply to all of the RB parcels. It would also be complicated to have both discussions at the same time. He concluded that from staff's perspective, addressing the issues in sequence would be the best alternative. Rezoning some parcels to a new transitional zone that is not as intense as the current RB zone would remove the problematic parcels from future discussions related to the RB zone. He expressed his belief that the Vision will probably not be as informative and helpful in dealing with these few parcels as it will be when discussing more intense, larger parcel development later in the year.

Commissioner Behrens referred to Development Code Chapter 20.40.040, which provides definitions for the Neighborhood Business (NB), Community Business (CB), Regional Business (RB) and Office (O) zones. He summarized that allowing residential uses in non-residential zones appears to be a conflict. He suggested that an easier and more straightforward approach might be to pull those out and create another section in the code to identify higher-density residential uses.

Mr. Tovar emphasized that 99% of the existing text in the Development Code was not written by the current staff. He said he is pleased that the Commission is discussing the notion of building down the number of words in the code. He agreed that it would be helpful to make the code more clear and succinct and include more graphics. He said he supports the concept of removing language that is inconsistent with the direction the City is heading. The same concept would apply to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Behrens emphasized his previous point that Chapter 20.40.030 refers to residential zones, and Chapter 20.40.040 refers to non-residential zones. He suggested that the code could leave the current non-residential designations in place, but move the residential content into another zoning category. This would eliminate the need to rezone properties. The remainder of 20.40.040 refers to business properties and is very appropriate. The conflict comes when trying to impose residential uses on business properties. Mr. Tovar suggested that this point could be debated. Again, he reminded the Commission that much of the existing code language was written before the City was incorporated and it may not be consistent with the City's current goal of encouraging a mixture of uses and ultimately moving towards more of a form-based code for certain parts of the City.

Commissioner Pyle asked if planners typically consider multi-family developments to be residential uses. He pointed out that many codes do not consider them residential uses. Instead, they are thrown into a commercial category. Mr. Tovar pointed out that traditional Euclidian zoning clearly segregated the various uses. Over time, the City has moved in the direction of desegregation if there is no need to separate uses within a zoning district, and this concept became known as mixed-use. The mixed-use concept has now evolved into a type of form-based code where it doesn't really matter so much what the

use is. What matters most are impacts, adjacencies, and building configuration. He suggested that segregating uses, other than single-family neighborhoods, would not make sense for the City. It would make more sense to look at the development and performance standards, the design and configuration of buildings, etc. He summarized his belief that residential uses should be permitted in any zone where they would not create more problems and impacts than the other uses allowed in the zone.

Commissioner Pyle asked if the City has any mixed-use types of development (ground floor commercial, second story office, and upper stories residential). Mr. Tovar answered that there are mixed-use developments in the Ballinger area, and development proposals for the Echo Lake and Ridgecrest areas include a mixture of uses. He summarized that mixed-use developments are limited at this time.

Commissioner Pyle referred to staff's earlier comment that there are some properties for which the RB zoning designation cannot really be made to fit. He suggested they create a new zone, rezone properties to that zone, and condition them appropriately on a case-by-case basis because they are so unique. Mr. Tovar cautioned that while the City has the ability to write regulations that are specific to properties, the City would not typically initiate a quasi-judicial rezone. Again, he noted that they are only talking about six to ten sites, which is such a small enough number that they could go into detail about conditions, adjacencies, and other reasons why the transitional zone would be more appropriate than the current RB zone. He summarized that this process would allow the City to reach a higher level of detail and understanding of each of these parcels and why they are more appropriate for something less intense than RB. The Commission could discuss specific standards they want to promulgate that would apply to all the parcels in the new zone. However, he cautioned that standards are different than conditions. Conditions are related to specific site plans and locations, but this same exercise is not available when considering legislative rezones. When developing standards, the City must anticipate what might happen on parcels in order to establish appropriate criteria.

Commissioner Wagner expressed her belief that the ideas presented by staff for discussion purposes are absolutely necessary and the right thing to do. However, she expressed concern that the proposed ideas appear to be very reactive in nature. Aside from limiting growth, she said the Commission does not have a lot of information about what they are trying to accomplish. She emphasized the importance of gaining a clear understanding of what problems they are trying to fix. She encouraged the Commission to also consider the City Council's goals for sustainability. She recalled an earlier hearing for a site-specific rezone from single-family to multi-family. While it was noted that the best use of the property would be a development with a smaller footprint but a more intense use, the Commission was not given the tools to increase the density because they were so focused on limiting the number of dwelling units. She cautioned that they must pay attention to incorporate creativity and flexibility to address the actual concerns of footprint bulk.

Commissioner Wagner emphasized the need for good public participation throughout the process. In order to avoid moratoriums in the future, it is important to get the right people involved to address the concerns. They need to also be careful not to discourage developers from moving forward with projects that are consistent with the City's goals.

Commissioner Broili suggested that the Commission hold off on additional discussions related to the RB and transitional zones until the visioning process is in place. He said he would not be comfortable making a recommendation regarding either issue because it may not fit with the ultimate vision for Shoreline. He summarized that he would support an extension of the moratorium until the visioning process has been completed. He said that while he would be in favor of implementing form-based zoning, it would be difficult to identify limiting factors before a clear vision for Shoreline has been established.

The Commission agreed it would be appropriate to solicit public comment prior to making a decision on whether or not to recommend an extension of the current moratorium. Mr. Tovar explained that if the Commission decides they don't want to take action in the near term to rezone properties to a transitional zone that is less than RB, they could still decide to move forward with the creation of the new zone but wait to apply it.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Lee, Shoreline, recalled that when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, the RB zone was designed to be near 185th Street. However, the Comprehensive Plan was created at a time when rent for business properties were much lower. There was no thought about the concept of down zoning, which is when the residential square foot built price becomes more valuable than commercial rental space. He said that while it is clear that the market forces are doing exactly what they should be doing, the community is very concerned about the impacts associated with higher density development. He suggested it is the Commission's task to figure out where the high density should be located. He said he supports very high density, and he doesn't think it is even appropriate to place a cap on density. If the correct regulations are put in place, the higher density would be sustainable (jobs, bus routes, etc) in order to function in the market. He summarized that it is important to establish good criteria and then decide where the very high density should be allowed. They need to make sure it is done separately from community business so they can preserve some community business opportunities.

Mr. Lee said he met with a group of people to identify ideas that address space, density and social issues. He submitted a one-page document of ideas for the Commission to consider. For example, they could establish a per-mile density. Once this density has been met, the remainder of the property would not be allowed to rezone to high density. This would enable community businesses to continue to thrive.

Les Nelson, Shoreline, referred to Commissioner Broili's recommendation that the Commission create a definition for CB zoning. He suggested they move one step further to revisit the relationship between RB and CB land use designations and RB and CB zoning designations. This might help eliminate some of the confusion. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan identifies properties near 185th Street for the RB land use designation. However, the RB zoning includes other properties throughout the City. He pointed out that the RB and CB zoning designations came from King County, and the land use designations were created by a previous Planning and Development Services Director. He suggested that RB rezone applications should be treated the same as other rezone applications by determining

whether or not the rezone would be consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan land use designation.

Mr. Nelson expressed concern that the only transition to date has been related to building shape and appearance, and they still haven't accomplished the concept of tiering up. He suggested the Commission needs to work more to address this concern. He referred to Ordinance 505, which talks about 110 dwelling units per acre, and noted that this references an average. Therefore, a 2-acre parcel could still be allowed to develop 220 dwelling units on one of the parcels, and the other acre could be preserved for green space and other amenities. He suggested that it would be more appropriate to maintain a density limit of 48 dwelling units per acre. This would require a developer to package together more than four acres in order to develop residential units in a tall building, and the remainder of the property could be utilized for green spaces, amenities, offices, parking, etc. If the regulations are not changed, each of the existing property owners will want to build their own building without aggregating properties and providing amenities and green space. He reminded the Commission of the Growth Management Act's goal of planning for growth while keeping the City livable. That means including green spaces and open spaces in areas where higher densities are developed.

Commissioner Pyle said that while he appreciates the ideas raised by Mr. Nelson, it is important to keep in mind that the Commission must also be realistic about what can be built. They should not create zones where redevelopment will never be realized. He noted that in order for a developer to amass four acres, they need to be allowed to develop a certain number of units. He inquired if Mr. Nelson is suggesting the City obtain the services of a consultant to consider what would be a reasonable return for development. Mr. Nelson agreed that the requirements should not be so restrictive that they prohibit redevelopment. However, the City must decide if it is important to protect single-family zones by providing appropriate transition. Commissioner Pyle said he recently read a report that indicated the return on investment required more than what most people would anticipate. Mr. Nelson said that regardless of how high the City allows development to occur in the RB zones, they must include an appropriate transition plan to protect the single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Behrens said he recently walked along the Aurora Corridor between 185th and 167th Streets. He noted there are several sites in the area that are substantial enough in size to handle very large scale developments. He suggested that market forces would control whether or not owners aggregate properties. However, perhaps they could start by identifying the large pieces of property that already exist and develop criteria that allows higher density development that is based on size, and location. He suggested that most people agree that they need to develop high-density development, but the issue is how and where it is done and what the long-term impacts will be.

Bill Bear, Shoreline, said one issue related to density and sustainability is making sure that as people are living closer together they are not socially further apart. For example, in New York City, people live at higher densities, but they are very stable communities. Part of this stability came about because New York City adopted rent control and has people living generation to generation in the same apartment buildings, which allows for great stability. He encouraged the City to identify ways to create community as they build density. There must be a way for the community to see each other face-to-face. If this is not factored in, the cost of higher density would likely exceed any potential gain. He

summarized that, to him, sustainable development means that you don't build a building and count on knocking it down ten years later to build a larger one. You find a way to build in stability of buildings and infrastructure, as well as people in the neighborhoods.

COMMISSIONER BEHRENS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL EXTEND THE MORATORIUM FOR RB DEVELOPMENT FOR AN ADDITIONAL SIX MONTHS. COMMISSIONER PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Kuboi clarified that the purpose for recommending an extension of the moratorium is to allow the Commission to integrate the outcome of the visioning process into their ultimate recommendation for the RB zoning designation. Commissioner Piro summarized that the Commission has had adequate discussion on the issue, and the staff provided excellent rationale to support the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Tovar encouraged the Commission to provide additional direction to staff about whether or not they want to move forward with the creation of a transitional zone but wait to apply it or bundle both issues together once the visioning process has been completed. He recommended the Commission proceed with initiating a code amendment to create a new transitional zone that is not as dense or intense as RB. If the Commission concurs, staff could move forward with draft language and schedule a discussion on the Commission's future work program prior to the completion of the visioning process.

Chair Kuboi asked if the City Attorney has issued an opinion on the proposed new transitional zone concept. Mr. Tovar pointed out that the City has the authority to create new zones. Chair Kuboi said he envisions that the transitional zone would have elements that are more restrictive than what's currently allowed in the RB zone. He questioned at what point this would trigger a taking. Mr. Tovar answered that a taking would occur only if the City removed all economic value from a property, and that is not what they are talking about. They are talking about theoretically reducing the economic value from what could be realized under RB zoning. Commissioner Pyle recalled that he asked this question a few meetings ago, and the Assistant City Attorney answered that the City has the authority to down zone properties or reduce their potential to redevelop. Mr. Tovar cautioned that the decision to down zone would have to be based on good public policy.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that if the City does not move forward with the transitional zone concept now, a property owner could vest under the existing interim RB regulations, and it would be too late for the City to apply the new transitional zone at a later date. He questioned how long it would take staff to create draft language for the Commission to consider. Mr. Tovar answered that the language could be drafted in a week, but it takes time for the SEPA notice to be issued and for the document to be forwarded to State agencies for review. The proposed language would be fairly simple, but it would not be ready for Commission review until November. If the interim regulation is continued for six months, it would not expire until next May.

The Commission unanimously agreed to direct staff to move forward with a transitional zone strategy.

Commissioner Pyle referred to a memorandum that was included in the Commission's packet about the concept of rezoning a property from R-12 and CB to RB. He questioned how the moratorium would impact this proposal. Mr. Cohn recalled that the original proposal was to rezone the property to RB, but when the application was presented to the Commission, the staff and Commission recommended CB zoning. Because a SEPA review was done for the application as RB, the same SEPA determination can be applied to the new application. Commissioner Pyle asked if a SEPA addendum would be filed considering new information brought to light since the SEPA determination was posted in 2006. Mr. Cohn said that if any new information is brought to light, the SEPA checklist would be modified. Commissioner Pyle summarized that there has been a lot of discussion surrounding the whole RB zone and transitional requirements that might apply since the application was originally submitted. None of these factors were considered as part of the initial SEPA scoping. Mr. Cohn said it was staff's thought that these additional factors would be discussed as part of the Commission's review and not necessarily in changes to the SEPA checklist. However, the SEPA checklist could be changed to reflect the results of the Commission's discussion. Mr. Tovar cautioned that elements of the environment do not include legislative actions of the City. Any new environmental facts would have to be addressed in subsequent SEPA documents.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Point Wells

Mr. Cohn advised that the supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Point Wells property would not be issued until December. The entire process was pushed back three months as a result of questions raised by the County. It is still on the County's work program to consider their comprehensive plan amendment related to the site next year, but there would be less time for their staff to prepare their reports. Therefore, there would be less time for the City to review the documentation.

Commissioner Training

Mr. Tovar announced that the City has budgeted money for the Planning Commissioners to attend training events. He noted there are three opportunities in the next few months. A three-day housing conference is scheduled in Tacoma in September and would focus purely on housing issues. Later in September the American Institute of Architects and the Cascade Land Conservancy would sponsor a three-day conference in Seattle entitled, "Making Density Work." The Annual American Planning Association Conference is scheduled for October 13th through 15th in Spokane, Washington. The theme of this conference is sustainability, and one panel would include a presentation by Juniper Nami of the City's Environmental Sustainability Strategies group. He advised that staff would forward links to all of these conferences to each of the Commissioners.

Town Center Project

Mr. Tovar announced that the City would not get extensively involved in the sub-area plan and work program until after the vision has been adopted by the City Council. However, staff is currently gathering preliminary information and making notes of things that are changing. For example, he noted that billboards are currently scattered along the Aurora Corridor, and they are very rarely removed. However, within the northern portion of the Town Center Area (north of 185th) they have lost one billboard. In addition, the billboard has been removed from the northwest corner of the Echo Lake

property development. Also, while doing some right-of-way survey work for miles two and three of the Aurora Project staff discovered that one billboard is entirely within the right-of-way and will have to be removed. A piece of another billboard near Firlands Way hangs into the right-of-way, and staff has notified the property owner that the sign must be removed from the right-of-way.

Sleep Aire Property

Mr. Tovar announced that a pre-application meeting has been scheduled with the developer of the Sleep Aire property for a mixed-use development. They are considering the option of constructing multi-family residential units over retail space. The Sleep Aire roof-mounted sign would be removed as part of this project.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Planning Commission Retreat

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that their retreat has been scheduled for August 21st. Both he and Chair Kuboi have invited the Commissioners to identify potential discussion topics. He noted that Chair Kuboi suggested they discuss the concept of creating subjective design review criteria. He reminded the Commission that a Design Review Subcommittee has been formed.

Commissioner Behrens suggested the workload related to the RB zone is quite large, and the retreat might offer a good opportunity for the Commission to informally discuss ideas.

Commissioner Kaje recalled that one of the hopes for the new vision is the integration of the various strategies that have been developed over the past few years. He suggested it might be useful for the Commission to become more familiar with each of the strategies and discuss how they might be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code. Mr. Tovar said one of the Commission's responsibilities will be to become more familiar with the strategies and distill out the essence of each one so they can be integrated into the text of the vision statement in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the City's current vision and framework goals are very different in structure and intent than what other cities have used. He suggested staff provide examples of vision statements and framework goals from other jurisdictions. He emphasized the importance of developing a vision statement and framework goals that are succinct and specific. Commissioner Piro agreed that the retreat offers a critical opportunity for the Commission to work on the vision, and he likes the idea of spending time to examine recent strategic planning efforts.

Commissioner Pyle suggested the Commission also discuss how code amendments should be brought forth in the future. He said he supports the concept of simplifying the code and trying to include graphic-rich sections to illustrate the concepts. He suggested they consider creating a set of policies outlining how to draft code in the future. These policies should steer away from text-rich language and move towards simplified language. Commissioner Piro noted that this issue dovetails well with the speaker series presented last year by Mark Hinshaw.

The Commission agreed that they should focus most of their retreat discussion on the visioning process, since this would lay the groundwork for most of their future work. Staff agreed to provide copies of

each of the strategic documents, as well as suggestions of specific pieces they should consider. Mr. Tovar noted that the documents are also available via the City's website. Chair Kuboi asked that some of the retreat time be spent in a free-form discussion about what Commissioners want to get out of being a Planning Commissioner.

NEW BUSINESS

Visioning Process

Mr. Tovar distributed a draft of an article he wrote announcing the upcoming visioning process and outlining opportunities for the public to participate. He invited the Commissioners to forward their comments to him by Monday, August 11th. He noted that the article would be published in the September issue of *CURRENTS*. At the Commission's next meeting, they could review the calendar of events and identify which of the meetings they might want to help facilitate. For example, there would be six to eight neighborhood meetings in October. He announced that at the end of October, the City Council would host a town hall meeting to discuss the issue further.

Commissioner Broili asked how the proposed visioning process would mesh with Forward Shoreline's visioning process. Mr. Tovar answered that Forward Shoreline has a separate visioning process that is described on their website. He suggested it would help the City's process if they would host one of the sessions, but they are still pondering this opportunity. The Chamber of Commerce has agreed to facilitate a session on the third Thursday of October, but there are still five or six open dates. He encouraged any group or organization that cares about Shoreline to spend some time discussing the vision.

Chair Kuboi asked staff to review the sequence that would be followed for each of the sessions. Mr. Tovar advised that the meetings would be modeled after a program conducted by the City of Kirkland, which received awards from the Puget Sound Regional Council and the American Planning Association. A short DVD would be produced and shown at each of the events to illustrate what currently exists in Shoreline, how the City has changed, and anticipated future changes. The video would also outline the process that would be used to create the new vision. The video would pose questions for the public to consider as part of their discussion. A facilitator would be available to lead the meetings and record the discussions and ideas. At the end of each session, participants would be invited to write out their answers to the questions raised. Staff would sort through the comments and prepare a summary analysis of major themes and ideas. The summary would be presented to the City Council on December 1st, and the Planning Commission would likely be invited to attend that meeting.

Mr. Tovar advised that in addition to the ideas raised by the public during the process, the Commission and City Council must also incorporate the three strategies: economic development, comprehensive housing, and economic sustainability. The Commission could play a large role in this process by distilling the essence of each of the strategies into something that could be incorporated into the vision statement and framework goals. The Commissioners could also facilitate a number of the public meetings in October, as well as meet with the City Council in December to review all of the public input and provide direction to staff regarding potential draft language. Once a draft has been prepared by staff, the SEPA process would be completed and a draft would be forwarded to CTED for comments.

Notices would be sent out for public hearings in January to allow the public an opportunity to review the actual draft language.

Chair Kuboi asked what the City would do to capture public input outside of the specific meetings. Mr. Tovar answered that the DVD would be streamed on the City's new website. In addition, the survey questions would be posted on the website, and the public would be invited to answer the questions via the internet. Chair Kuboi asked what would be done to engage the school-age population. Mr. Tovar answered that Steve Cohn and Paul Cohen spoke with seniors at both of the high schools. Staff would contact the high schools again to find out the best way to conduct the visioning exercise with their students. The Parks Department also works with youth groups, and they plan to conduct a session with at least one of these groups. They would also conduct a session at the Senior Center.

Commissioner Broili asked how the results of the public process would impact the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Tovar once again reviewed the process that would be used to create the new vision language. He explained that if pieces of the Comprehensive Plan are totally at odds with the vision statement, staff would recommend the City Council either tweak the policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan or remove them. The City Council's intent is for the Comprehensive Plan to be more specific and current. Commissioner Broili expressed his hope that the visioning process includes a discussion about how the City of Shoreline can take advantage of potential exchanges or influence from their neighbors (Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Lake Forest Park and Seattle).

Commissioner Wagner suggested the visioning process offers an excellent opportunity for community outreach to explain how the Planning Commission works and what their role is. Perhaps they should provide handouts outlining the process via a flow chart. She said she would hate for people to come to the meetings and provide their opinion without having a clear understanding of the process and when they can best provide their input. Mr. Tovar agreed that the fruit of effective outreach is an informed, active, participating public. It may be that the visioning workshops will offer an opportunity for neighborhood associations to get fresh new ideas. If the neighborhood associations are more effective and successful, they will become a good conduit for communicating with the Planning Commission, City Council and City staff. He suggested staff offer the public an opportunity to sign up for more information at each of the sessions.

Commissioner Behrens said someone recently mentioned to him that two of the City borders are 145th Street and Ballinger Way. He noted that one side of these two streets is located outside of Shoreline, so the City only has control over a part of these roads and they are forced to cooperate with other jurisdictions in some very basic and simple ways. Mr. Tovar suggested that one framework goal could talk about intergovernmental coordination and opportunities to pool resources.

Les Nelson, Shoreline, said it sounds like the visioning workshops will focus on meetings with special organizations and 95% of the public is not part of any special organization. He asked how they could encourage the general public to attend the events and provide their comments so that unbiased feedback is obtained. Mr. Tovar said the best way to reach the citizens of Shoreline is through *CURRENTS*. Articles regarding the visioning process would be published in both the September and October issues. In addition, there would be an open ended opportunity for members of the public to view the DVD and

conduct their own meetings. There may also be a town hall meeting at the end of October. He emphasized that members from the general public would be welcome to attend and participate in any of the meetings hosted by organizations throughout the month of October. Commissioner Broili suggested staff research opportunities to link with the precinct captains to interface with the citizens in their precincts. Mr. Tovar invited the Commissioners to forward potential contacts to staff. Commissioner Behrens suggested that the Republican and Democratic Caucuses also offer an opportunity for encouraging public involvement.

Ridgecrest Commercial Neighborhood Redevelopment Proposal

Mr. Cohn distributed working drawings for the Ridgecrest Commercial Neighborhood. He noted they are a lot different than what was illustrated earlier by staff. The design review process is taking place at this time, and he invited Commissioners to forward their comments to Paul Cohen.

Update on Rezone Application

Mr. Cohn announced that a few weeks ago, the City Council acted on the rezone proposal for property on 1st Avenue (R-12 to R-24). The City Council adopted R-18 zoning for the property.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Piro said former Commissioner McClelland asked him to announce that the North City Jazz Walk is scheduled for August 12th.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Kuboi reminded the Commission that the Commission Retreat is scheduled for August 21st.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 P.M.

Sid Kuboi
Chair, Planning Commission

Renee Blough
Acting Clerk, Planning Commission