

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 17, 2008
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

Commissioners Present

Chair Kuboi
Vice Chair Hall
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili (arrived at 7:09 p.m.)
Commissioner Kaje
Commissioner Perkowski
Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Rachel Markle, Assistant Director, Planning & Development Services
Flannary Collins, Assistant City Attorney
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Piro

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kuboi called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Kuboi, Vice Chair Hall, and Commissioners Behrens, Kaje, Perkowski, Pyle and Wagner. Commissioner Broili arrived at 7:09 p.m. and Commissioner Piro was excused.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission accepted the agenda as proposed.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle reported that the City Council approved the application to rezone properties located at 16520 through 16538 Linden Avenue North from R-8 to R-24. The vote was 6-1. Council Member Way expressed concern about the lack of sidewalks on the west side of the street adjacent to the park, particularly given the potential increase in traffic and that children would cross in this location

frequently. Ms. Markle further reported that the City Council also unanimously approved the application to rezone property located at 17562 – 12th Avenue North from R-12 to R-24.

Mr. Markle announced that the City Council started their review of the proposed Development Code amendments regarding CB zones, but the issue was tabled to their May 12th meeting. The City Council also heard about the Shoreline Sustainability Strategy, and all comments were positive and constructive.

Ms. Markle reported that staff is unclear about the direction that was given at the joint Planning Commission/City Council Meeting regarding the Commission's earlier recommendation that most quasi-judicial matters be referred to the Hearing Examiner for the next 12 months. Chair Kuboi recalled that some City Council Members were not enthusiastic about the Commission's proposal, and they asked the Commission to consider the issue further and address the concerns that were raised. The Commission agreed to discuss this issue at a future meeting and provide further direction. Vice Chair Hall suggested that when this issue comes up again, it would be helpful for staff to provide excerpts from meetings where the proposal was previously discussed. Ms. Simulcik Smith noted that the proposal was mainly discussed at the Commission's dinner meetings, and there is no tape or written recording. Commissioner Behrens asked staff to also provide a synopsis of the discussion from the City Council's perspective, including the handout that was provided by Council Member Way. Commissioner Pyle observed that the City Council was not so much opposed to the proposal, but they were concerned about appearance of fairness, the costs that would be passed on to the applicant, and how the program would be managed. He suggested these are all important issues to address before forwarding an updated recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Markle announced that the City Council would hold their retreat on April 25th and 26th. The agenda would include a discussion about the vision for the City of Shoreline. The Planning Commission's role would likely be part of that discussion.

Ms. Markle mentioned that Forward Shoreline held a meeting on April 16th. Staff members who attended indicated the discussion was hopeful. A few Commissioners indicated they attended the meeting, as well. She also reported she met with Fircrest Representatives, who are starting Phase 2 of their master plan. The plan should come before the Commission for review within the next year.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 3, 2008, were approved as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said the dialogue that took place at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting was very good. Regarding the proposal to send quasi-judicial items to the hearing examiner for 12-months, Mr. Lee suggested that perhaps the Commission could make this decision on a case-by-case basis. The Commission could retain their ability to review the important applications as time permits.

Les Nelson, Shoreline, recalled a comment made by Commissioner Pyle about small properties along Aurora that could probably not accommodate any other type of zone than R-48. He questioned what process would be used to accomplish these site-specific rezones. Commissioner Pyle explained that his comment was based on a range of options that one could pursue for a specific piece of property under a specific Comprehensive Plan land use designation. For example, oftentimes, a land use designation of R-12 to R-48, can give property owners a false idea that they can rezone to a higher density. Perhaps in circumstances where it is not possible to get a particular zoning designation, the Comprehensive Plan should be changed or the land use designation redefined so it doesn't include a density that would not be allowed. Mr. Nelson agreed and asked what process would be used to make these changes. Commissioner Pyle answered that this would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the definition and/or land use designation to allow for a different range of options for underlying zoning. Mr. Nelson suggested this could potentially be done through the subarea planning process as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Perkowski indicated he attended the Forward Shoreline Meeting on April 16th and was impressed with the level of discourse. King County Councilmember Bob Ferguson provided some very useful insight and advice on how to deal with conflict in a public process. Commissioner Broili added that he found Mr. Ferguson's remarks to be right on target and well appreciated. He said he was encouraged by the direction Forward Shoreline is taking and the process they are putting forward to work toward a strategy for bringing a vision to the City that is outside the realm of the political arena. He noted they have a consultant from outside of Shoreline to help them work through the process. He pointed out their goal is to ensure that everyone has a voice in the vision that would be produced through the process.

STAFF REPORTS

Study Session on Master Plan Amendments

Ms. Markle explained that the Growth Management Act (GMA) states that comprehensive plans can be amended annually, with a few exceptions such as subarea plans that are being adopted for the first time. The state's intent is to require cities to collect amendments over a year and then review all of the amendments at the same time in order to have a holistic picture of what the impacts would be. She introduced the proposed 2008 amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and associated Development Code amendments and noted there were no public initiated amendments.

Commissioner Wagner noted that at recent meetings, the public has voiced more interest in the Comprehensive Plan. She suggested that *CURRENTS* would be an appropriate place to inform the public of the on-going Comprehensive Plan amendment process and how they can participate. Ms. Markle advised that Comprehensive Plan amendments are collected up until December 31st of each year. Ms. Markle suggested they advertise the process sometime in January or February of each year. She noted that the opportunity is advertised year round on the City's website.

Ms. Markle advised that Comprehensive Plan amendments are reviewed via a legislative process. Notice was sent to CTED on March 26th and SEPA comments are due on April 18th. The public comment period would be open until adoption. A public hearing has been scheduled before the Planning Commission on May 1st. The City Council is scheduled to conduct a study session on the Commission's recommendation on May 19th, with anticipated adoption at their meeting of June 9th. Ms. Markle reviewed the main purposes for the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments as follows:

- **Streamline master planning for essential public facilities.** Ms. Markle pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan encourages master planning for single-family institutions and essential public facilities. However, because the Plan states that an amendment would be required in order to adopt a master plan, this discourages master planning due to a lack of predictability for the applicant. Applicants may have to wait nearly a year to have a master plan permit application processed. If the City truly wants to encourage private entities to prepare master plans, it is critical they are allowed to apply and have their master plan applications processed more than once a year.

Ms. Markle said the Comprehensive Plan encourages master planning because it allows the City to cumulatively address impacts such as traffic, stormwater, environmental protection, design and use compatibility, parking and safety. Through this process specific development regulations and controls can be put in place to address the impacts. Without a master plan, these sites would be allowed to develop on a piecemeal basis using either conditional use permits, an administrative process, or using special use permits, a quasi-judicial process.

Ms. Markle advised that the 1st Northeast Transfer Station is the only approved Master Plan in the City. It was reviewed as a legislative item, and no changes were made to the Comprehensive Plan. While this site is small and used for only one purpose, it could be used as an example of what a master plan would look like. A master plan would include specific development regulations for height, setbacks, bulk and density. It would also identify specific landscaping, parking, design and circulation standards. In addition, the standard sections of the City's code could be applied. A master plan would also include a long-range site plan, phased mitigation plans, and phased infrastructure improvements.

- **Assign a new land use designation called “planned area” to replace single-family institutions.** Ms. Markle recalled that the City recently employed a new development tool called “planned area” for the Ridgecrest Commercial Neighborhood. The tool has been used by other cities to identify and responsibly plan for those areas within a city that represent unique challenges and opportunities such as colleges, airports, hospitals, neighborhood commercial centers, etc. She pointed out that what the Comprehensive Plan talks about single-family institutions and essential public facilities and the need to master plan, and it became clear to staff that the “planned area” tool could be used for a variety of defined planning scenarios.

Ms. Markle said staff is proposing that the “planned area” land use designation be defined as follows: *“pertains to a defined geographic area that is uniquely based on natural, economic or historic attributes subject to problems from transition in land uses; or contain essential public facilities. This level of planning seeks to engage area residents, property owners and businesses to clarify and apply*

existing Comprehensive Plan policies to better reflect changing circumstances, problems and opportunities. Planned area designations may be initiated by property owner(s) or the City during the annual review of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.” Ms. Markle said the proposed amendments would also firm up the process. In order to receive planned area zoning, the area must be defined as a planned area on the future land use map.

- **Define and differentiate “subarea plans” and “planned areas”.** Ms. Markle advised that the proposed amendments also seek to amend the current definition of “subarea plan” to better reflect how the tool has been used by the City over the past 12 years. She explained that the current definition seems to indicate that development regulations would always be a part of a subarea plan, but it is possible to adopt a subarea plan and then come back later with development regulations. She reviewed the differences between “subarea plans” and “planned areas.” She noted that only the City can apply for subarea plans, and they can occur at any time. Subarea plans may or may not include development regulations, and the definition is broader in terms of what geographic areas they can be used for. Either the City or a private applicant can apply for a planned area, but they can only occur as part of the annual review process. In addition, planned areas may be a subset of a subarea. Planned areas are also defined more narrowly.
- **Identify a public process for private property owners to prepare comprehensive long range plans.** Ms. Markle said she is often asked if a private property owner can apply for a master plan, and the current answer is no. She explained that the question stems from a desire to develop in a way that doesn’t fit within any of the existing zoning designations. Often there is a belief that the developer could provide, through design or conditioning, community benefits related to such things as affordable housing, preservation of open space and trees, jobs, public infrastructure, upgrades, etc. in exchange for deviations from the blanket development standards. She advised that under the proposed amendment, a private property owner could apply for a site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment and associated rezone to planned area, and this would be a legislative process. However, in order to get zoning specific to the site, a property owner would have to apply for a master plan permit, which would be a quasi-judicial process.
- **Relocate Master Plan processes from the Comprehensive Plan to the Development Code.** Ms. Markle explained that the master plan concept is not mentioned at all in the Development Code. At this time, everything that governs a master plan is in the Comprehensive Plan (Land Use Policies 76 and 77). While this information is great, it is time to move it into the Development Code so that applicants and the public can see exactly what is required. In addition, she suggested the list in the Comprehensive Plan is incomplete, and the proposed amendment defines the process and provides review criteria. A checklist for submittal has already been prepared, as well.

Next, Ms. Markle reviewed the proposed Development Code Amendments as follows:

- **Add a definition for Master Plan Permit in SMC Chapter 20.20.** Ms. Markle noted, again, that there is currently no definition for “master plan” in either the Development Code or Comprehensive Plan. Staff is proposing the following definition: *“A permit issued by the City that establishes site specific permitted uses and development standards for certain planned areas or essential public*

facilities.” She added that the permit would be limited to those properties identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Add Master Plan Permit as a Type C permit to Table 20.30.060 and create a purpose statement, decision criteria and vesting rules for Master Plan Permits in SMC 20.30.** Ms. Markle said this amendment would actually outline the quasi-judicial process and criteria for master plan permits in the Development Code. She explained that, currently, staff’s review of master plan applications is based only on the criteria for a Development Code amendment, which is very broad. The proposed new criteria would balance citywide goals and objectives for critical areas, design, transportation, public service, parking, transition between uses, stormwater, etc. She summarized that the amendments seek to provide clear understanding for the public and the applicant.
- **Add Shoreline Community College, CRISTA, and Fircrest as Planned Areas 1, 3 and 4 on the zoning map with a limited scope and permitted uses section.** She said this amendment is intended to equal no change. She explained that the underlying zoning would remain in place and would not change until a master plan permit is approved through a quasi-judicial process. She said the intent of the proposed amendment is to set the stage so the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan would not need to be amended for the purposes of approving a master plan permit. She further said staff believes this change would be more transparent to property owners.
- **Specific to Planned Area 1 – Shoreline Community College.** Ms. Markle said staff is proposing to not allow Shoreline Community College to continue to expand using the non-conforming use provisions. She explained that non-conforming uses such as Shoreline Community College, CRISTA and Fircrest are allowed to expand with a conditional use permit, which is an administrative process, or a special use permit, which is a quasi-judicial process. This allows the properties to be redeveloped and developed piecemeal. She noted that, oftentimes, a single-proposal does not trigger frontage improvements and/or major upgrades to stormwater, etc. Staff believes they have reached a point with Shoreline Community College where they are no longer confident impacts can be mitigated. She advised that the college has been contacted about the proposed change that would require them to master plan. She noted that staff does not believe the same issues exist with the CRISTA and Fircrest sites.

Ms. Markle emphasized that the proposed amendments would not change the development controls currently in place for Shoreline Community College, CRISTA or Fircrest. However, the proposed amendments would identify and define a process for master plan permits, specifying who can apply for a master plan permit and create specific review criteria.

Commissioner Pyle asked a clarifying question about the amendment that would identify a public process for private property owners to prepare comprehensive long range plans. He asked if this amendment would be similar to what could be achieved through a contract rezone, a binding site plan, etc. Could the amendment be used to achieve a difference in use, or is it merely something that could be used to achieve a deviation from the standard application of the zoning controls. Ms. Markle said an applicant would be able to use this concept to change the permitted uses and the development standards. However, it is important to keep in mind that a property must meet certain criteria to be a planned area.

Commissioner Pyle asked if there would be a property size limitation. Ms. Markle said that has not been proposed. She said she originally thought that planned areas would be smaller than subareas, but this did not work.

Commissioner Pyle asked if the master plan permit concept could be applied to allow a private property owner to construct a business use in a residential zone if they could prove they meet certain circumstances. Ms. Markle said that, technically, this could happen. However, it is important to keep in mind that a property owner would have to go through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process and meet all of the specific criteria related to public benefit. She said the concept is similar to a contract rezone. However, in a contract rezone, a property would still be beholden to the underlying zone, but with conditions. A master plan permit would be used for properties that are not able to meet all of the use requirements or development standards.

Ms. Markle advised that the City does not have provisions for contract rezones anymore; however, they do have provisions for binding site plans. Commissioner Pyle noted that a property owner who could not achieve his/her objective through a binding site plan could pursue a public process for preparing a master plan, if the circumstances were right. Ms. Markle agreed, as long as they can get through the legislative portion of the program.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that staff's proposed amendments to Land Use Policies 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 would apply the same provisions for all types of areas, and the same set of criteria would be used. He suggested there should be more guidance and restriction on what could be allowed in a low-density residential area as opposed to a community business area. He suggested that this gap should be filled by adding language to both the Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan that takes into account the context that a particular master plan is being proposed for.

Ms. Markle pointed out that the Planning Commission would recommend and the City Council approve the location of planned areas through the legislative process. If a planned area is determined inappropriate for a particular zone because it cannot meet the criteria, the proposal would be denied. If a land use change is not approved, a property owner would not be able to apply for a master plan permit. She pointed out that Shoreline Community College and Fircrest are located in R-6 zones. Because they are essential public facilities, the City cannot preclude their continued use or expansion. She suggested it would be difficult to not offer the subarea or master plan concepts as an option to change the land use in an R-4 or R-6 zone.

Commissioner Kaje suggested that if a property owner in any zone wants to do something different than the Development Code would allow, the language should provide specific guidance about what the Commission and City Council should consider if the properties are surrounded by low-density residential. Ms. Markle agreed this would be appropriate. However, rather than addressing this issue by adding additional language to the master plan criteria, it would be more appropriate to consider this issue when reviewing the Comprehensive Plan criteria.

Commissioner Wagner asked how many sites could potentially be impacted by the proposed amendments, other than the three identified by staff (CRISTA, Shoreline Community College, and

Fircrest). Ms. Markle said she has received four inquiries about the potential for master planning, and she does not anticipate the master plan permit being a tool that is used frequently. It could be used to create individual planned areas after a subarea plan has been adopted. This would be done through a legislative process.

Vice Chair Hall asked if all conditional use and special use permits require a legislative process. He recalled that one permit for a building at Shoreline Community College came through the Commission for review and a recommendation. Ms. Markle explained that Shoreline Community College is a non-conforming use in a residential zone. As per recent direction from the City Attorney, most development permits for this property would require a conditional use permit not a special use permit. Conditional use permits are administrative decisions that do not come before the Planning Commission for review. She advised that the use table found in the Development Code indicates whether a conditional use or a special use permit would be required in order for a non-conforming use to be expanded. Special use permits do come before the Commission for review and a recommendation to the City Council.

Vice Chair Hall said the staff report points out that the 1st Avenue Northeast Transfer Station is the only facility currently operating under a master plan in the City. However, staff has not proposed to designate this property as a planned area. Ms. Markle advised that they could make this designation. Commissioner Hall pointed out the City's intent of limiting the master plan concept to those areas designated "planned area" in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that if a new master plan were proposed for the transfer station, a lengthy legislative process would be required to designate the property as a planned area. He suggested it would be more appropriate to designate this area as a planned area now. Ms. Markle agreed this would be a good idea.

Vice Chair Hall expressed surprise that the criteria for rezones was not touched on in the proposed new language. He recalled that over the past year, the Planning staff has suggested the criteria overlaps and does not work well. He questioned if it would also be appropriate for the Commission to revisit the current rezone criteria. He noted the Commission also discussed this issue in the context of whether or not they felt comfortable transferring the responsibility for doing quasi-judicial rezones to the Hearing Examiner. There was some concern in that discussion about whether the criteria are sufficiently explicit. He asked staff to respond to this issue prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner Perkowski referred to the proposed amendment related to streamlining master planning for essential public facilities. As proposed, master plan permits could be amended using the same process as approving the master plan. He asked staff to share their thoughts about whether this would truly end the piecemeal approach or if the amendment process would make the situation almost analogous to the current conditional use permit process. He questioned if the language should tighten the threshold for what constitutes an amendment. Ms. Markle pointed out that property owners have to spend a lot of money and time to come up with sufficient analysis to create an initial master plan. She felt it would be a pretty major situation for a property owner to want to go back through the expensive (about \$10,000 per application) and time consuming master planning process. Commissioner Perkowski suggested the opposite could also be true. Again, he suggested the thresholds for the amendment process should be carefully considered. Ms. Markle agreed to review the language and try to come up with something different to address the concern.

Commissioner Wagner inquired if the City has heard any feedback from Shoreline Community College regarding the proposed amendments. Ms. Markle advised that she has regular contact with the Vice President of Administration at the college to discuss the proposed amendments. He stated the college doesn't have plans to do any development for the next few years, and they currently have one active building permit. He does not foresee the proposed amendments would cause trouble for their future plans. She pointed out that the college has prepared a master plan permit application, but it is not a complete application.

At the request of Chair Kuboi, Ms. Markle reviewed the three review criteria for Comprehensive Plan amendments. They are as follows:

- The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the countywide planning policies or other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and City policies.
- The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a subarea plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision, or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan.
- The amendment will benefit the community as a whole and will not adversely affect the community facilities and/or the public health, safety or general welfare.

Vice Chair Hall asked if the master plan already submitted by CRISTA would be processed as a legislative action or if it would be processed under the new provisions as a quasi-judicial application. Ms. Markle said CRISTA's application would be vested under the existing criteria, since the project manager anticipates issuing a completeness letter by the end of the week. If the amendments pass it will be processed as a quasi-judicial item, if they are not passed it will be processed legislatively.

Vice Chair Hall pointed out that the proposed language for Land Use Policy 12 is structured differently than the other amendments. Ms. Markle agreed to review the language to make it clear that density could exceed 12 dwelling units and the R-8 or R-12 zoning designation if a subarea plan, neighborhood plan or special overlay plan has been approved.

Vice Chair Hall referred to Figure LU-1 and asked if the planned area designation is a designation or an overlay on top of some other designation. Similarly, he asked if the planned area zone would be a zoning district or an overlay on top of another district. Ms. Markle explained that the underlying zoning must remain in place on the zoning map until a master plan permit has been approved. She said she could write simple language for Fircrest and Shoreline Community College because the entire sites are zoned the same. However, because the CRISTA property consists of two different zones, it would be difficult to describe in writing and easier to illustrate on the map. That's why she used an overlay. She said she would consider further whether or not it would be appropriate to identify the underlying land use on the Comprehensive Plan land use map.

Vice Chair Hall recalled that in the Shoreline community, tremendous concern has been voiced about the distinction between land use designations and zoning designations. As he reviewed the staff report, he noted that a number of terms have been used. He suggested this makes is complicated for the general

public to clearly understand. He asked staff to share their ideas for making the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code more accessible to the general public. Ms. Markle said she originally took out terms such as “neighborhood plan” and “special overlay” in an effort to focus on getting a tight master plan permit process and definitions in place for Shoreline Community College, CRISTA, and Fircrest. However, she was nervous about proposing too many changes to the existing plan. She said she would support removing some of the terms. This would be easy to do and would make the plan more transparent.

Commissioner Broili asked if it would be possible to provide illustrations to lay out the flow of how the pieces all relate to each other. He noted that some people respond better to visual information as opposed to verbal information. Ms. Markle referred to the chart labeled Attachment D, which represents her attempt to visually lay out the concepts contained in the proposed amendments. She asked Commissioner Broili to review Attachment D and provide comments for how it could be improved. Commissioner Broili suggested they use a flowchart approach to illustrate the concepts. Ms. Markle agreed to attempt to create a flowchart. Vice Chair Hall suggested that simplifying the relationship between the different planning tools would help reduce the public’s confusion at the public hearing.

Commissioner Kaje referred to the proposed decision criteria found in Section 20.30.337.B, and asked if the term “mitigate” is specifically defined in the code. Ms. Markle reviewed the code’s current definition for the term “mitigation.” Commissioner Kaje inquired if this definition would apply to all sections of the code, and Ms. Markle answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that a few of the criteria talk about mitigating impacts. He suggested that the proposed language be changed to capture the hierarchy of the mitigation concept: avoid, reduce, and then mitigate impacts if they cannot be avoided or reduced. Commissioner Kaje also referred to Criteria 6 in Section 20.30.337.B, and suggested the word “limit” be changed to “minimize.” If the intent is to minimize conflicts between the master plan property and adjacent uses, the language should make this clear. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Behrens referred to Criteria 4 of Section 20.30.337.B and asked how staff proposes to project what type of public transportation system would be available at a particular time in the future. Ms. Markle clarified that the intent of the language is to require an applicant to implement traffic mitigation measures to address the anticipated impacts associated with each phase of their development. In addition, she noted the City does model into the future for transportation, so they do have information on what they perceive the traffic impacts would be in the future. She emphasized that the proposed language is not intended to allow an applicant to rely solely on public transportation as a way to mitigate the impacts.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Commission discussed whether it would be appropriate to accept public testimony as opinions, since this item was not scheduled as a public hearing. City Attorney Collins noted that a public hearing on the proposed amendments has been scheduled for May 1st. She suggested that those who speak

tonight be asked to limit their comments at the public hearing to issues they have not yet raised. She noted that the item is legislative, so it is important to get as many comments as possible.

Les Nelson, Shoreline, expressed confusion that subarea plans are defined in the Comprehensive Plan, but not in the Growth Management Act (GMA). He suggested that doing planned areas through a quasi-judicial process would take some of the large facilities out of the realm of public comment. He noted that GMA requires that all proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan be considered by a government body concurrently so the cumulative affect of the various proposals could be ascertained. He suggested it would defy the intent of GMA if the City were to consider Comprehensive Plan changes associated with master plans, subarea plans and planned areas outside of the yearly cycle. He said his interpretation of GMA is that cities are allowed to create subarea plans at any point, but the final adoption must be done on a yearly cycle where all changes are considered at the same time.

Mr. Nelson said he also appreciates the Commission's discussion about disseminating information to the public by means other than the City's website. He suggested that this change would meet the requirements of the GMA to widely and broadly disseminate to the public a process for creating comprehensive plan amendments.

Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said he looks at the proposed concepts in a hierarchal manner. Master plans are the most complex and difficult. He said he was involved in the process for establishing the 1st Avenue Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan. While the process was difficult, it addressed most of the concerns raised by the public. He recalled that the proposal went through a legislative process, which allowed the citizens to lobby the City Council to address problems. He requested the City Attorney provide justification for making applications for master plans, subarea plans and planned areas quasi-judicial matters. He suggested the City consider making the process for changing from a planned area to a master plan legislative rather than quasi-judicial. In addition, he suggested that the "subarea plan" designation be renamed to "neighborhood subarea plan." He said neighborhood subarea plans should be the lowest on the hierarchy of concepts proposed, and using the word "neighborhood" would clearly define who the stakeholders are.

Commissioner Behrens said his understanding is that the planned area process would be legislative. That means an applicant would go through a formal legislative process to start with. An application would be presented to the Planning Commission, and they would make a recommendation to the City Council. If adopted by the City Council, an applicant would be allowed to apply for a master plan permit, which would be reviewed via a quasi-judicial process. He summarized that the proposed process would actually provide for a legislative process on the front and a quasi-judicial process on the end. Ms. Markle agreed. However, she pointed out that the exciting details are done as part of the master plan process.

Chair Kuboi inquired what type of detail would be envisioned at the Comprehensive Plan amendment stage for a proposed planned area. Ms. Markle said the proposed amendments were intended to focus on Shoreline Community College, Fircrest and CRISTA, which do not require a lot of detail because the Comprehensive Plan already identifies the need to master plan for these areas. There are no requirements in place to identify what a private applicant would have to provide in order to convince the

Commission and City Council that they deserve a Comprehensive Plan land use change. She said staff would advise an applicant to provide as much detail as possible about what they want to do, but the level of detail has not been spelled out in the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Wagner noted that none of the information required for the Comprehensive Plan amendment would be binding on the final master plan that is approved through the quasi-judicial process. The master plan process would actually define the details of the proposal. Ms. Markle agreed and added that if an applicant comes forward with a master plan proposal that is inconsistent with what was considered for the planned area, the current zoning would remain in place until they come back with something that meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Broili said he anticipates that, over the course of time, other applications for planned areas would come before the Commission. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to provide some definition as to the level of detailed information that is expected. Ms. Markle pointed out that not a lot of detail would be required at the time the concept is first presented so it may be difficult to create a set of criteria. Commissioner Pyle pointed out that staff has the authority to govern the submittal requirements for planned area applications. He suggested that rather than adjusting the criteria for evaluation, the City could adjust the required submittal items, depending on the type of application. In order to deem an application substantially complete, a certain level of detail would have to be provided.

Commissioner Behrens suggested that many of the public concerns could be most thoroughly vetted during the legislative planned area portion of the master plan process. He questioned how the legislative review would be conducted. Ms. Markle described that, as part of the legislative review process, the City could mitigate impacts associated with the planned area land use designation by imposing conditions. Commissioner Behrens asked if staff believes the legislative review process would enable the City to address the more controversial issues. Ms. Markle said the legislative process would be where the broad use and density issues are vetted out. She suggested staff review the process that was used by Fircrest to consider the broader issues. Perhaps they could mirror their efforts when reviewing future proposals.

Chair Kuboi summarized the Commission's direction to staff as follows:

- Consider identifying the 1st Avenue Northeast Transfer Station site as a planned area.
- Revisit the issue of revising the rezone criteria.
- Provide more clarity regarding the amendment process.
- Rework Land Use Policy 12 to make the language more clear.
- Review the map and possibly make revisions.
- Review the language in an attempt to simplify terms.
- Provide a type of "cheat sheet" for the public hearing that is written for the benefit of the public to explain the master plan concept as clearly as possible. The public benefits of master plan should be clearly outlined.
- Add verbiage that captures the hierarchy of the mitigation process to make it clear that an applicant should first attempt to avoid impacts, and mitigation should be the last resort. This could be done by including an explicit reference to the code section where the mitigation concept is defined.

- Change the word “limit to “minimize in Criteria 6 of Section 20.30.337.B.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Economic Development Committee

Chair Kuboi recalled a recent request that the Commission provide a volunteer to serve on the Economic Development Committee. The Commission agreed to table the issue until staff could provide more information about the level of commitment that would be required for participants. Ms. Simulcik Smith agreed to email more details to each Commissioner.

Subcommittee to Evaluate the Concept of Design Review

Chair Kuboi recalled that at the joint meeting with the City Council, there was some mention about Commissioners participating on a subcommittee to evaluate the concept of design review. He invited the Commissioners to notify him of their interest.

NEW BUSINESS

Subcommittees in General

Chair Kuboi recalled that when the Surface Water and Transportation Master Plans were updated previously, the Commission utilized subcommittees as a way to cover additional task areas that the Commission, as a whole, was unable to do. He questioned if the Commission wants to consider using the subcommittee process to accomplish their significant 2008 work plan. The Commission agreed to discuss this concept more at a future meeting.

Discussion on Proposal Related to Quasi-Judicial Items

Vice Chair Hall reminded the Commission that the City Council asked them to reconsider their recommendation to move quasi-judicial items from the Planning Commission to the Hearing Examiner for 12 months. The Commission agreed to discuss this issue further at a future meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Kuboi announced that a public hearing on the proposed master plan amendments has been scheduled for May 1st.

ADJOURNMENT

**COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED AT 9:07 P.M.
COMMISSIONER WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.**

Sid Kuboi
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission