

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 6, 2008
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Chair Piro
Vice Chair Kuboi
Commissioner Wagner
Commissioner Phisuthikul
Commissioner McClelland
Commissioner Harris (left at 7:13 p.m.)
Commissioner Hall (left at 8:24 p.m.)
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Pyle

STAFF PRESENT

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Planning & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Piro 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 Piro, Vice Chair Kuboi, and Commissioners Wagner, Phisuthikul, McClelland, Harris, Hall, Broili and Pyle.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission accepted the agenda as proposed.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Les Nelson, Shoreline, recalled that at the last meeting Vice Chair Kuboi asked him to share his thoughts about the R-24 and R-48 zoning designations, but he was not allowed to respond because the public testimony portion of the hearing had already been closed. Mr. Nelson emphasized his point that, regardless of the height limit of the zone, a property owner would not be able to build to the height allowed in the R-24 and R-48 zones without constructing very large units because of the limit on the

number of units allowed. He summarized that limiting the number of units to 24 or 48 would also limit the mass of the building because the economy would not support the development of very large units.

PUBLIC HEARING ON MATULOVICH REZONE REQUEST FOR PROPERTIES AT 16520, 16522, 16526, 16532 and 16538 LINDEN AVENUE NORTH (FILE NUMBER 201699)

Chair Piro reviewed the rules and procedures for the quasi-judicial public hearing. He reminded the Commissioners of the Appearance of Fairness Rules and invited them to disclose any ex parte contact they might have received regarding the subject of the hearing outside of the hearing. Commissioner Harris announced that one of the parties to the application is a long-time friend. Therefore, he indicated he would excuse himself from participation in the hearing. He left the meeting at 7:13 p.m. No one in the audience voice a concern.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Szafran said the applicant is requesting to rezone five contiguous properties on Linden Avenue from R-8 to R-48. He provided an aerial overview of the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised that the subject parcels are currently zoned as R-8, and are developed with four, single-family homes and one duplex. Most of the units are renter occupied. Parcels to the north are zoned R-8 and R-18 and developed with three, single-family homes and two fourplexes. Parcels to the south are zoned R-12 and R-18 and developed with townhomes. Parcels on the west side of Linden Avenue North are zoned R-6 and developed predominantly with single-family homes. There is Regional Business (RB) zoning to the east of the subject properties along Aurora Avenue.

Mr. Szafran said the Comprehensive Plan designates the entire block as mixed use to the north, south and east of the subject properties. The majority of the properties west of Linden Avenue are identified as low-density residential and public facility (Richland Highlands Park). Mr. Szafran provided pictures to illustrate the existing site conditions of the subject properties. He also provided pictures to illustrate the single-family residential development and park land that is currently located on the west side of Linden Avenue.

Mr. Szafran displayed a chart comparing the current R-8 zoning designation with both R-24 and R-48 zoning. He noted the applicant is proposing R-48 zoning, but staff is recommending R-24 zoning. He pointed out that building coverage is the same for the R-24 and R-48 zones, with only a 5% difference in the amount of impervious surface allowed. The real difference between the two zones is in the number of units allowed.

Mr. Szafran said both staff's proposal and the applicant's request would be consistent with the mixed-use goals and policies found in the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, it would meet the zoning criteria by:

- Increasing the number of housing units.
- Increasing the housing choices.

- Locating higher-density housing in an appropriate area (adjacent to RB zoning) as directed by the Comprehensive Plan.
- Locating higher-density housing near public transportation (Aurora Avenue) and near a major park.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject properties as mixed-use so any residential zoning between R-8 and R-48 would be consistent, as would all commercial zones. He pointed out that subsequent development of the properties would create a transition between high-intensity uses (RB along Aurora Avenue) to lower-intensity uses (R-6 to the west). Staff feels the likely zoning for a transition density on the site would be R-24 or R-48.

Mr. Szafran reviewed the concerns raised at the neighborhood meeting as follows:

- Traffic – Neighbors pointed out that streets are already impacted by activities at the park, the high school, speeding cars, and no sidewalks. Many questioned where all the cars were going to park.
- Crime – Neighbors believe by adding additional housing, crime and drugs may infiltrate into the area.
- Property Values – Neighbors expressed their concern that possible rental units would erode the value of the single-family homes in the community.
- Density – Current neighbors were worried that potential renters would change the “feel” of the single-family neighborhood.

Mr. Szafran said staff recommends approval of R-24 instead of R-48 zoning. He explained that Linden Avenue is classified as a local street, meaning it does not have sidewalks and has not been developed to its full width. Typically, staff believes R-48 zoning should front directly onto a collector or arterial street. Staff does not believe that, in most cases, a zone that allows 48 units would be appropriate on a local street. He advised that staff believes the R-24 or R-48 zoning would be a workable transition adjacent to the RB zone. However, because of the very low density on the west side of Linden Avenue, staff believes R-24 zoning would be a better fit for the area.

Commissioner Phisuthikul said the zoning diagram shows the properties encroach onto Linden Avenue, as does the playfield at Richmond Highlands Park. That means that Linden Avenue is partially located on private property. Mr. Szafran answered that a large portion of the street is located on City property that is part of the park, and the remainder is on private property. He said the owners of the properties would be required to dedicate right-of-way for Linden Avenue to be its full width. Vice Chair Kuboi asked if this dedication requirement would impact the unit count for the subject properties. Mr. Szafran answered that the dedication would result in a 3,000 square foot reduction in the amount of property available for development to occur.

Commissioner McClelland questioned why the City’s Public Works Department has not settled the right-of-way issue. Staff noted that, regardless of whether the properties are zoned R-48 or R-24, the unit count would be impacted by the dedication requirement. Commissioner Hall questioned why this situation should impact the Commission’s final decision one way or the other. He suggested it is an issue that could be worked out through the normal course of development. Even if the applicant were to build a project consistent with the current zoning, he would have to address this situation and provide frontage improvements, etc. He reminded the Commission of the retreat discussion that the questions

they ask during a hearing should have a bearing on how they would vote on the proposal. Commissioner Pyle said he deals with right-of-way issues frequently, and it is not unusual to deal with them as part of a development proposal.

Vice Chair Kuboi clarified that the depiction offered by staff of what could happen on the properties given the R-48 or R-24 zoning designation is based on the five parcels being aggregated. Mr. Szafran concurred. Vice Chair Kuboi asked if this would be a requirement of rezone approval. Mr. Szafran answered negatively.

Applicant Testimony

Mike Matulovich, Applicant, Shoreline, said he owns the property at 16532 Linden Avenue. He pointed out that because they requested R-48 zoning, all of the data they collected and submitted to the City would support the R-48 zoning. He suggested the City's Comprehensive Plan supports R-48 zoning for all the subject properties, as does the traffic analysis that was provided. The other zoning and buildings on the block, which is mostly multi-family or business, support R-48 zoning. He advised that upon completion of the development, the property line would be changed to address the right-of-way issue. He pointed out that the property owners currently own 17 feet of Linden Avenue on the north end of the subject properties and 19 feet at the south end. He added that Mr. Koo, owner of the southern two properties, has already donated 19 feet of the front of his property to the City of Shoreline. This was done when the back portion of his property was developed as a duplex. *(The parcel map provided by Mr. Matulovich was entered into the record as Exhibit 1.)*

Mr. Matulovich said people have expressed a concern that the property owners do not have a connection with the neighborhood. He pointed out that the property owners are all long-time residents of the community. He said he grew up just down the street. He has owned his current property for five years, and lived in the home for four years. He summarized that he has many close connections and family in the neighborhood. His desire is to construct a quality development. He said the owners of the parcels believe that the proposed rezone would have a positive impact on the neighborhood. The goal is to create a buffer between the commercial development on Aurora Avenue and the single-family residential and park properties to the west. They do not intend to build substandard housing, and he noted that most of the block has already been developed as multi-family residential or business uses. They believe the proposed change represents positive growth.

Ernest Swanson, Party to the Application, Brier, said he owns the property at 16538 Linden Avenue. He said he grew up in Shoreline from 1954 to 1976, and his mother still owns property on Wallingford Avenue. He said he has a connection to the community and wants the redevelopment to be positive. He said he purchased property in Shoreline because he loved the community. When he purchased the property, the paint was peeling off all four sides of the house, and the roof was in terrible shape. The backyard was completely covered in blackberry bushes. Over the past five years, he and his family have maintained the property and carefully screened tenants to bring affordable housing to citizens of Shoreline. He commented that this is the only investment property he owns, and he is very committed to redeveloping the property in a quality manner.

Questions by the Commission to Staff and Applicant

Commissioner Hall asked the applicant and parties to the application to comment on their view of the future of the properties if they were rezoned to R-24 as recommended by staff as opposed to their request for R-48. Mr. Matulovich said the property owners do not currently have a building plan. However, the usability of the property would be a lot greater with an R-48 zoning designation, and that's what they would prefer. He emphasized that they are not necessarily interested in developing to the maximum number of units allowed, but they don't want to be limited by a smaller number.

Public Testimony or Comment

Les Nelson, Shoreline, agreed with the staff's recommendation that a lower density would be more appropriate for the subject properties. In fact, he suggested that an R-12 or R-18 zoning designation would be even better, and both would be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan's land use designation of mixed-use. He expressed his belief that zoning in an area should be balanced on both sides of the street so there is not a large demand for parking for the more intense development on one side that causes the lower-density property owners to suffer the consequences.

Commissioner Wagner asked staff to comment on other densities that were considered for the subject property, and why they are recommending R-24. Mr. Cohn pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject properties as mixed-use, so the first density they considered was Community Business. Staff felt that retail businesses or offices were probably not appropriate in the current street environment. Next, they considered the lower-density residential designations and determined that a higher residential density would be more appropriate. He noted there are townhomes next to the subject properties, and staff considered the option of rezoning to a type of townhouse zoning, which is about 24 units per acre. As the Staff Report notes, staff felt R-24 would work better than R-48 in terms of traffic, which has to go through single-family areas to get to Aurora Avenue. Staff made the judgment call that R-24 would be a better transition zone from the R-6 properties.

Commissioner Wagner clarified that the subject properties are owned by three separate people. She asked if the numbers in the staff report are based on the entirety of all the properties as one large, single lot that would require dedicated land for street and frontage improvements. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively. Commissioner Wagner asked what the property owners would have to do to aggregate the properties. Mr. Szafran said the lot lines could be removed via an administrative process. Mr. Cohn pointed out that if the properties are not aggregated, it could be possible to develop more units because the City rounds up when calculating the number of units allowed. Commissioner Wagner said she would be curious to know the difference between the number of units allowed on the separate subject properties as opposed to aggregated.

Commissioner Hall asked if the applicant would be more likely to develop the properties as five separate projects, one on each parcel. Or would they likely design a development that aggregates the five parcels together. Commissioner Wagner pointed out that the applicant would not be bound to aggregate the properties if the rezone were approved. Therefore, the Commission must consider both alternatives. Mr. Swanson said he does not intend to sell his property, and he would do any redevelopment that

occurs on the site. Mr. Matulovich said there are currently no building plans for the subject properties, and they haven't determined if they would be developed as one or separately. Chair Piro summarized that the Commission should consider the parcels as five separate sites and not make the assumption they would be aggregated for development.

Robert Koo, Party to the Application, said he owns the properties at 16520, 16522 and 16526 Linden Avenue. He said he purchased the home at 16520 when it was constructed in 1965, and he lived there for a long time. He recalled that when he purchased the properties, they were part of King County because Shoreline had not been incorporated yet. King County allowed lots that were adjacent to commercial zones to be developed as duplexes. He short platted two lots into three lots and constructed a duplex on the rear lot. At that time, the County recognized there was no Linden Avenue between 165th and 167th Streets, and they asked him to donate 19 feet of his property frontage for this purpose, which he did. He said the duplex is in good condition, and he would like to maintain it for now. The other two homes are fairly old, and he would like to redevelop these sites.

Mr. Koo said he would prefer R-48 zoning for the subject properties, and he expressed his belief that an R-48 zoning designation would not create any more impacts to surrounding properties than would the R-24 zoning. He noted that most residents in the area would travel down Linden Avenue to 165th Street in order to access Aurora Avenue. He said he doesn't anticipate the residents (of the subject properties) would travel northbound on Linden Avenue. He noted that the intersection at 167th and Aurora Avenue only allows right turns. If the City approves R-48 zoning, he would be allowed to construct an additional story of residential space, which would make it more affordable to provide underground parking. The cost per unit would be much less.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner McClelland said she was originally under the impression they were talking about an aggregated piece of property. Now, it appears the owners want to maintain the separate lots, and that some of the existing structures would be maintained. She questioned if the unit count in the Staff Report would be correct given that each lot would have to have its own setbacks. Mr. Szafran said the table was provided to illustrate the unit count differences between the two zoning designations, but staff did not take rights-of-way, etc. into account. Commissioner McClelland inquired how many units would be allowed on a single 7,500 square foot lot that is zoned R-48. Mr. Cohn pointed out that however many units would be allowed in an R-24 zone, the number would be double for an R-48 zone. Commissioner McClelland said it sounds as though the proposed zoning would be far less dense than the people who attended the neighborhood meeting might have perceived it. Commissioner Broili reminded the Commission that they have been charged with making a decision about whether or not R-24 zoning would be appropriate for the site. How the site is eventually developed has no bearing on the Commission's decision.

Commissioner Pyle agreed with Commissioner Broili in part, but he expressed his belief that the zoning controls found in the Development Code are ultimately what the Commission should consider when reviewing a rezone of this magnitude. They must look at what the current and future zoning controls would provide for upon redevelopment and not what the property owners intend to do with the property.

It is important to recognize that a property owner could sell a parcel, and a new owner may come up with a different plan. The Commission should keep in mind that future redevelopment of the site would only be limited by the zoning controls that are in place. Rather than considering sentiment and ownership, they should consider factors such as setbacks, lot coverage, landscaping, number of units allowed, parking requirements, proximity to transit, etc. Ultimately, security lies in the development standards.

Commissioner Hall said he applied the R-24 and R-48 density calculations to the five properties, not taking into account any future dedication of land. An R-24 zoning designation would allow between four and eight units per site, and the R-48 zoning designation would allow between eight and fifteen units on each property. He noted this number would likely be less based on right-of-way dedications. If the properties were aggregated, the total number of units allowed might be one greater or one less. He summarized that if the properties were developed individually, the bulk and massing would be broken up by the zoning regulation requirements. If they were aggregated, the potential development could be larger and more contiguous with open space on one side or the other.

Final Questions by the Commission and Commission Deliberation

Commissioner Pyle noted that the Commission does not have an opportunity to condition the rezone application. He also pointed out that a SEPA review would be required for any redevelopment that exceeds four units. If the properties were developed independently, no traffic review would be required. However, if the properties were aggregated, redevelopment could potentially require traffic review. Mr. Cohn agreed but pointed out that the traffic study in the submittal documents suggests the existing road infrastructure is adequate to support an R-24 or R-48 zoning designation.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be required frontage improvements for any of the sites to be developed. However, the property owners would be eligible to pay a fee in lieu, and no frontage landscaping would be required by the code. If an applicant were required to put in frontage, street trees could be used in lieu of the landscaping in the front yard. This could ultimately result in no separation of landscaping between the multi-family and single-family developments except the street trees. Commissioner Pyle noted that interior landscaping within the setbacks would be required if the sites were redeveloped independently, and the developer would be eligible for up to a 50% reduction in the parking requirement because of the properties proximity to transit. Mr. Szafran said this parking reduction would be at the discretion of the Planning Director. Commissioner Pyle also noted that side yard setbacks would be required and would provide for more limited development within the sites.

Vice Chair Kuboi asked if staff agreed with the information provided in the traffic study. Mr. Szafran answered that the traffic study was reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer, and he did not raise any issues or concerns. Vice Chair Kuboi asked staff to once again review the subjective merits of the R-24 and R-18 zoning designations. Mr. Cohn said both zones would allow the type of density staff would expect to see as a transition from commercial uses along Aurora, and there was not a lot of R-48 zoning close by the subject properties. Nearby development is townhouses, and today's townhomes are typically developed at 24 units per acre. He reviewed that 20 years ago, townhouses were developed at

about 8 to 10 units per acre, but that has changed dramatically in the last several years. Mr. Cohn said the staff also considered the impacts of putting additional density on a local street. They felt that even though the local street could handle the additional traffic, there was no compelling reason to do it. The Commission must answer the question of what the best transition would be, given the location of the subject properties between the R-6 and RB zones. Staff believes R-24 zoning would be a better choice than either R-18 or R-48. He cautioned that staff did not take economics into consideration, but they did consider that the market demand for townhouses is about 24 units per acre.

Commissioner Broili noted there is no R-24 zoning nearby. He questioned what is going on in the area to warrant the higher density, when the maximum density currently in the area is R-18. Mr. Cohn said staff believes the market demand is for 24-units per acre, and staff does not see a lot of difference between R-18 and R-24 in either the number of units or the associated impacts.

Vice Chair Kuboi summarized that staff is stating that an R-24 density would allow a developer to construct a unit that would sell on the market. This makes it appear as though staff is beginning to weigh economic, non-planning factors into their recommendation. He said the bigger issue is what the street would look like 20 years from now if a rezone is approved. Approving this rezone could result in other property owners along the east side of the street making the same type of rezone request and this could change the character of the street. Mr. Szafran said that when he considered the appropriate zone for the subject properties, he considered how much density could be most efficiently accommodated on the sites, while being sensitive to the single-family zones and utilizing the opportunities for transit on Aurora Avenue. He noted there are not a lot of areas in the City where they can provide more density close to Aurora Avenue and directly adjacent to intense business uses. He said he felt R-24 zoning would provide the appropriate balance. Mr. Cohn referred to the aerial photograph and noted that townhouses have already been developed on the south side of the subject properties. A rezone to R-24 would not represent a great change; the change has already started, and the proposed rezone would continue what is already taking place on the street.

COMMISSIONER HALL MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CHANGING THE REZONE OF FIVE PARCELS ON LINDEN AVENUE SOUTH (16520, 16522, 16526, 16532 AND 16538) FROM R-8 TO R-48 AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT. COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Hall commended staff for bringing a proposal that is different than what was originally proposed by the applicant. They took a hard look and were willing to recommend something different. This sends a clear message that the staff and Commission are willing to work with the community and the proponents to find a balance. He also applauded the applicant's professionalism in presenting the matter, as well. He suggested it would be appropriate for the Commission to duly consider their proposal for R-48 zoning.

Commissioner Hall shared the reasons why he would be in favor of the rezone, whether it was R-48 or R-24. He recalled Mr. Koo's comment about possibly developing his property far into the future, and this reminded him of the importance of keeping in mind that there are no guarantees on how a property would be developed. He also considered the things about the subject parcels that are inherently long

term such as it's proximity to Aurora Avenue, transit service and the park across the street. He disagreed with the citizen comment that it is not appropriate to place high-density residential development next to a park. He suggested a park would provide a magnificent buffer. He also considered such things as the properties' proximity to Shoreline Community College, the high school, etc. While traffic and speeding are already issue, he would not expect this to change as a result of the proposal. Commissioner Hall said he respects the property owners who shared their connections to the community, and he is completely convinced they care about the neighborhood. He expressed his belief that redevelopment would likely enhance the safety and security of the neighborhood by putting more eyes on the street. He said parking would always be an issue, but the more opportunities to walk to parks and transit, the less parking would be a problem.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that the hearing was noticed as R-48 zoning, and the comments from the community were based on R-48. However, no one from the neighborhood attended the hearing to oppose the rezone. He contrasted this with many of the other rezone applications that come before the Commission for review. They often hear from a large number of people who live across the street coming out to voice their opposition. The only three people in the neighborhood they heard from were in support of the rezone for its potential future redevelopment opportunities. For those reasons, he said he would vote to support the rezone at either R-48 or R-24.

Commissioner Pyle agreed with Commissioner Hall's comments. In addition, he suggested the Commission consider the rezone proposal from the perspective of a non-project action, as was disclosed in the SEPA checklist. There is no development proposal to consider. In doing so, he said the Commission must consider the zoning controls as he discussed earlier. He said he would support rezoning the properties to R-48. He believes the properties' proximity to the park and to transit opportunities make it a good location for the higher use. However, at the same time, he feels a great need for the Commission to focus their efforts on possible revisions to the Development Code so they can better the community but also provide for the density they need to achieve along places like Aurora Avenue. In the interim, he said he would support either R-24 or R-48 zoning for the subject properties.

Commissioner Wagner pointed out that the Commission did receive one letter that expressed strong opposition to the R-48 rezone request. She suggested the Commission should contrast this discussion with their recent recommendation to the City Council that would allow a developer to build to the envelope without worrying about how many units are inside a structure. She noted the difference in outside appearance between the R-24 and R-48 zones would be minimal. However, she also referred to Mr. Nelson's comment that this could potentially result in much larger units if a developer were to build to the maximum size possible. She suggested that if the Commission believes this logic is still applicable, then R-48 zoning would make as much sense as R-24 in terms of look, feel and neighborhood character. There would not be a significant difference in the mass of the building.

Commissioner Phisuthikul said he would not support a rezone to R-48. Instead, the staff's recommendation of R-24 zoning would offer a good compromise and an appropriate step down buffer between the higher-density commercial uses on Aurora Avenue and the single-family uses to the west. He reminded the Commission that they would be considering the issue of "transition" in the future as they discuss anticipated redevelopment along Aurora Avenue.

Commissioner McClelland said she would support a rezone to R-24 as an appropriate transition between Aurora Avenue and the single-family neighborhood. However, she said it grieves her to see the cute little starter houses torn down and destroyed. She wished the City had a large piece of land to relocate the houses to. She emphasized that transition to the single-family neighborhoods across the street is a sensitive issue. It is important to keep in mind that the street would be all the transition people have between the higher density commercial uses and the small houses on the west side of Linden Avenue.

COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND CHANGING THE ZONING FROM R-48 DOWN TO R-24 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER PHISUTHIKUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Broili expressed his belief that staff has reviewed the proposal carefully, and their recommendation to limit the zoning to R-24 would be appropriate. He suggested R-24 zoning would offer an appropriate transition between the RB zoning along Aurora Avenue and the R-6 zoning on the west side of Linden Avenue. He emphasized that at some point in the future as the City grows, the properties could eventually be zoned upward. But presently, R-24 would be an appropriate upgrade.

Chair Piro said he would support the motion to amend. He agreed with the comments provided by Commissioner Hall that it would be appropriate to allow for more intense development, particularly given the properties' proximity to Aurora Avenue and opportunities to take advantage of the emerging transit corridor that is being developed. However, he said he is concerned about the transition issue and that they not set too much of a pattern. He suggested that as the City grows and matures and takes on more density, the density could be accommodated in areas that are already zoned for higher-density development. While there may be a few single-family properties that merit a rezone, they should strive to keep the single-family neighborhoods intact into the future. Again, he said he believes the subject properties are located in an area that is appropriate for higher density, and an R-24 designation would be sensitive to the need for transition to protect the character of the single-family neighborhoods.

THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.

Closure of the Public Hearing

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE MATULOVICH REZONE LOCATED ON LINDEN AVENUE NORTH, PROJECT NUMBER 201699. COMMISSIONER HALL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

THE MAIN MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hall left the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Pyle referred to the issue he raised earlier about the affects of a rezone on a piece of property due to the requirements found in the Development Code. He inquired when the Development Code Amendments would be presented to the Commission. Mr. Cohn said he expects a Development Code Amendment bundle would be presented to the Commission within the next six weeks. He encouraged interested Commissioners to submit their ideas for new amendments to staff within the next week. Commissioner Pyle suggested the Commission form a subcommittee to work on code amendments, and he indicated his willingness to participate. Mr. Cohn said a second batch of code amendments would also be presented to the Commission in September.

Commissioner Pyle suggested that with the next set of Comprehensive Plan amendments, it would be appropriate to review the land use designation map and identify properties, via a GIS study, that are clearly residential but do not abut Aurora Avenue or an arterial street. He suggested the Commission consider the concept of recommending a land use change for these properties to high-density residential. He suggested the current mixed-use land use designation sends a mixed message to property owners that they can rezone their property to any zone. The actual analysis that is supposed to be done at the Comprehensive Planning stage was never really done properly, and many of these sites are not really appropriate for Aurora type designations and should be a transition site, instead. Mr. Cohn agreed it is important to review the Mixed Use land use designation. He further agreed there is a need for tighter Comprehensive Plan designations in a lot of other places, as well. He cautioned that staff does not have the time to accomplish this task for at least six to nine months, but they know the Commission would like them to share their thoughts about how to address the problems.

In light of the Development Code amendments that are scheduled to come before the Commission in September, Commissioner Broili asked if the Commission would also talk about low-impact development changes, as well. Mr. Cohn said low-impact development ideas would be discussed by the Commission later in the year, but not necessarily with the September Development Code amendments. He emphasized that the City's ability to change the Development Code is not limited to one time per year. Commissioner Broili agreed with Commissioner Pyle that a subcommittee should be appointed to review low-impact development ideas, as well as other code amendments. He said he envisions the Commission developing a list of suggested code changes, including the issues raised by Commissioner Pyle, as well as low-impact development issues. Mr. Cohn agreed to work with staff to form a subcommittee to start this issue. Chair Piro agreed to meet with staff to review the extended agenda and identify an appropriate time to initiate the subcommittee and identify its task and schedule.

Chair Piro reported on a meeting he attended with Planning staff and Council of Neighborhoods (C of N) staff. He recalled the Commission held a brief discussion to assess the benefits of their attendance at the C of N meetings. The Commission had originally thought this would be an opportunity for them to spend more time with neighborhood groups and interject planning and land use issues into their discussions. He said the Commission expressed concern that their attendance at the meetings was in an observer capacity only. This issue was raised at the meeting, and the C of N staff suggested the Commission partner with the Planning Department to propose some concrete issues that could go both

to the C of N and individual neighborhood groups for discussion. This would allow them to get into the agenda sequence and get a more regular time at the actual C of N meetings.

Mr. Cohn said his interpretation of the C of N staff's response was that the Commission is welcome to attend their meeting on a regular basis, but in a listening mode. Perhaps once or twice a year they could provide a presentation. If the Commission wants to talk to the individual neighborhood groups, they would go the impacted group rather than the C of N. Chair Piro said he suggested there would be some value for the Commission to get on the agenda of the neighborhood groups even if they didn't have a specific issue, to discuss general planning issues. Again, Mr. Cohn noted this would be with the individual neighborhood groups rather than with the C of N.

Chair Piro said that he and Vice Chair Kuboi occasionally attend the Echo Lake Neighborhood Association Meetings, and they have been invited to submit information for the community newsletter. He summarized that a good relationship has been built, and they have been able to clear up misinformation on previous occasions. Mr. Cohn suggested that as Commissioners attend the Council of Neighborhood meetings, they should not hesitate to correct misinformation if possible.

Vice Chair Kuboi said that some of what is going on in one neighborhood now may become an issue in another neighborhood in the future. He suggested their overall strategy should be to impress upon the neighborhood groups that issues are citywide. Mr. Cohn said staff's hope was that representatives from the various neighborhood groups would get Planning Commission information out to their groups via the C of N, but the C of N staff suggested the City not depend upon that happening and suggested they use other means to get the word out.

Chair Piro again summarized the meeting conclusion that the Commission should list the types of issues they could bring into conversation for specific neighborhood groups and the C of N. They could forward this information to the C of N and request an opportunity to present the issues at their meeting as well as various neighborhood group meetings. He said it would be up to the C of N and the individual neighborhood groups to issue an invitation to the Commission.

Ms. Simulcik Smith noted that the C of N staff requested that items sent to the C of N from the Commission should be uniform in appearance. She suggested the Commission establish a template for transmitting communications. Mr. Cohn said they also suggested it is better to provide written information to the C of N.

Commissioner McClelland pointed out that the C of N and the various neighborhood associations are involved with more than just land use issues. They talk about all kinds of things that involve people in the community. She said she would like the Commission to be pulled more into that process. Mr. Cohn said the C of N is not suggesting Commissioners avoid attending the meetings, but they indicated the Commissioners would not be given a forum every meeting. Their role would be more of a listener.

Vice Chair Kuboi reported that the Comprehensive Housing Strategy's Advisory Committee offered a presentation to the C of N on March 5th, and they had a lot of questions. Chair Piro advised that staff would provide an update to the Commission in April regarding the committee's work.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Cohn announced that the City's Surface Water Manual would be updated by staff over the next several months, and this would involve some Development Code amendments, as well. The updated draft and proposed amendments would be presented to the Commission in July. He advised the City is currently using the 1998 King County Surface Water Manual, and they plan to change to either the 2005 King County Surface Water Manual or the Department of Ecology Manual for Western Washington. Several staff members are currently working on the project.

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission of their joint meeting with the City Council on April 7th. He invited the Commission to identify the issues they want to discuss with the City Council. Vice Chair Kuboi said he would like a better handle on how the City Council envisions the Southeast Subarea Plan would proceed. He said he would be particularly interested in learning what the Commission's role would be in the process. Mr. Cohn said staff envisions the formation of a committee to work on this task, and perhaps one member of the Commission could be appointed to participate. The Commission would be informed of the committee's meeting times. He announced that a kick-off open house has been scheduled for March 19th, and impacted property owners in the Briarcrest and Paramount Park Neighborhoods have been invited to attend and share their ideas.

Chair Piro suggested it would be appropriate to have a general discussion with the City Council about subarea planning. He noted that some citizens have raised concern about how the subarea planning process would relate to the current Comprehensive Plan. He said it is important for the City to communicate a common message to the public.

Commissioner Wagner questioned if it would be appropriate to discuss the Commission's transit resolution with the City Council. Chair Piro announced that he presented the resolution to the City Council. After a very positive conversation, they indicated their appreciation to the Commission for raising the issue. They passed the resolution unanimously, with no modifications. Steps are currently being taken to transmit it to city councils of neighboring cities, as well as to King County Council Members, legislators, etc.

Chair Piro announced that the City Council also discussed Sound Transit's alternate plan in light of the recent defeat of Proposition 1. There is interest in having a transit-only ballot measure in 2008 or 2010. The City Council expressed concern that there is currently only minimal service from Sound Transit to the City (one stop at 145th and Interstate 5 during peak hours). Under the new plan, that service would be removed altogether, meaning there would be no direct service to the City of Shoreline. The City Council request staff draft a transmittal letter to express their displeasure with the proposed plan.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

There were no new business items scheduled on the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner McClelland referred to an article from the March 6th edition of *THE SEATTLE TIMES* written by Gene Duvernoy and Steve Franks in response to a letter from a professor at the University of Washington. She agreed to leave the article with staff, and they could forward a web link to each of the Commissioners. Commissioner McClelland suggested the article might be a helpful item to include in the City Council's next packet, and the remainder of the Commission agreed that would be appropriate.

Commissioner Phisuthikul announced that he attended the March 3rd City Council Meeting, where they discussed proposed zoning for the Ridgecrest Commercial Neighborhood. He reported that the City Council made a motion to hire an independent, third party reviewer to study the feasibility of developing a project comparing three, four, five and six-story buildings. He said he was frustrated by this decision, and felt the City Council took a step backwards. He emphasized that the project has already been in the works for more than a year, with input from local communities and citizens.

Chair Piro said he was present when the proposal was first introduced to the City Council, and he has attended several subsequent discussions, as well. He commended staff for developing a matrix that allays many of the issues that have come out during the process. They have offered pros and cons to the various issues, as well as the course of action each might take if they were pursued.

Vice Chair Kuboi asked for a status update on the process for filling the future vacant Commission positions. Mr. Cohn reported that staff received 17 applications. The subcommittee met and identified the top 10 candidates, and these individuals would be invited to interview. Commissioner Broili asked staff to suggest the subcommittee consider providing the interview questions to each applicant before the interview takes place.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Piro announced that the Commission's March 13th agenda would include a study session on the proposed code amendments related to the moratorium on development in CB, RB and I zones. Mr. Cohn apologized for not having the March 13th packet ready. Staff is working to correct the colors on the map before it is disseminated. Mr. Cohn advised that a public hearing on the proposed code amendments has been scheduled for March 20th.

ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED THE COMMISSION ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:04 P.M. COMMISSIONER WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Rocky Piro
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission