

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

October 6, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Craft
Commissioner Chang
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Moss-Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Ray Allshouse, Building Official, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Montero
Commissioner Malek

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Craft called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Craft and Commissioners Chang, Maul, Mork and Moss-Thomas. Vice Chair Montero and Commissioner Malek were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 15, 2016 and September 29, 2016 were adopted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: UPDATE ON UNIT LOT DEVELOPMENT

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran recalled that at the September 15th meeting, there was a discussion about proposed regulations relative to Unit Lot Development. The Commission posed a number of questions, which Mr. Allshouse, the Building Official for the City, is present to address.

Mr. Allshouse explained that Unit Lot Development (ULD) is an improved process to create more housing options and homeownership opportunities by reducing unnecessary regulatory barriers. He reviewed that, at their last meeting, the Commission raised the following concerns relative to the proposed provisions:

- Vertical separation of walls and fire sprinkler requirements.
- Construction of walls between the units.
- Additional costs of building structurally independent units.
- Difficulty financing condominium projects versus fee-simple units.

Mr. Allshouse explained that the City's current fire code requirements include a provision that any new building that is greater than 4,800 square feet (including the garage) must be sprinkled, and there are no exceptions. In the first ULD subdivision application that came to the City, each unit was proposed to be 1,935 square feet. That means the project exceeded the 4,800 square foot limit at the third unit. Most of the projects proposed are more than three units, which means the units will actually be some of the safest in the City because they will be sprinkled.

Mr. Allshouse advised that there are provisions in the model code, as amended by the State of Washington, that lay out specific requirements for separation walls, and the proposed ULD provisions would not reduce these requirements in any way, shape or form. From a fire safety standpoint, the minimum requirements would always be maintained. If a structure is less than 4,800 square feet, the common walls would still be required to be two-hour construction. However, the code is very friendly when it comes to sprinklers, and as a general rule, a one-hour credit is allowed when sprinklers are installed in a building. There are also provisions that restrict what can be in the common walls to electrical wiring only. For example, there cannot be any pipes or ductwork.

Regarding seismic issues, Mr. Allshouse said the main concern is the structure's ability to react to lateral forces. Because the units in ULD projects would be located next to each other, the lateral dimension would be greater. The longer dimensions would be more resistive to lateral forces.

Mr. Allshouse reviewed that, with an apartment building, the entire structure would be owned by a single entity and the units would be separated by a one-hour fire wall. With a ULD project, property lines would be drawn along the common walls, but the building would be treated as a single building for code compliance. Because ULD projects would be constructed on a single piece of property, they can be designed and constructed to be fully compliant with the code. However, not all of his colleagues are in agreement when it comes to drawing property lines. Some are very conservative and look at the

common wall as the combination of two exterior walls. Others look at the common walls as interior walls, even though they are separated by a few inches. After wrestling with this and looking at what other jurisdictions have done across the board, Mr. Allshouse said he is extremely comfortable that the City can allow the buildings to be designed and constructed as though they are a single entity and then subsequently divide them. However, it will be important to require a recording on the title that indicates that the individual dwelling units are considered as a portion of a single building under the applicable edition of the residential code so that people who purchase the structures understand that they cannot just blow the unit away without having to worry about their neighbors.

Based on his evaluation, Mr. Allshouse voiced assurance that the proposed provisions represent a solution that meets the requirements of what the developers are looking for and provides opportunities for further ownership of units, which is a good thing from a planning standpoint. The proposed provisions relieve developers from having to put in another layer or two of chip board, which would be hidden inside the wall. Also, allowing the units to be tied together would result in a structural cost savings. The provisions would not result in a major difference in building design. Although the chance of someone wanting to blow away one of the middle units is possible, it is not likely. If there were a fire, because of the combination of the sprinklers and the rated construction, the chances of it getting beyond the first unit would be extremely slim. He summarized that the provisions represent a reasonable risk that still assures maximum health and safety.

Commissioner Maul expressed his opinion that the proposed ULD provisions make sense and the units would still be safe. Mr. Allshouse clarified that it simply represents an alternative means and method for achieving the City's housing goals. He is convinced the provisions will be a good solution and provide additional options to the City's new citizens.

Commissioner Mork said she appreciated Mr. Allshouse's explanation of how the square footage of a development would be calculated, and how the sprinkler requirement for any project over 4,800 square feet would provide the needed fire protection.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

STUDY ITEM: FUTURE REGULATIONS OF SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES

Staff Presentation

Director Markle reviewed that the City Council enacted a moratorium on the acceptance, filing and processing of new applications for self-storage facilities. The purpose of the moratorium was to provide time to evaluate the City's vision, goals, policies, subarea plans and Comprehensive Plan, and to look at how other jurisdictions are regulating the use. She explained that the current code does not clearly address where self-storage facilities are permitted, and the use tables need to be updated. She emphasized that a moratorium is not the City's preferred method of regulation. The goal is to take the time that is needed to review all aspects of the use, but move the amendments forward as quickly as possible.

Director Markle advised that there was a recent dramatic increase in the number of applications for self-storage facilities. There are currently four self-storage facilities that were established prior to 1989 under King County rules, and one has been constructed since 2004. Recently, the City permitted two new applications, and six requests for pre-application meetings were submitted within the past eight months. This uptick in permit applications led staff to recognize that the current regulations do not contemplate self-storage facilities.

Director Markle reviewed that the main issues related to self-storage facilities are design and aesthetics. In addition, there is a concern that there could be a concentration of the use. If the City allows all of the self-storage facilities in the all of the locations that are proposed and leaves it open for future applications, they may end up with more self-storage facilities than the City's vision intended for the limited number of commercial properties.

Director Markle reported that staff met with self-storage facility experts to learn more about the industry they are proposing to regulate. All interested parties were invited to attend, including the applicants associated with the six proposed projects. The intent was to solicit feedback, particularly on the following questions:

- **Who are the users of self-storage facilities?** Almost everyone uses some form of self-storage at some point in their lives, including apartment dwellers, businesses, sports leagues, families in transition, home occupations, and pharmaceutical reps.
- **What is the demand for self-storage facilities, and how does a developer of self-storage facilities decide to come to a particular community?** The national statistic indicates that each person in the United States could use 6 to 10 square feet of storage. Self-storage facilities in urban areas are typically designed to serve a 3-mile radius, or a 10-minute drive with normal traffic. About 1 in 10 households rent storage space, and the existing storage in the City is near capacity. Most of the existing storage is not climate controlled.
- **Why has there been a sudden influx of self-storage project proposals?** Nearly all of the jurisdictions in the region allow self-storage uses, but the use is not allowed in Lake Forest Park and it is only allowed in limited areas of Mountlake Terrace. Self-storage facilities are one of the fastest growing segments of commercial real estate; and as the City's density increases, self-storage facilities are becoming a logical investment. In addition, financing for self-storage facilities has recently been made available to developers.

When organizing thoughts to move forward with regulations for self-storage facilities, Director Markle suggested that the Commission consider the following questions:

- **Where should self-storage facilities be permitted?** Based on review of the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (included in Staff Report), as well as the Comprehensive Plan policies in combination with the subarea plans, staff is recommending that the use be permitted in the Mixed Business (MB) and Community Business (CB) zones, but prohibited in the Town Center (TC), Neighborhood Business (NB), Campus (C), and all Residential (R and RM) zones.

- Are there areas in the MB and CB zones where self-storage facilities would be inconsistent?** Based on the Comprehensive Plan, staff is suggesting that perhaps self-storage facilities should not be an allowed use in the Community Renewal Area (Shoreline Place), which is zoned MB. Based on the design standards in the North City Plan and the Comprehensive Plan, in general, staff is also recommending that the use should also be prohibited on corner lots in the MB and CB zones. In addition, it may be appropriate to prohibit the use in the Ridgecrest Community Business District, which is zoned CB and very small and somewhat unique. The larger North City Subarea has a fair amount of multi-family development, making it a desirable location for self-storage facilities, but direction in the North City Subarea Plan speaks to areas where self-storage facilities may not be consistent. A Councilmember also suggested that if the City prohibits self-storage facilities in Town Center Subarea, perhaps they should extend the boundaries to the north and south. However, this approach would require a longer process that involves a Comprehensive Plan amendment, which can only be considered once a year.
- How many self-storage facilities would be considered too many?** With the six proposed projects, as well as the two permitted and five existing facilities, there would be thousands of units and 100s of thousands of square feet of storage. Given that the current need is estimated to be 10 square feet per capita and the City's population is 54,000, this large amount of storage space does not add up. Following the City Council meeting where the moratorium was established, staff obtained a map identifying the location of existing self-storage facilities in Puget Sound. As per the map, the density of self-storage facilities in Shoreline, even with the current proposals, is not much different than other cities along the Interstate 5 Corridor. Staff also prepared a map to illustrate the 3-mile radius that would be served by each of the existing and proposed facilities. The self-storage facility industry is attracted to Shoreline because there are fewer facilities in the surrounding communities. Prices are higher as a result of the limited supply, and often there are only large spaces available in facilities that are near capacity.
- Should the City be selective on the location of self-storage facilities and should a buffer be required?** One way to prevent an overconcentration of self-storage facilities is to apply a no-build zone between facilities. A map was provided to illustrate what a 500-foot buffer from existing facilities would look like.
- How can the City prevent the development of a disproportionate number of self-storage facilities in the community, thus allowing self-storage facilities to usurp a large amount of the area available for other commercial uses?** One idea is to require that retail commercial space on the ground floor must be retail. This would activate street level use of the site, create jobs and provide opportunities for goods and services. However, just because the retail commercial space is developed there is no guarantee that it will be rented any time soon. Some of the sites in the MB and CB zones may not be suited for active retail/service uses, and perhaps their best use is something more like a self-storage facility. It was also pointed out that there could be vehicular conflicts between self-storage facility users and retail/service customers. Access to the self-storage facility should remain separate from the access for pedestrian retail customers. Examples were provided of various styles of self-storage facilities, ranging from the old-building style to the newer, more contemporary style. Drawings of one of the proposed new facilities was also provided, noting that

the design would be more contemporary in nature. It was discussed that the old-building style is typically used in areas where land is more plentiful, and the more contemporary styles are used in urban locations. The contemporary design would be consistent with the types of buildings the City would permit in the commercial zones based on the commercial design standards.

Director Markle suggested that design standards should be adopted if the Commission recommends that self-storage facilities should be permitted in some zones within the City. For example:

- Concern about single-level, sprawling development could be addressed by requiring multi-story buildings.
- Concern about outdoor storage of boats, recreational vehicles, pods, etc. could be addressed by prohibiting outdoor storage.
- Concern about multiple garage doors visible to the public could be addressed by requiring internal access.
- Concern about large, blank walls, such as prefabricated warehouses and big boxy buildings, could be addressed by requiring glazing on all floors, as well as wall length maximums and façade and roofline variation.
- Concern about materials and colors not being complimentary could be addressed by requiring specific materials and muted tones.

Director Markle advised that a public hearing on the proposed amendments is scheduled for November 3rd, and the Commission's recommendation will be presented to the City Council at a study session on November 28th. It is anticipated that the City Council will conduct a public hearing and take final action on December 12th.

Director Markle invited the Commissioners to share their additional ideas and identify any additional information needed to move forward with the public hearing on November 3rd. She specifically asked the Commissioners to provide direction on whether self-storage facilities should be permitted or prohibited. If permitted, what additional conditions or standards should apply?

Public Comment

Randall Olsen, Cairncross and Hempelmann, Seattle, said he was present to represent Sherry Development, the applicant of a project planned at 14533 Bothell Way NE (a few parcels north of NE 145th Street and Bothell Way). The site is currently developed as a restaurant and large parking lot and is located across the street from Rick's, which is a strip club. An existing self-storage facility is located immediately south of the proposed project. He asked the Commission to consider recommending an option that would allow for self-storage facilities in the CB zone and not prohibit them from being located next to each other. He commented that one strategy that other jurisdictions use is to find specific locations (or nodes) where the uses can be concentrated, typically at the edge of cities and outside of the town center areas. This approach would allow access to the facilities for everyone in the City to use without resulting in a concentration of the use in areas where more walkability is desired. He voiced support for allowing self-storage facilities to locate in the MB and CB zones. He noted that he submitted a letter that provides more detail about his points and specifically about how a self-storage facility in the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea would meet the policies in the subarea plan.

Holly Golden, Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson P.S., Seattle, said she was present to represent Lake Union Partner's on a proposed project at 19237 Aurora Avenue North (just north of 192nd Street on Aurora Avenue). Currently, the site is undeveloped and is used as a dumping ground. The site is steep and narrow, and self-storage is its only viable use. She referred to a comment letter that she submitted at the end of August and specifically noted the following points about why a self-storage facility would be appropriate at the site based on the City's Development Code and Comprehensive Plan. She explained that, under the City's Development Code, the site is zoned MB, which supports a mixture of residential and commercial growth that is essential infrastructure for any new apartments and businesses. Under the City's Comprehensive Plan, the site is designated as Mixed Use 1 (MU1), which allows the most intense uses and encourages a mix of uses. The site is outside of the Town Center Subarea and is located on Aurora Avenue North. The property is not considered a corner lot or a gateway to the City. It is currently underutilized and the sites to the north and south have the same designation. She summarized that self-storage in the proposed location would also be consistent with Comprehensive Plan goals related to encouraging a mix of businesses that complement each other, creating economic momentum, and redeveloping underused parcels.

Ms. Golden noted that Options 1 and 2, which are outlined in the original Staff Report, would allow self-storage at this location, and her client would support either one. Option 1 would be more limited, as it would only allow self-storage facilities on MU1 sites, which are busy corridors like Aurora Avenue North and outside of town center. Her client supports a reasonable limit on the use. Option 3 would only allow self-storage facilities as accessory uses, and it would be limited to 30% of the use of the building. This option would not work at the 19237 location because no other uses are appropriate there. She summarized that the proposed project meets a lot of the supplemental index criteria guidelines that are outlined in the Staff Report and discussed as part of Director Markle's presentation. For example, it is not a corner lot, the building would be multi-story, it would be located outside of the community renewal area, it would be respectful of the adjacent neighbors, and it is a good design with high-quality materials. However, some of the standards on the list would be burdensome enough to kill the project. For example, the requirement of retail space on the lower level or the 50% glazing standard would basically be a de facto prohibition on the use.

Ms. Golden concluded her comments by stating that self-storage facilities should be allowed at 19237 Aurora Avenue North, which is located in the MB zone with a MU1 Comprehensive Plan designation. The project is supported by adopted City policies and it would be good for both residential and commercial growth in Shoreline. Her client supports either Option 1 or Option 2, which would both allow the use on the subject site.

Scott Roberts, Lake Union Partners, Seattle, said he is one of the owners and developers of the property at 19237 Aurora Avenue North. He provided a rendering, which was also included in the Staff Report, that demonstrates the contemporary design of the proposed project. He voiced concern about some of the design standards recommended by staff. He explained that his firm does mostly multi-family apartment development in the Puget Sound, Portland, Denver and Salt Lake City areas. The current trend is that units are getting smaller and smaller (average of between 500 and 650 square feet), and there is not a lot of storage space. Even with the smaller units, development is not keeping up with population growth and there is a housing crisis. The storage facilities are very important to people who

live in small apartments in urban areas. He encouraged the Commission to leave flexibility in the design standards because many of the sites are left-over sites, with odd configurations that prevent them from being developed into things the community would like to see. Retail and residential uses get higher rents, and good sites are developed as such. The self-storage facilities are typically built on unique properties that are not conducive to other types of development. That means that the projects have to be “shoe-horned” in. Perhaps design standards should be applied on a case-by-case basis. He noted that the property at 19237 Aurora Avenue North is extremely steep and has a strange shape, and the curb cut is difficult, as well. Mr. Roberts voiced particular concerns about the following proposed design standards:

- **The requirement for retail space on the ground floor.** Retail uses would conflict with the storage use, given that space is needed for large trucks that are used to load and unload the units. Also, requiring retail space would confuse the use. The marketability of self-storage facilities is very sensitive and competitive, and the facilities need to be easily identifiable to passersby.
- **The requirement that the design emulate office development or some other retail use.** There has been a lot of advance in the design and marketability of self-storage facilities. They are more attractive, function well and serve a needed purpose in the community. Trying to clad them into something that tricks the public into thinking they are not storage is probably not the best approach.
- **The requirement that 50% of the façade be glazed.** Given that many of the sites that are developed as self-storage are odd shaped and unique, requiring 50% glazing could result in windows in odd places. A glazing requirement should be applied on a case-by-case basis.
- **The requirements for specific cladding materials.** This requirement seems odd and a bit inequitable because all of the materials that would be prohibited on storage facilities are actually acceptable materials in the City’s commercial development standards. This may be a case of prejudicing one use over another.
- **The requirement that truck loading docks not face residential development or the street front.** This should also be decided on a case-by-case basis. The requirement would end up prohibiting his proposed project. Because the site is so narrow and steep, there is no way to load the building without a loading dock facing north, which is parallel to the street.

Rodger Ricks, Cascade Investment Properties, LLC, Redmond, said he is the developer of the proposed project at 20029 – 19th Avenue Northeast. He said he provided written comments that were included in the Staff Report. He said he appreciates the City’s process of trying to understanding issues surrounding self-storage facilities. Many communities do not allow them, and their residents have to use nearby communities as a closet. He appreciates that the City is trying to provide for the needs of its citizens. Mr. Ricks said the three-mile radius is really the outside of the range, and 85% of the clients actually come from a two-mile radius. Sometimes, drive times are more accurate assessment, and his letter provides a drive map that displays the market area. He said it is important that self-storage facilities are distributed throughout the community in an equitable fashion. They should be close enough so that residents do not have to drive all over the community to access storage opportunities.

Mr. Ricks said he opposes a buffer requirement and believes that self-storage facilities should be allowed to locate adjacent to each other or within close proximity to each other. Sometimes people like to be able to do comparison shopping of nearby facilities. He said he is also opposed to requiring retail commercial space on the ground floor, and he agreed about the dangers of mixing pedestrian traffic associated with retail uses with truck traffic associated with the self-storage use. In addition, he is concerned about the proposed glazing requirement. Glazing is costly and reduces the efficiency of the building. They try to put windows on the end of each isle so that natural light can flow through the building. They also like to provide windows on the street façade.

Mr. Ricks referred to the Staff Report, which suggests a 150-foot building length. He supports Mr. Roberts' earlier comment that self-storage facilities are often developed on odd-shaped lots, and the parcel he is proposing to develop has been vacant for more than 20 years. That means it has not added to the tax base in any significant way. The lot is odd shaped and will not work for retail development. The 150-foot limit would severely limit the execution of a viable design. He said he would prefer Option 2, which is most equitable. Option 3 would be too limiting and not viable. It is important that the facilities have dedicated management and security, as well as all of the access amenities that are provided in the new generation of self-storage facilities. These services will not be possible if they are developed as accessory to some other type of commercial development.

Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline, said that, as a user, she is sympathetic to the self-storage industry. She voiced concern that the City not develop regulations that are difficult to use. Now that her property has been upzoned, she would like to sell it. She does not want to be told at some point in the future that she cannot get top dollar for her property because developers and businesses would rather go to jurisdictions where it is easier to do business. She encouraged the Commission to develop regulations that are easy to understand and business friendly.

Dave Lange, Shoreline, said he would like self-storage facilities to be limited to primarily arterial streets. He likes the idea of having two or three clustered together, as that would not impact the general neighborhoods. If self-storage facilities are allowed in the Mixed Use Residential (MUR) zones, then retail uses should be required on the ground floor to increase the walkability and participation of the building within the neighborhoods.

Greg Elmore, Seattle, commented that self-storage is an essential service, and there is definitely a demand for the product. He said he is a proponent for property at 16750 Aurora Avenue North and has invested heavily in advanced development of a self-storage facility. He is also an urbanist and architect, and many of the City's achievements are remarkably commendable, such as undergrounding of powerlines and improving the streetscape environment for pedestrians. He encouraged the Commission to consider many of the recommendations put forward by Director Markle in terms of design standards, adjacency, corner lots, relationships to park and rides, and the pedestrian environment of the Town Center area.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Moss-Thomas requested background information on the recommendation that self-storage facilities only be allowed as accessory uses. She also requested background on the 50% glazing

requirement and the 150-foot length limit. Director Markle said the accessory use requirement comes from the City's existing code. Currently, self-storage is only regulated as an outright use in the MUR-45' and MUR-70' zones. The newly adopted 185th Street Station Subarea Plan addresses the concept of allowing mini storage to be included as part of a large mixed-use development. However, the storage space would be limited to 30% of the total use and would require a conditional use permit.

Director Markle said the glazing requirement and the building length limit came from the City of Lynnwood's code, which is the most heavily regulated example staff found in their research. She referred to the earlier comment that the City's existing standards do not even limit building materials for commercial development to the level that has been suggested for self-storage facilities. She explained that the idea came from the City of Lynnwood's code, as well, and some matching would need to be done. The façade length is another area where they would have to match what is being proposed with the existing code. The requirement of 50% glazing would allow for a different type of look other than blank walls that have little interest to the pedestrian.

Commissioner Chang recalled the previous comment that self-storage facilities are often located on odd-shaped lots that are not conducive to other types of development. She observed that many are also developed on fairly flat lots that could have been developed as multi-family residential with retail instead. Director Markle commented that the developers are the ones who have done due diligence in determining what is most feasible for their lots. She suggested it is likely a matter of interpretation and a number of factors related to a developer's personal investment. Perhaps the representatives could provide more input as to why some of the sites are not well suited. Chair Craft said profit is the bottom line, and there is clearly a cost benefit to building one type of development over another. While he recognized there are some unique lots that are not conducive for residential and retail development, self-storage facilities have good profit margins compared to the building costs.

Commissioner Chang asked how self-storage development fits within the City's vision. Director Markle said self-storage is not specifically addressed in the City's vision, with the exception of some of the subarea plans that describe the types of uses and environment that are desired. For example, the use clearly does not fit in the Town Center Subarea or the Community Renewal Area. Also, the North City Subarea Plan specifically prohibits the use in some locations. The Comprehensive Plan appears to support the use within the MB zones that do not have special designations, and there are no specific restrictions. In general, it is known that Shoreline has a job deficit, and the MB zone is where new jobs could be created. It could be determined that self-storage facilities do not provide a large number of jobs, and are therefore, are not part of the vision.

Commissioner Mork asked how many total square feet of self-storage space would be available in Shoreline if all of the proposed facilities are constructed. Director Markle said that, as a rule of thumb, the non-Costco variety of self-storage averages about 100,000 square feet, but not all of that space would be useable. If all six were built at this level, it would add 600,000 square feet of storage to what already exists, as well as the two projects that have been permitted. Commissioner Mork concluded that this amount of storage space would be well in excess of the estimated 6 to 10 square feet of storage space that is needed per person. Director Markle agreed and noted that the facility would also serve the residents of neighboring jurisdictions.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she also uses self-storage, and she was amazed at how costly self-storage is and how hard it is to find. As residential units get smaller and people age and move from their larger homes, there will be a greater demand for self-storage space. She commented that it is very important that the City have consistent development standards for the various commercial uses. She questioned the need to call out self-storage as something different than other types of commercial uses, but agreed that aesthetics must be considered as part of any type of development proposal to ensure that the buildings blend well with the community. She referred to a relatively new self-storage facility on Aurora Avenue in Lynnwood that has a significant amount of glazing and questioned whether a glazing requirement would accomplish the City's goal relative to aesthetics. Other design tools may be more useful. With the exception of the MUR zone, she said she does not support a requirement of retail on the ground floor. She voiced concern that self-storage and retail are not congruent uses, and requiring retail as part of a self-storage facility could result in a lot of vacant storefronts. Having a dedicated security perimeter is important to people who use self-storage facilities, and retail customers coming and going could raise issues when determining who belongs at the facility and who does not.

Director Markle summarized that, as per the Commission's discussion, the amendments put forward for the public hearing would allow self-storage facilities in the MB and CB zones. Staff would revise the proposed list of design standards based on the public testimony and Commission's discussion and to match up better with the existing design standards. As currently recommended by staff, the use would also be prohibited on corner lots, within the Community Renewal Area, etc. The buffer requirement would be carried forward for public comment at the hearing, as well.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle reviewed that at their recent retreat, the Commission talked about including an update on "development in Shoreline" as a standing item on the Commission's agenda on a monthly basis. She provided a copy of the written report she provides to the City Manager each month to identify new applications and said she can also provide a mapping component in the future to identify the location of the projects. She reviewed the status of the various projects included in the report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Revision to ByLaws

Chair Craft recalled that the Commission reviewed its bylaws at their recent retreat. They specifically discussed Section 4, which states that "*The clerk shall record and retain, by electronic means, each meeting for the official record and shall prepare summary minutes for the Commission, maintain official records and post agendas.*" It was suggested that including "by electronic means" might be too onerous, given the Commission's work and the inability to record some meetings that are held off site, such as field trip visits. The recommendation was to remove the clause.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE SECTION 4 OF ARTICLE III OF THE COMMISSION'S BYLAWS BE AMENDED BY STRIKING "BY ELECTRONIC MEANS." COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the October 20th Commission Meeting agenda will include a public hearing on code amendments related to transitional encampments and a study session on 2016 Development Code Amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Easton Craft
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission