

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

November 17, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Craft
Commissioner Chang
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development
Julie Ainsworth Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Kendra Dedinski, Traffic Engineer
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Montero

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, Malek, Mork and Thomas. Vice Chair Montero was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 3, 2016 were adopted as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Chair Craft reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Cohen reviewed that the public hearing is on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan amendments. He explained that the State's Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to no more than once a year. To ensure the public can view the proposals within a citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket (or list) of amendments that may be considered each year. The City Council set the final docket in June, with 8 amendments (3 privately-initiated and 5 city-initiated). He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** would amend Land Use Policy LU-47, which considers annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the southern border of the City. This amendment was also on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket and was bumped to 2016. The City is currently engaged in the 145th Street Corridor Study and is working towards annexation of 145th Street. Staff is recommending that the amendment be placed on the 2017 docket to be more in line with these other projects.
- **Amendment 2** is consideration of amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and has also been on the City's docket for a while. The City anticipated that the Transportation Corridor Study on mitigating adverse impacts from the BSRE's proposed development of Point Wells would be completed in 2016. However, delays in Snohomish County's review of the BSRE's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) have delayed the City's review of the DEIS and the completion of the Traffic Corridor Study as described in Subarea Plan Policy PW-12. Staff is recommending that this same Comprehensive Plan amendment be docketed for 2017.
- **Amendment 3** would amend the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan to add goals and policies to the Parks Element of the Comprehensive Plan based on policies identified in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. The City, through analysis contained in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 185th Street Station, has identified a need for more parks, recreation and open space. The City will work with the Parks Board and the community to determine the process of locating new park space within the subarea, establishing a means to fund new park spaces (i.e. park impact fees), determining a ratio of park space per new resident in the subarea, and any other park issues that arises during the public process. Staff is recommending that this amendment be carried over to the 2017 docket, with the understanding that the updated PROS Plan will most likely be adopted in 2017.
- **Amendment 4** would amend Transportation Policy T-44 by adding a Volume Over Capacity (V/C) Ratio for Collector Arterial Streets. The amendment was privately initiated and was carried over from the 2015 docket. The City Council directed staff to study the proposed amendment as part of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update, which has not yet begun. Staff has reviewed the proposal in consideration of existing TMP modeling efforts. Staff believes that expanding the .90 V/C standard to apply to the collector arterials would have current and future implications and

require growth projects to address deficiencies in our transportation impact fee structure. Staff is not recommending approval of the amendment.

- **Amendment 5** would clean up Land Use Policies LU-63, LU-64, LU-65, LU-66 and LU-67. These all reference outdated King County countywide planning policies. Policy FW-32 (establish a countywide process for siting essential public facilities) and SI-1 (consideration of alternative siting strategies) are no longer in the Countywide policies. The amendments also correct references to policy numbers that have changed.
- **Amendment 6** is a privately-initiated amendment that would amend Point Wells Subarea Plan Policy PW-12 by adding the following language, *“As a separate limitation in addition to the foregoing, the maximum number of new vehicle trips a day entering the City’s road network from/to Point Wells shall not exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road west of 8th Avenue NW under the City’s .90 V/C standard based on Richmond Beach Road being a 3-lane road (the .90 V/C standard may not be exceeded at any location west of 8th Avenue NW along Richmond Beach Road.”* Staff does not support the amendment, as it is already addressed by the City’s Level of Service (LOS) Standards. While the applicant has pointed out it is not staff’s place to recommend changes to the proposed amendment, the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes a project to restripe Richmond Beach Road in this segment from four lanes to three. This would be the future roadway configuration, which would limit capacity more than it is today. Therefore, the capacity is driven by the future CIP.
- **Amendment 7** would amend the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan to move policies related to the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, amend the text, and amend the borders of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan to fit with the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan.
- **Amendment 8** would add a new Point Wells Subarea Plan Policy adopting a V/C ratio of 0.65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street. This privately-initiated amendment would add a new policy to the implementation section of the Point Wells Subarea Plan. The City Council discussed the merits of the amendment at their June 13, 2016 meeting and agreed that the amendment would provide the community assurance that the City will study a V/C ratio of .65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive north of NW 196th Street and would not exceed .90 on Richmond Beach Road measured at any point west of 8th Avenue. Staff supports the language in the proposed amendment and believes the supplemental LOS Standard provides an appropriate limit for the street in consideration of the existing neighborhood and future growth at the Point Wells site.

Mr. Cohen summarized that staff’s overall recommendation is to carry Amendments 1, 2 and 3 over to the 2017 docket, approve Amendments 5, 7 and 8, and deny Amendments 4 and 6.

Commissioner Malek asked if Amendment 8 addresses what is in Amendment 6 by limiting the V/C ratio. Ms. Dedinski answered that the language in Amendment 6 is duplicated in Amendment 8. Staff’s recommendation is to approve Amendment 8, which would make Amendment 6 unnecessary.

Commissioner Malek requested clarification about staff’s concerns relative to the potential wide-range implications of Amendment 4. Ms. Dedinski explained that the V/C Ratio, if expanded to collector

arterials as proposed in the amendment, would have widespread citywide implications. Based on the current model contained in the 2011 TMP, the amendment would result in failures for collector arterials in the City already. That means the City would have to add growth projects into its current transportation impact fee structure, and this would increase the cost of trips to developers. It would also require that the City be on the hook for improving the roadways, which ultimately means expanding the roadways. Expansion might not be the vision of the neighborhood. The better way to address the issue is when the TMP is updated in 2017. Especially when dealing with the subarea plans, the City needs to take a hard look at how collector arterial are addressed as the nature of the roadways are going to change as development occurs in the subareas.

Chair Craft clarified that some of the issues that would have to be taken into consideration now would include addressing the capacity on the collector arterials, meaning that the streets would likely have to be widened to increase the opportunity for capacity. Ms. Dedinski agreed. For example, the projected traffic model shows that the V/C Ratio is over .90 on Fremont Avenue N, so it would be necessary to add one or two lanes to address the capacity issue. That might not be what the neighborhood wants. It is a collector arterial, and is not intended to encourage more traffic.

Commissioner Malek asked how neighborhoods can reconcile their opposition to wider roadways with increased density. He asked about the costs of mitigating the impacts of increased density. Ms. Dedinski said she does not have the ability to provide specific cost information. However, widening a roadway, while still providing the standard sidewalks, etc., would likely require some costly right-of-way acquisition. At this point, staff does not have enough background information to make that type of decision.

Commissioner Malek summarized that the City's proposal is to move forward with an update of the TMP, and the information contained in the updated TMP will be used to address the overall picture. Ms. Dedinski explained that the work done in 2011 was a great start at addressing LOS Standard issues, and the Transportation Impact Fee Program is relatively new for the City. There is an opportunity for refinement when the TMP, modeling and traffic analysis are revisited in 2017.

Chair Craft said he appreciates the City's deliberate and holistic approach of looking at the issue in a broader citywide scenario. This will allow the issues to be addressed in an order that would be predictable and recognizable for the community. The community would have an opportunity to have significant input and discussion. The proposed amendment jumps ahead without the appropriate public input and notification, as well as the City's analysis. Ms. Dedinski agreed and added that the focus of staff's recommendation on Amendment 8 is to get at the heart of the specific and unique issues that Richmond Beach is facing without having the wider implications.

Commissioner Thomas referred to Amendment 8 and asked if adopting the .65 V/C Ratio has already been assessed or if it is something that requires further study. Ms. Dedinski said Amendment 8 was proposed in 2015, and it was studied based on direction from the City Council.

Commissioner Mork noted that Amendment 3 calls for exploring the possibility of a park impact fee or dedication program. She asked if a park impact fee that is adopted in 2017 would have to wait until 2018 to be implemented if Amendment 3 is postponed until 2017. Ms. Dedinski answered that park

impact fees are already being considered as part of the PROS Plan update and will be on the 2017 docket for approval. The Park impact fee is outside of the Comprehensive Plan and can be adopted at any time. Commissioner Mork questioned the need for Amendment 3. Mr. Cohen said the recommendation to defer is to make the amendment more applicable or apparent that the policy would be addressed as part of the PROS Plan update. The Parks Department does not necessarily disagree with the amendment, but they believe it is premature. Commissioner Mork asked if there is a downside to approving the amendment in 2016. Mr. Cohen referred to the Parks Department comments that words such as “explore” are pretty soft at this point. Although they are recommending that the amendment be deferred to 2017, staff would not be opposed to its approval in 2016.

Commissioner Mork expressed concern that the City start down the path as soon as possible on acquiring additional park land, etc. Postponing the amendment sends the message that the City is “sitting on its hands.” Chair Craft said he supports the Parks Department’s belief that the issues outlined in the amendment would be studied as part of the PROS Plan update and the recommendation would proceed under a more comprehensive look at parks. On the other hand, the language in Amendment 3 is sufficiently benign. It makes the point without prescribing specific actions to take place. Mr. Cohen explained that the policy and the PROS Plan will be linked together. If the PROS Plan update was not scheduled in the near future, it might be more important to adopt the amendment sooner rather than later.

Commissioner Maul summarized that, if Amendment 3 is adopted, the PROS Plan would address how the issues in Amendment 3 would be solve. Commissioner Thomas commented that adopting the amendment would identify specific things that need to be addressed in the PROS Plan. Perhaps this would send a stronger message that the issues are important.

Commissioner Chang referred to Amendment 2 and voiced concern that the proposed language anticipates that the vehicle trips per day on Richmond Beach Road would increase. She questioned if that is the direction the City wants to head. She suggested they should hold onto the 4,000-trip maximum for future negotiations. Commissioner Malek agreed that the amendment appears to skip ahead to a presumption that traffic volumes will increase. Director Markle said it is important to remember that the City has its own subarea plan for Point Wells that anticipates the property will develop, but to a lesser degree than what is proposed in Snohomish County. Through that redevelopment, they would expect the number of trips to increase, as well. Ms. Dedinski said the idea is to account for some level of trips given the current planned annexation area. Commissioner Thomas said staff’s recommendation would simply move the amendment to the next calendar year because it is not going to be resolved in 2016 anyway.

Commissioner Maul noted that the Comprehensive Plan already identifies a 4,000-trip maximum. Commissioner Malek recalled public comments that the City already raised the maximum trip limit to 4,000, and concern was raised that the limits would increase even more. Ms. Dedinski said the limit on the street will remain capped at 4,000 trips until there is a completed and agreed-upon transportation corridor study from the developer. Commissioner Malek recalled that, at one time, there was a suggestion that substantially more trips be allowed, and the final agreement was 4,000. Any movement in the cap would be disconcerting. Ms. Dedinski advised that the initial traffic study the City conducted with consultants had an average daily volume limit of about 8,250, recognizing other infrastructure

limitations. Commissioner Thomas recalled that the way the street was classified resulted in a daily volume limit of 8,250. At that time, there was concern that something specific had to be done to reduce the number, and an emergency meeting was held to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Chang questioned what the number would be with the 3-lane configuration, and said she is concerned that the City is already talking about increasing the volume when annexation is not going to happen anytime soon. Ms. Dedinski said the thought is that the amendment could be carried over into 2017 since there is nothing to suggest anything would be approved in the next year.

Commissioner Malek asked about the status of the Traffic Corridor Analysis from BSRE. Ms. Dedinski answered that the analysis is indefinitely on hold. She recalled that the developer was asked to revise his project submittal. Commissioner Maul asked if 8,250 is what full build out of Point Wells would produce. Ms. Dedinski answered that when the Point Wells Subarea Plan was put together nearly a decade ago, the City studied what the maximum trips coming from the site would be before infrastructure failures occurred along the corridor as a result of development. Given the current configuration, the road capacity was identified as 8,250. If the street were redesigned to 3 lanes, the directional capacity would be 960 vehicles per hour. Generally, when talking about capacity, it is an hourly volume rather than an average daily traffic volume, which is what most of the references in the documents speak to. Typically, the peak-hour volume is about 8% to 12% of the daily volume. The capacity of a 3-lane configuration would be inherently lower than with a 4-lane configuration.

Public Testimony

There were no public comments.

Commission Deliberation and Action

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Thomas summarized that a lot of study has been done by staff, and the Commission has reviewed the amendments a number of times.

COMMISSIONER MORK MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO SEND AMENDMENT 3 FORWARD AS PART OF THE 2016 DOCKET AS OPPOSED TO POSTPONING IT TO THE 2017 DOCKET. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mork commented that it is very important to send a message to the Shoreline residents and the City Council that the Commission is very interested in parks.

THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO ALTER THE LANGUAGE IN AMENDMENT 5 BY ADDING THE WORD “ADDITIONAL” BETWEEN “AND” AND “CRITERIA.” COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Thomas reviewed that, as currently proposed, the language in LU-63 refers to LU-65 and the language in LU-65 refers to LU-63. The proposed amendment would make it clear that the criteria in LU-63 and LU-65 would both apply.

Chair Craft asked if the proposed amendment would materially change the intent of the language. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor indicated she does not see a problem with the proposed amendment. It simply makes it clearer that the criteria in both LU-63 and LU-65 must be considered.

THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE THE LANGUAGE IN LU-65 OF AMENDMENT 5 TO READ, “USE THIS SITING PROCESS TO SITE THE ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES THAT MEET THE CRITERIA IN LU-63.” COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Thomas expressed her belief that the word “interim” was included in the language as an oversight, since this is no longer an interim process. Mr. Cohen voiced support for the proposed amendment, which is intended to clarify the policy.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Chang asked members of the Point Wells Subcommittee to comment on Amendment 2. Commissioner Malek said he supports the staff’s recommendation that the amendment be moved to 2017 for further study. However, he shares Commissioner Chang’s concern that the language assumes an increase in traffic.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE AMENDMENT 2 BY REPLACING THE WORD “INCREASING” WITH “OF.” COMMISSIONER CHANG SECONDED THE MOTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Commissioner Maul reminded the Commission that staff is recommending that Amendment 2 be forwarded to the 2017 docket. Therefore, he questioned if changing the language would really be necessary at this time. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor clarified that, if the amendment is accepted by the City Council, the amended language would be forwarded to the 2017 docket.

Commissioner Malek agreed with Commissioner Chang’s concern about including language that implies an increase in the number of trips. The idea of the study is to determine a number of plus or minus.

Commissioner Mork asked if “trips” is a weird nomenclature for how traffic planners normally think about traffic. Ms. Dedinski agreed it is unique. Commissioner Mork asked if this is an opportunity to try and put it in the correct units. Ms. Dedinski answered that it is okay as it is, but that is essentially

why staff is recommending the supplemental LOS of .65 for Richmond Beach Drive. It adds an extra measure, as well as being consistent with the GMA provisions.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Chair Craft closed the public hearing.

STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 20TH MEETING

Staff Presentation

Mr. Cohen recalled that the Commission had a study session on the 2016 Development Code amendments on September 15th and requested additional information on two of them (Amendments 5 and 13). Staff is now proposing five additional Development Code amendments and two Municipal Code amendments. The purpose of the study session is to allow staff to respond to the questions and concerns that were raised at the September 15th meeting, introduce the new amendments, and gather public comment. He reviewed the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 13.** The Commission pulled Amendment 13 from the general batch. Amendments related to self-service storage facilities are now included as a separate batch of amendments, for which the Commission held a study session on October 6th and a public hearing on November 3rd.
- **Amendment 5.** The Commissioners raised questions about Amendment 5, which pertains to unit lot development. To address the Commission's concerns, Ray Allshouse, the City's Building Official explained that the City's current fire code requirements include a provision that any new building that is greater than 4,800 square feet must be sprinkled and there are no exceptions. He also explained that there are provisions in the model residential building code that lay out specific requirements for separation walls and the proposed amendment would not reduce these requirements in any way, shape or form. Lastly, he advised that because the lateral dimensions of a unit lot development would be greater, it would be more resistive to lateral forces.
- **New Amendment 2.** This amendment would add the term "Non-Vegetated Surface" to the Impervious Surface Definition. This is one of four amendments recommended by the Department of Ecology (DOE) to incorporate Low-Impact Development (LID) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the Development Code.
- **New Amendment 7.** This amendment is intended to address the expiration of the vested status for land use permits and approvals. It adds an exception to vesting timelines for Special Use Permits (SUPs) granted to public agencies, which includes Sound Transit. He explained that a time limit on a project that may go on for ten or more years needs to be addressed so the applicant does not have to come back to the Hearing Examiner for additional SUPs.

- **New Amendment 10.** This amendment also addresses the SUP. It increases the vesting period for SUPs issued to public agencies because of the long development timelines for projects. As written, a public agency can request a modification to the SUPs expiration provisions allowing for vesting of the SUP for a period of up to five years from the date of the Hearing Examiner approval; or if the SUP provides for phased development, for a period up to 10 years from the date of the Hearing Examiner approval.
- **New Amendment 9.** This amendment would simply change “Director” to “Director of Public Works” for approval of a Deviation from Engineering Standards applications. He explained that Public Works is the department that processes and approves these deviations.
- **New Amendment 25.** This amendment fixes the dimensional requirements for Mixed Use Residential (MUR) Zones. He explained that front yard setbacks in the MUR-70’ Zone differ, depending on what kind of street they are located on. This minor amendment would strike “up to” in the front setback standards. These words create confusion because Exception 14, which accompanies the table, states that, *“The exact setback along 145th and 185th Streets, up to the maximum described, will be determined by the Public Works Department through a development application.”*
- **New Amendment 1.** This amendment would delete SMC 16.10, which is the Shoreline Management Plan. The City adopted a new Shoreline Master Program in 2012, and it is part of the Development Code that replaces SMC 16.10.
- **New Amendment 2.** This amendment would strike SMC 16.20, which is the fee schedule. The City lists all of its fees in SMC 3.01, making SMC 16.20 redundant and unnecessary.

Mr. Cohen summarized that there is a total of 37 proposed Development Code amendments and two Municipal Code Amendments. A public hearing on the entire batch of code amendments is scheduled for December 1, 2016.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Markle advised that staff recently started the practice of providing a monthly update on what is new in development permitting. She distributed copies of the report that was shared with the City Manager for the month of October. She explained that the report lists the applications the City received in October for significant projects. She reviewed the list as follows:

- **Ground Evolution.** The application is for five row houses located at 1620 – 185th Street within the 185th Street Station Subarea.

- Self-Storage Facility. The application is for a heated storage facility on 165th Street. This is one of the two that were permitted before the moratorium was put in place. A permit has now been issued.
- Anderson House and Anderson Plaza. The application is for a substantial remodel of a residential care facility and nursing home. The project was approved in September, but the applicant has not picked up the permit yet.
- Public Health Lab. The application is for remodel work at the Public Health Lab.
- Potalla. The application is for redevelopment of the Denny's Triangle site by Shoreline Place on Aurora Avenue North and Westminster Avenue. The proposal is for 309 units in a 2 to 5-story development. The receiver is looking for a buyer to purchase the site. Staff continues to review the building permit in hopes that a buyer will come forward.
- RLD Aurora Square. The application is for a 6-story, 160-unit development, with some retail. The permit is still under review.
- Shoreline Multi Family. The application is for a project on 10th Avenue, within the 185th Street Station Subarea. Staff is currently waiting for the applicant to respond to their corrections. The applicant has until February to submit revisions or the permit will expire. Currently, the applicant is having difficulty obtaining financing because the first two floors are proposed as storage, as there is not enough room for parking to accommodate more residential units. The City denied the applicant's request for a parking reduction. A parking reduction cannot be granted until the station has been built.
- Vision House. The application is for an expansion of the existing project.
- Arrabella 2. This application is for a reduced number of units (81). The applicant had some issues with property lines.
- City Project. The City has submitted permits to construct a third floor on the police station.
- Single-Family Residents. The application is for redevelopment of a property in the Highlands, which happened to have a substantial valuation.
- Sound Transit. The City has officially started the permitted process with Sound Transit for the Lynnwood Link extension. A pre-application meeting was held for the Special Use Permit (SUP).
- 2-Story Office Warehouse Facility. This project is proposed for the Ballinger area.

Director Markle reported that Sound Transit conducted an open house for the 30%-in-progress designs for the station on November 16th. For those who were unable to attend, the materials from the presentation can be viewed at www.lynnwoodlink.participate.online.com. There were a number of great photographic design images for the public to view and get a feel for the station design. Mr. Cohen

added that there would be a few more community meetings on the station design as Sound Transit gets to higher percentages of completion. These additional meeting dates will be announced at a later date.

Mr. Cohen provided copies of the Commission's draft letter to the City Council. He noted that it needs to be finalized and signed so it can be forwarded to the City Council in preparation for their joint meeting with on November 28th. Staff has not received any comments from Commissioners to date. However, the draft was updated to identify three topics the Commission wanted to emphasize.

Commissioner Thomas recalled that, at their last meeting, the Commission agreed that the proposed amendments relative to Transitional Homeless Encampments should be an item of discussion at the joint meeting. Mr. Cohen reported that staff is planning to come back to the Commission on December 16 with alternative code language based on the comments that were received at the public hearing. However, the amendments would not be presented to the City Council until after the first of the year.

Commissioner Malek suggested that the letter should be updated to make the point that the Commission would like to reconsider cottage housing as part of an approved zoning option as they work with staff to update the single and multi-family development standards. Chair Craft felt that more general language is appropriate, since the Commission has not reached a consensus relative to cottage housing. As drafted, the letter brings it to the City Council's attention as one option to consider when updating the single and multi-family development standards. After further discussion, the Commission agreed that a separate bullet item should be added to indicate the Commission's desire to talk about the different types of housing, and cottage housing could be listed as an example.

Mr. Cohen agreed to update the letter and forward it to Chair Craft for a signature.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Thomas announced that she and Commissioner Mork attended the American Planning Conference in Portland, Oregon. They both participated in the walking tour of light rail developments going down to Milwaukee Street. It was very interesting to hear about the City's progress and approach and how they engaged the community and found developers to do the station area improvements.

Commissioner Mork reported that she attended Sound Transit's community meeting on November 16th. She commented that the City provided its own table, which was very well received. It was helpful to show the bicycle and pedestrian routes.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohen advised that a public hearing on the 2016 Development Code Amendments is scheduled for December 1st. The Deep Green amendments will also come back on December 1st for a public hearing. Ms. Basher reminded the Commissioners of their dinner meeting with the City Council on November 28th at 5:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Easton Craft
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission