

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 19, 2009
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Hall
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Kaje

Staff Present

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

Commissioners Absent

Chair Kuboi
Commissioner Perkowski
Commissioner Piro
Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Wagner

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Hall 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: Vice Chair Hall and Commissioners Broili, Behrens and Kaje. Chair Kuboi and Commissioners Perkowski, Piro, Pyle and Wagner were excused.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Cohn did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Kaje said he was surprised that the discussion regarding concurrency and level of service standards was left out of the March 5th minutes. He asked that the clerk listen to the audio recording and insert the additional verbiage. Changes were also noted for the February 26th minutes. It was agreed that the Commission would consider approval of both sets of minutes at their next meeting, when a quorum was present.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Leathan Wene, Shoreline, said he was present to address the closure of the Fircrest Pool, which was discussed in a recent article in *THE ENTERPRISE* newspaper. He said he has already notified the Governor's Office, as well as other elected officials. He encouraged the Commissioners to approach the Shoreline City Council, the State Legislature, and the Governor's Office, as well.

2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET

Vice Chair Hall recognized there was not a quorum of Commissioners present to conduct a formal public hearing. While the Commission could accept public comments regarding the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket, they could not take formal action. Therefore, the Commissioners would accept comments from the public and then offer their individual thoughts to advise the City Council regarding the amendments. Commissioner Kaje pointed out the Commission could also forward a recommendation to the City Council that a formal public hearing be conducted before the Planning Commission. It would be up to the City Council to make that decision.

Vice Chair Hall recalled that in prior years, the Planning Commission was not involved in the process of setting the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket. This new step was added in an effort to give the public more opportunity to become involved. Because a few of the amendments are time sensitive, the Commission should provide the City Council with their best input without a formal hearing. After the City Council takes action to set the docket, the amendments would come back before the Commission for a formal public hearing and recommendation to the City Council on the merits of each proposal.

Commissioner Behrens questioned the need for a staff presentation since the Commission would not be taking action. Vice Chair Hall expressed his belief that it would be appropriate to proceed through the staff presentation and public comment period before the Commissioners offer their opinions. However, he encouraged the staff to keep their report brief.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission and the public that the purpose of the docket is to create a list of amendments to be studied. It is not staff's intent to discuss whether or not the amendments have merit at this time. He explained that staff initiated two Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposals related to the visioning process and future development at Point Wells. He invited Mr. Szafran to review the amendments that were proposed by citizens as follows:

- **Suggested Amendment 1** – Mr. Szafran explained that this amendment would add definitions for the terms “compatibility” and “detriment” into the Comprehensive Plan. He recalled that at the last study session, the Commission agreed with staff that this request would be better addressed as a Development Code amendment. As requested by the Commission, staff contacted the applicant, Mr. Logan, about the appropriateness of the request being processed as a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Logan indicated he would like the amendment to proceed as a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Szafran said staff recommends this amendment be excluded from the Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket and be processed as a Development Code amendment, instead. He summarized that while the Comprehensive Plan should and does have policies regarding compatibility with adjacent land uses (Land Use Goal 1 and Community Design Policies, 2, 3, 4 and 9), specific standards, requirements and procedures should be located in the Development Code. If specific requirements need to be updated, changed or revised, the changes should occur in the Development Code and not within the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Suggested Amendment 2** – Mr. Szafran explained that this proposed amendment is a request to clarify whether Regional Business (RB) zoning should permit residential development at a density greater than 48 dwellings per acre. Specifically, the applicant charges that the Community Business (CB) and Mixed-Use (MU) land use designations do not anticipate densities over 48 units per acre. The applicant also inquired as to why the area on Aurora Avenue North between 185th and 192nd Streets is designated RB in the plan and not CB like the rest of the Aurora Corridor. Mr. Szafran summarized that staff believes these are appropriate issues to address. If they are added to the docket, they would be raised when the City Council takes up the RB permanent regulation discussion.
- **Suggested Amendment 3** – Mr. Szafran advised that this amendment is site specific and would change the land use designation of one parcel (346 North 148th Street) from low-density residential to mixed-use. He emphasized that staff has not received a rezone application for this parcel, but they expect to receive one if the item is added to the docket and is approved by the City Council. He advised that the Commission received a letter from an interested neighbor that speaks to zoning specifics, even though there is no rezone application at this time. The appropriate time to talk about rezone issues is when a rezone application has been submitted. He summarized that staff believes this proposed amendment merits additional discussion and should be added to the docket.
- **Suggested Amendment 4** – Mr. Szafran explained that this amendment would add language to the introduction section of the Comprehensive Plan to add or expand references to the Ballinger Neighborhood. Clean up language is also needed to correctly spell the street name in those sections. Staff recommends adding the proposed amendment to the docket for further discussion.

Questions by the Commission to Staff

Commissioner Kaje recalled that at the last meeting, Commissioner Pyle brought up the issue of the need for guidance on the appropriate process and criteria for considering parcel-specific land use designation changes. He asked if **Suggested Amendment 3** is intended to be an opportunity to discuss

the merits of changing the land use designation for a specific parcel or to discuss how the City processes parcel-specific land use designations. Mr. Cohn said the proposal is to change the land use designation for this one specific property. If the amendment is included on the docket, the Commission would review a site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendment and a concurrent rezone, and there is a separate set of criteria that must be considered when reviewing each proposal. A more general discussion about the process and criteria for reviewing site-specific Comprehensive Plan amendments is not part of the docket at this time, but he agreed the Commission could have this discussion at some point in the future.

Vice Chair Hall explained that when **Suggested Amendment 3** comes before the Commission for a public hearing, the staff report would include photographs of the neighborhood, a current zoning map, and an analysis of the five Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria. Staff has not prepared their in-depth report at this stage in the process. Mr. Szafran explained that the applicant would not submit a formal application for either the Comprehensive Plan amendment or the rezone until the City Council has made a decision to docket the suggestion.

Vice Chair Hall agreed with Commissioner Kaje that the Commission should have a discussion at some point in the near future about the process and criteria for considering site-specific Comprehensive Plan land use amendments.

Commissioner Behrens said he sees this as a two-part process. Approving the Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the land use designation from low-density residential to mixed-use would be the first step in the process, and the second step would be to consider the actual rezone application. Vice Chair Hall explained that the code allows applicants to request a Comprehensive Plan amendment concurrently with a rezone. There are typically several applications of this type per year, and the Commission holds one public hearing and makes a recommendation on both applications. Commissioner Behrens said that whether or not the applications are heard at the same time, the Commission must make a recommendation regarding the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment before they can consider the rezone application. They cannot recommend approval of a rezone application that is inconsistent with the current land use designation.

Public Comment

Greg Logan, Shoreline, said he is the assistant director of the Highland Terrace Neighborhood Association. He referred to **Suggested Amendment 1**, which he submitted. He explained that the need to maintain compatibility is a broader issue than simply the Development Code. He provided each of the Commissioners with a copy of the Comprehensive Plan framework goals, which were identified in the record as Exhibit 1. He referred to framework goal 2, which states that land uses should promote quality building and development that is compatible with the surrounding environment. In addition, he noted there are other places where compatibility is referenced in the Comprehensive Plan, such as Land Use Policy 10. He summarized that if the City is going to use the term “compatibility” in a significant manner in the Comprehensive Plan, a definition should be provided in the glossary.

Mr. Logan provided a picture that was taken from his living room window to illustrate the impact of a fairly recent land use decision as seen from his bedroom and living room windows. He said when he

moved into his home there was nothing on the adjacent property but second growth forest. He also provided a two-minute video he prepared to show what it is like to have heavy equipment operating in a residential neighborhood. The Commission should ask themselves how this is compatible with a residential neighborhood. He concluded that defining the term “compatible” in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code would help protect the citizens of Shoreline.

Commissioner Behrens said he certainly doesn’t want to down play Mr. Logan’s concerns. However, there are many terms and phrases in the Comprehensive Plan that are not defined in the glossary. He noted that Mr. Logan’s documentation cites several places in the Comprehensive Plan where the term “compatibility” is used and valued. He reminded the Commission and Mr. Logan that the Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be the basis for the Development Code. He asked Mr. Logan to share his ideas for what else could be changed in the Comprehensive Plan, besides adding a definition for the word “compatibility” to prevent similar situations from occurring. Commissioner Behrens expressed his belief that the solution to the problem lies in the Development Code rather than the Comprehensive Plan. He said he is not convinced that adding a definition to the Comprehensive Plan would resolve the problem.

Mr. Logan pointed out that “compatibility” is a significant word that is used frequently throughout the Comprehensive Plan. He said he believes the Comprehensive Plan already contains plenty of material that would have allowed the City to genuinely maintain compatibility, which is a conditional use permit requirement.

Commissioner Behrens said that if the language is already in place in the Comprehensive Plan to address compatibility, then the appropriate method for dealing with the issue is via amendments to the Development Code to make sure procedures are in place to catch problems related to compatibility during project review. Again, he said he does not believe additional language in the Comprehensive Plan would solve the problem, particularly since Mr. Logan already indicated the concept of compatibility is already addressed in the current Comprehensive Plan language. Again, Mr. Logan said “compatibility” is a fundamental word throughout the Comprehensive Plan, and having no definition opens the door for problems.

Miklos Kohary, Kohary Construction and Development, Edmonds, said he owns property on Westminster Way, and he is currently in negotiations to purchase an adjacent lot, as well. However, his addendum to the purchase and sale agreement is that he would have the ability to rezone the property. He explained that the small triangle lot that fronts Westminster Way is not large enough for any kind of serious development, and he currently uses the property for storage. A large church parking lot is located to the south of his property and a fairly dilapidated duplex is located to the east. He explained that if he were to own the whole property, he would be able to design a visible and nice project of mixed residential and commercial development that would front of Westminster Way.

Mr. Kohary said City planners told him it would cost him \$12,000 to go through the process of amending the Comprehensive Plan and rezoning the property, and he would not get his money back if the rezone application were denied. He said he’s not sure he wants to take this risk without having a better understanding of the City Council’s intentions towards the property. He summarized that

applications would come forward if and when the Commission and City Council indicate they would be in support of his proposal.

Vice Chair Hall clarified that the Planning Commission would not make the final decision about whether to put **Suggested Amendment 3** on the docket. The proposal would not come back before the Commission unless the City Council makes the decision to move it forward. However, it is important to understand that when an amendment is placed on the docket, it is still just being studied and evaluated. The merits of the proposal would be considered after a formal public hearing has been conducted on an actual application. There is no guarantee that the Commission would recommend approval of Mr. Kohary's application. Mr. Kohary said he understands this process, and if the amendment is included on the docket he is ready to take the risk. However, it is important for the City to realize that this parcel is not developable as it is currently zoned.

Planning Commission Comments for the City Council

Commissioner Behrens said he supports docketing **Suggested Amendments 2, 3, and 4**. However, he would not be in support of docketing **Suggested Amendment 1**; not because he doesn't believe the issue raised by Mr. Logan is important but because it could be better addressed as a Development Code amendment. If the amendment is docketed, it should be done for the specific purpose of defining the word "compatible." However, that is not how the proposal was submitted.

Commissioner Broili said he is undecided regarding **Suggested Amendment 1**. However, he would be in favor of including a definition for "compatibility" or "compatible" since this is a fairly nebulous term that can be misconstrued or have different meanings. A definition might add more clarity to the overall Comprehensive Plan. He said he would support docketing **Suggested Amendments 2, 3 and 4**.

Commissioner Kaje said he supports moving all of the suggested amendments forward, but he does have some concerns about **Suggested Amendment 1**. While Mr. Logan's concern is valid, he cautioned that it would be very difficult to come up with a definition for compatibility. He recalled recent Commission discussions about the City's vision where they talked a great deal about neighborhood character and the need for transition between different types of uses, and these issues speak to compatibility of adjacent uses. He said he is not confident that going through an exercise to define the term would address the needs of the City or Mr. Logan. At the same time, he appreciates Mr. Logan's concern and noted the City is struggling with the issue of compatibility in a variety of different venues. He concluded that he is not confident that **Suggested Amendment 1** is the right approach for solving this problem, but he would support it going forward if only to force the discussion upon the City Council. He stated that both the Commission and the City Council has wrestled with the issue of compatibility in recent years as the City has grown, and they need to figure out how to address the issue when proposals come before them.

Vice Chair Hall referred to a comment letter the Commission received related to the vision statement. The letter suggests that while the proposed vision statement and framework goals are appropriate, the challenge will be aligning the vision in the Comprehensive Plan with the Development Code. In addition, they must ensure that day-to-day implementation of the permitting process is aligned with the

Development Code and Comprehensive Plan Policies. He suggested that the Commission and City Council would deal with the issue of compatibility frequently as they implement the vision statement and framework goals and revise the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code. While this process may be slow, he does not feel they need to amend the Comprehensive Plan at this point. He would rather strengthen the compatibility issue by updating the Comprehensive Plan and amending the Development Code.

Vice Chair Hall pointed out that the proposed framework goals include a new goal that should help address concerns such as Mr. Logan's. They retained Framework Goal 2 that talks about promoting quality building and development that is compatible with the surrounding environment. However, they recommended the word "environment" be changed to "area." In addition, the Commission is recommending Framework Goal 8, which says "respect neighborhood character and engage the community in decisions that would affect them." Hopefully, as the City goes forward, they will figure out how to do just that.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Follow-Up Work on Drafting a vision statement and framework goals

Mr. Cohn explained that the purpose of this discussion is for the Commission to identify the language they want to include in the final documents that would go forward to public hearing. The Commission will postpone their formal recommendation until the March 26th meeting when a quorum of Commissioners would be present.

Mr. Levitan announced that a public hearing before the City Council has been scheduled for April 13th, and staff was planning to post the final version of the vision statement and framework goals on the City's website March 27th. He reported that the deadline for public comments on the draft was March 18th. Written comments were provided to each of the Commissioners. He recalled that at their March 5th Meeting, the Commission asked staff to prepare updated options for a "vision map." He referred the Commission to the three map versions, which vary slightly in how they illustrate the commercial corridor and more intense commercial nodes along Aurora Avenue.

Mr. Levitan recalled the Commission also asked staff to review and consider the tense of the vision statement in hopes of addressing some of the City Council's confusion. The Commission suggested that additional language be added to clarify that even though the document is written in the present tense, it is talking about the future. He invited the Commissioners to provide suggestions for how to address this concern.

Lastly, Mr. Levitan recalled that the Commission agreed to add a new framework goal that addresses the issue of art, history and cultural services and resources. He referred to the draft language that was prepared by Vice Chair Hall and invited the Commissioners to share their ideas and comments.

Commissioner Kaje suggested it would also be appropriate and fairly easy to add something about the value the City places on art and heritage to the actual vision statement, perhaps near the beginning

where they list all the excellent attributes of the City in 2029. He said he would attempt to create language over the next few days and forward it to the Commissioners in advance of the March 26th Meeting. He recalled the Commission heard quite a bit of talk about arts and heritage at the various public meetings. Therefore, it would be appropriate to address the issue in both the framework goals and the vision statement.

Commissioner Kaje said he read through the vision statement again and did not find the tense of the text to be inconsistent. However, he suggested the confusion could be addressed by inserting “Shoreline in 2029 is a place where people of all ages . . .” after the first clause in the very last paragraph. Perhaps this type of language could be inserted in another location, as well. He summarized that there are a few sentences in the vision statement that could be massaged without adding any new content. He offered to prepare a recommendation for the Commission to consider at their March 26th meeting.

Vice Chair Hall said he supports keeping the vision statement in the present tense. He suggested inserting the following sentence at the very beginning: “Imagine for a moment that it is the year 2029 and you are in the City of Shoreline. This vision statement is what you will see.” Rather than sprinkling references to the year 2029 into the text, “In 2029” could be added to the headings. For example, “In 2029 Shoreline is a City of Neighborhoods.” This would remind readers that their mind set should be the year 2029. Commissioner Kaje agreed that Vice Chair Hall’s proposed change would resolve the confusion related to tense without sprinkling 2029 throughout the text. Commissioner Behrens concurred.

Mr. Cohn said Commissioner Perkowski called staff just prior to the meeting to share his thought that the current tense seems to work fine. He recommended the Commission add a heading on the top that says “Shoreline in 2029” and then refer to “2029” in a few places throughout the document. Mr. Cohn summarized that Vice Chair Hall’s recommendation would fit very well with Commissioner Perkowski’s recommendation.

Mr. Cohn said Commissioner Perkowski also suggested that language related to having a vibrant arts scene and thriving economy could be added to the 3rd Paragraph. The Commission concurred that it would be appropriate for Commissioner Perkowski to draft additional language for the 3rd paragraph for the Commission’s consideration on March 26th.

Commissioner Kaje referred to the last sentence of the second to the last paragraph of the vision statement. While he agrees with the intent, he suggested the language be changed to read something like “As the population has gotten older over time, the availability and diversity of senior services, housing choices and other amenities have kept pace with these population changes.” Vice Chair Hall agreed the sentence reads awkwardly. He suggested the following alternative language, “As the population has gotten older over time, people have benefited from the senior services, housing choices and other amenities that are available in Shoreline.” Commissioner Kaje observed that the intent of this sentence is to make it clear that as the senior population grows, the City’s priority is to keep pace with the change.

Vice Chair Hall noted that staff incorporated the comments the Commission provided at their March 5th meeting into the latest draft of the framework goals. In addition, he referred to the changes he submitted to staff after the March 5th Meeting and invited the Commissioners to provide their comments.

Commissioner Kaje referred to the language Commissioner Hall proposed for a framework goal to address art, history and culture. He suggested that while he agrees with the intent, “programs” might not be the right term to use. While some things may be programs, they are talking about encouraging arts in a variety of ways. Vice Chair Hall said his intent was to make the statement as broad as possible. Commissioner Broili suggested the following: “Encourage an emphasis on arts, culture and history throughout the community.” Commissioner Behrens reminded the Commission that Shoreline’s History and Cultural Museum has identified a handful of historic sites throughout the City. He suggested the language identify the importance of these sites and the need to create more. Vice Chair Hall noted that the Shoreline Historical Museum is specifically mentioned in the vision statement, but naming specific sites as part of the framework goal would probably not be appropriate at this point. The Commission directed staff to incorporate the language recommended by Commissioner Broili.

Commissioner Kaje recalled that the Commission discussed the option of talking about the environment and natural resources in one goal and the role of environmentally friendly, progressive and innovative development in another. He said he is not convinced it is appropriate to lump both concepts together into one statement. Commissioner Broili said the current language does not make it clear that the City would welcome and pursue innovative approaches. Vice Chair Hall observed that the intent of the proposed language was not only to protect the environment through development, but also encourage restoration of the environment through development. However, he agreed it does not call out the built environment as a separate goal. Commissioner Broili pointed out that City is, by nature, a built environment. He suggested the issue is much more comprehensive than buildings and streets; it involves a more systemic approach to urban development by embracing the bigger picture. The Commission agreed to discuss this issue again at their March 26th meeting.

Vice Chair Hall referred to the introductory paragraph of the framework goals and noted that he added an introductory sentence based on the Commission’s previous discussion. He also noted the last sentence, which makes it clear that the framework goals are not listed in order of priority. Commissioner Broili questioned if it is necessary to number the framework goals since this implies some prioritization. The goals must be considered as a whole way of looking at how the City is developed and what it will look like in 20 years. The Commission agreed to move the last sentence to the beginning of the opening statement.

Commissioner Hall noted that Framework Goals 3 and 15 were combined to read, “Provide a variety of gathering places and recreational opportunities for all ages. . .” Commissioner Kaje expressed concern about striking out Framework Goal 15 and combining it with Framework Goal 3 because gathering places are distinctively different than recreational opportunities. He suggested it would also be appropriate to provide more definition to describe what is meant by a “gathering place.” Commissioner Broili agreed. He suggested the framework goal be changed to make it clear that the purpose of a “gathering place” is to build community and connect people. Commissioner Kaje suggested that Framework Goal 15 stand on its own, but be rewritten to describe the purpose of gathering places.

Vice Chair Hall observed that whenever one of the framework goals is considered in isolation of the others, the concept of a holistic approach is lost. He encouraged the Commission to keep the framework goals short and succinct. He pointed out that the intent of “gathering places” is described in two different places in the vision statement. Commissioner Behrens suggested they change Framework Goal 15 to read, “Provide a variety of places where the community can interact.” This better describes the purpose of the goal.

Vice Chair Hall summarized that the Commission has agreed with most of the language in the vision statement and the framework goals. However, they still need to work on the last sentence of the second to the last paragraph of the vision statement and Framework Goal 15. He suggested staff incorporate all the changes they have agreed on and highlight the language that is still in question. The Commission could resolve the remaining issues at their next meeting on March 26th.

Commissioner Behrens reminded the Commission that the City Council would hold a separate public hearing on the draft vision statement and framework goals. He suggested it would be appropriate to forward the Commission’s comments regarding unresolved issues to the City Council and ask them to provide their suggestions.

Commissioner Kaje said he struggles with putting maps that look like they were done with 1990 software into a 2029 vision statement. He observed that the maps could communicate more information without being busy and complicated. Mr. Cohn said the maps were intended to identify the various neighborhoods and their commercial areas. In addition, the maps identify the transportation corridors (railroad, Highway 99, Interstate 5, Sound Transit, and Interurban Trail). The Version 3 map was an attempt to respond to Commissioner Piro’s recommendation that development along Aurora Avenue North be differentiated. Vice Chair Hall expressed a preference for Version 1 of the maps because it is more generic. He agreed with Commissioner Kaje that the appearance of the maps could be improved. He observed that the City does not have adequate policy basis or subarea planning in place yet to differentiate without running the risk of inadvertently tying the City’s hands in the future.

Vice Chair Hall left the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Commissioner Kaje recalled that when the Commission and City Council met together to review vision statements from various places, they were very attracted to the sketches provided by the City of Corvallis to illustrate what neighborhoods, neighborhood centers and commercial centers might look like. He suggested that including similar sketches in the City’s vision statement would support the notion of trying to convey what they think the City should look like in the future. He said that if the maps are intended to support the vision, they should keep in mind that the vision is about principles, ideas, goals, etc. At this time, they don’t know where the boundaries of the various areas will be in the future. He summarized that maps draw attention away from the principles and vision and make people focus on where their properties are located on the map. He recommended they eliminate the maps and provide artist renderings to illustrate ideas and concepts.

Mr. Cohn said it was staff’s intent to provide sketches in the vision statement, and Mr. Levitan has already selected some pictures that could be presented at the Commission’s next meeting. He cautioned

that while staff could provide examples of illustrations that could be incorporated into the document, they won't have any final renderings. Commissioner Kaje said he does not think the sketches need to be finished before the language can be approved. He suggested they finish the vision language and then invite local artists to submit sketches that describe the concepts. He summarized that while the sketches will be important and valuable, they don't need to be part of the package that gets adopted.

Commissioner Broili said he believes that graphic illustrations are powerful tools that have been used successfully in other locations. He referred to a traffic corridor project in the southeast that took many years to get approved. He observed that they were not able to gain significant community support until they provided graphics to illustrate the concepts. He liked Commissioner Kaje's idea of casting out into the community to find artists who can contribute. He asked staff to visit the website, livingbuildingchallenge.com, where they will see some cutting edge zero footprint buildings that are being proposed not only in the United States, but globally. The buildings are self sustaining, and that is where the future is. Graphics that illustrate this concept will help drive home the point of the vision. He announced that the Cascade Building Council's Living Building Challenge is happening right in Seattle, and the Northwest is one of the leaders. There are a number of examples of buildings that have already been proposed and some that are even under construction.

Commissioner Behrens said he is also intrigued by Commissioner Kaje's suggestion to use local artists. He suggested that anyone who has the potential of having a graphic piece put into a public document that has a life span of up to 10 years is good advertisement, and they would probably receive a good response from artists within the community. He agreed that artist renderings can be powerful tools to describe the intent of the vision statement. He recalled that when the Commission, City Council and community members reviewed vision statements from other jurisdictions, everyone was struck by Corvallis' presentation because it provided numerous graphic illustrations.

Commissioner Kaje observed that there is a big difference between an artistic representation of a future vision of a part of town and a graphic illustration. The maps draw attention to things being more specific and intentional than the Commission intends, and this could draw away from the purpose of the vision. He suggested the Commission revisit this issue again next week. Based on the comments the Commissioners have provided on the vision statement and the framework goals, the Commission should be able to finish up next week. He suggested they circulate their additional comments via email prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Levitan agreed to send the absent Commissioners a summary of the meeting discussion as soon as possible. Staff could update the vision statement and framework goal language based on the Commission's recommendations. The updated language could be forwarded to each Commissioner via email, and the Commissioners would have an opportunity to respond and recommend changes.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Cohn advised that at the next City Council Meeting, Mr. Tovar would make a presentation regarding Regional Business (RB) Zones. He would recommend the moratorium be extended for six more months to give the Commission time to work on permanent regulations. He would also

recommend calling out a special demonstration district for Midvale Avenue between 175th and 185th Streets to encourage redevelopment during the moratorium period. The old RB rules would be applied in the demonstration district, which calculate unit count based on bulk and height. However, the following conditions would apply:

- Height would be limited 50 feet for properties within 200 feet of single-family zones.
- Development must meet Level 3 Built Green Standards.
- Plug ins for electrical cars must be provided.

Commissioner Broili asked why a developer would only have to meet the Level 3 Built Green Standards in order to build to the greater density. He said he would support the greater density if the developer were required to meet Level 5 Built Green Standards. He summarized that he is not opposed to high density, but he is opposed to the way they currently develop high density. Mr. Cohn said he would research this question more and provide an answer at a later date.

Commissioner Behrens asked if the unit count within the special demonstration district would exceed 110 units per acre. Mr. Cohn answered affirmatively. He said staff would expect to see development proposals for between 140 and 160 units per acre. Commissioner Behrens pointed out that this particular corridor holds a large portion of the City's existing low-cost housing. If they are going to look at allowing people to build at a greater density, the City needs to consider opportunities to require a substantial number of units of low-cost housing. They should not give tax breaks for building one-bedroom apartments; they need to be family-oriented units. In addition, developments must be compatible with, and hopefully expand, the open space that currently exists. He would like to see a project that provides a lot of open space in front of the building and adjacent to the Interurban Trail. He observed that adding a large number of residential units in an area that is already heavily congested would also require a very thorough traffic plan.

Mr. Cohn explained that the special demonstration district would be part of the six-month moratorium extension. The proposal would be presented to the City Council on March 23rd. Commissioner Kaje asked if the City Council would have the ability to consider the moratorium and the special demonstration district as separate issues or would they have to remain bundled together. Mr. Cohn said they could be considered separately.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business scheduled on the agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None of the Commissioners provided reports during this portion of the meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Ms. Simulcik Smith referred the Commissioners to the packet that was prepared for the March 26th meeting, which would include a study session on the Point Wells Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Mr. Cohn said the agenda also includes a discussion regarding the process for setting growth targets. He explained that while the countywide group has not come up with any numbers, staff would tell the Commission about the different allocation models the countywide group is considering. He noted that the agenda would be revised to add a discussion regarding the vision statement and framework goals at the end of the meeting.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out that the Commission would conduct elections for new officers on April 2nd. Ms. Simulcik Smith advised that elections would be scheduled as the first item under “New Business.” Commissioner Kaje said he may not be able to attend the April 2nd Meeting, and he asked if staff could estimate the time at which the elections would occur so he could come for just that portion of the meeting. He also asked if he would be able to enter his thoughts on the matter in absentia. Ms. Simulcik Smith explained that nominations are made live at the meeting, so it would be difficult to get his vote ahead of time. However, an estimated time for the elections would be identified on the agenda. Commissioner Kaje asked if it would be appropriate for him to show up just in time to participate in the election. Mr. Cohn answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Kaje noted that since the website has been reworked, it no longer provides the audio recording from the Commission meetings. Ms. Simulcik Smith clarified that the audio recording of the Commission meetings has never been available via the City’s website. Commissioner Kaje said he would like to have access to the audio from the March 5th Meeting. Ms. Simulcik Smith agreed to provide the audio.

Commissioner Behrens referred to the minutes of March 5th and recalled there were a number of times throughout the proceedings where people referred to the concept of cross-through traffic. He requested traffic statistics to identify how much of the traffic on Shoreline’s arterial and collector streets is actually cross-through traffic and how much is generated by residents of the City. He said he is not sure there are accurate statistics to support the assumption that the majority of the traffic is just crossing through Shoreline to reach another location. Mr. Cohn said that he would ask about the possibility of obtaining statistics, but he cautioned that origin and destination studies are difficult to gather.

Ms. Simulcik Smith announced that the Volunteer Breakfast is scheduled for Friday, April 17th. Commissioners should receive their formal invitations within the next few days.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Will Hall
Vice Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission