

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 5, 2009
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

Commissioners Present

Chair Kuboi
Vice Chair Hall
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Kaje
Commissioner Perkowski
Commissioner Piro
Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Steve Cohn, Senior Planner
Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager
Alicia McIntire, Transportation Planner (arrived at 7:20 p.m.)
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner (arrived at 7:25 p.m.)
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kuboi called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:08 .m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Kuboi, Vice Chair Hall, and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Kaje, Perkowski, Piro, Pyle and Wagner.

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

The minutes of February 19, 2009 were accepted as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in the audience.

STAFF REPORTS

Transportation Master Plan Update

Mr. McKinley announced that Alicia McIntire is the project manager for the Transportation Master Plan Update. He referred to the tentative schedule for the Transportation Master Plan Update and noted that the bulk of the work would be completed in 2009, with final adoption in late 2010. He explained that once the new growth targets are available from King County, the Transportation Master Plan Update Team would work with the Planning and Development Services Department staff to allocate the targets to different areas within the City to identify the impacts of increasing density in different places on the transportation system and the capital funding that would be required to serve the growth. He reminded the Commission that land use and transportation can be controversial, so a good public process is essential.

Mr. McKinley explained that other functional transportation issues such as transit, pedestrian and bicycle systems must also be considered as part of the update. For example, he observed that transit agencies are looking for opportunities to cut back on transit service as a result of the economy. Therefore, while the Transportation Master Plan must provide policies for increasing transit opportunities, they must also include policies for cutting back in some situations. He noted that many of these decisions are made at a regional level, and service cut backs in King County are being made proportional to where the service is being provided. Since the majority of the service is provided in the Seattle/Shoreline area, they would be expected to absorb a proportional amount of the cutbacks. In addition, the regional policy is that the Seattle/Shoreline area should only receive about 20% of the new services that is added. He expressed his belief that it is counterproductive to significantly cut service in areas where there is the highest density, most demand and most productive routes, and staff hopes to tackle these policy issues as part of the update.

Mr. McKinley reviewed that Metro's current zone system identifies a zone change at the Shoreline City limit line at 145th Street. Staff believes they should push for having the whole west subarea for Metro (Shoreline, Seattle, Lake Forest Park) as a single-zone. Mr. McKinley recalled that Sound Transit's Proposition 1 was approved by voters last fall and includes light rail to Lynnwood and two light rail stations in Shoreline (145th and 185th Streets). As part of the update, the City must determine what types of land uses they want to have around these stations and how access would be provided.

Mr. McKinley said the update might also include a review of how the City's bicycle and high-priority pedestrian systems interface to verify City priorities. Another key piece of the update will be to identify capital projects and potential funding sources. With revenues being tight, the City will have to rely more heavily on grant funding. They must review each future project in light of their grant potential, which will require strategic prioritization. Mr. McKinley said that once the Transportation Master Plan Update has been completed, they hope to have an ultimate cross section for each arterial street. When

private developments are proposed, the City would have a clear and tight definition of what each street should look like. Without this clear information, it is difficult for City staff to identify the required street front improvements.

Ms. McIntire explained that traffic modeling will be an important component of the update. Staff anticipates modeling several land use scenarios for how growth could be dispersed throughout the City and how the growth would impact the transportation system. They will also consider transit and non-motorized transportation systems as part of this modeling effort.

Ms. McIntire said another element of the update is a review of the City's concurrency ordinance and policies. She explained that the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that cities plan for their growth and have the infrastructure in place to accommodate the growth, but the only aspect under which a City can deny developments is if they do not have the facilities in place to meet the transportation level of service standards. She summarized that the City's current transportation concurrency ordinance is based on what a new development would do to the level of service. However, there are also ways to address concurrency from a plan-based perspective, which is a much more holistic approach that addresses more than just vehicular standards. She said that, depending on the budget and schedule, the project could also include the development of policies and implementation strategies for the plan.

Ms. McIntire advised that staff has still not determined how the work load associated with the update would be divided amongst the consultant and staff. Staff anticipates the formation of citizen's advisory board to work on both the non-motorized and transit portions of the plan. They also anticipate a technical advisory committee that is composed of representatives from Sound Transit, Metro and Community Transit to provide input into the transit plan.

Mr. McKinley reported that staff has been pursuing the concept of improving cross county transit service and creating a seamless service along Highway 99 from Everett to Downtown Seattle. They have had some early discussions with Metro and Community Transit to discuss the notion of potentially relocating many of the Aurora Village Transit Center functions to the 192nd Street Park and Ride, which is currently owned by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and operated by King County. The two are working out a swap that would result in King County owning the property, and King County is very interested in doing a transit-oriented development project in this location with the goal of increasing park and ride capacity. The idea is to allow transfers between Community Transit and Metro Buses to occur on Aurora Avenue. The ultimate goal would be a regional transit approach that would allow for a one-seat ride the whole way. The next phase would be to look at the best way to serve the light rail stations when they come on line in 2023.

Commissioner Broili asked if the scope of the Transit Plan would be 20 years. Ms. McIntire said the transit plan would include short, medium and long-range plans of up to 20 years. Commissioner Broili asked if the model strategies would be based on an assumption that cars would continue to be the major mode of transportation for the next 20 years. Ms. McIntire clarified that staff has not made any assumptions, at this point, about how the model would be built. Mr. McKinley explained that the plan must address all modes of transportation until they have the density or funding to support a highly effective and connective transit environment, they will have to rely on several different modes.

Commissioner Broili pointed out there are a few things currently going on politically and globally that would certainly impact the study, such as peak oil and the rising cost of energy. He suggested that both of these items would have a huge impact on transportation in the future and questioned how the 20-year plan would address these quickly changing aspects. Mr. McKinley explained that the City would be broken into 120 traffic analysis zones for the modeling exercise, and mode splits for each of the zones would be identified.

Chair Kuboi asked if the Commission would have a role in identifying and reviewing the assumptions that are used for the modeling exercise. Mr. McKinley noted that a consultant would be hired to help staff complete the modeling work, which cannot be done in house. Chair Kuboi summarized that when the project reaches the point where the assumptions and scope of work are being established, the Commission would like an update from staff and an opportunity to comment.

Commissioner Broili referred to Mr. McKinley's earlier announcement that Sound Transit has proposed two light rail stations in Shoreline and observed that parking would become an important element in the success of these stations. Ms. McIntire explained that Sound Transit anticipates approximately 500 parking spaces at each of the stations within the northern corridor. Commissioner Broili raised concern that there is not sufficient land in the vicinity where the two stations are proposed in Shoreline to provide a large number of parking spaces. He suggested this be addressed as part of the master plan update.

Commissioner Broili asked for clarification about staff's earlier statement that it is often difficult to identify street front improvements. Mr. McKinley referred to a recent project that took place at the corner of Midvale Avenue and North 185th Street. He explained although the Aurora Avenue Design states that this needs to be a five-lane cross section, staff had to base the frontage improvement requirements on the Development Code, which currently identifies 185th as a four-lane road in this location. Therefore, because the City wanted the developer to set the building back to accommodate the five-lane road and sidewalk, they had to purchase the additional land. Ms. McIntire explained that if there had been a lack of right-of-way and the cross section identified more, the City would have been able to require the developer to dedicate the delta. But because the cross section was different in this location, the City had to purchase the right-of-way.

Mr. McKinley agreed with Commissioner Broili that it is important to consider how best to accommodate people who come to the light rail stations. Is it better to increase density around the transit stations so that people who live nearby can walk or provide parking garages to accommodate people who come from further away? Other options include providing a shuttle service from other neighborhoods, as well providing pedestrian and bicycle access.

Commissioner Kaje recalled that in the process of creating a vision for Shoreline, the Commission talked a lot about how the City should prioritize pedestrian improvements. They considered the notion of looking more strategically at how to foster vibrant districts, and part of that is to connect the surrounding neighborhoods with sidewalks. He noted there are several districts that provide sidewalks in front of the businesses, but the neighborhoods are completely disconnected from a pedestrian standpoint. He summarized that pedestrian improvements and the prioritization of projects is an

important topic to the Commission and community, and the Commission would like an opportunity to provide input early in the process.

Apart from spreading out projected growth and some pattern through the City, Commissioner Kaje asked how the concurrency analysis would look at placement of a major facility in the middle of a neighborhood that is currently served by residential streets, such as a large jail, perhaps. Mr. McKinley explained that there are a lot of different methods of setting concurrency standards. He explained that when the Growth Management Act was adopted in the 1990's, almost all the jurisdictions implemented a concurrency standard that was based on intersection level of service (LOS). Developments were analyzed to determine how they would impact the LOS at the intersection. If the standard would be exceeded by a proposed development, City funding must be available to upgrade or rebuild the intersection or the developer would be required to make those improvements.

Mr. McKinley advised that since the Growth Management Act was adopted, there has been a lot of innovation and experimentation over how to set LOS or concurrency standards and how to measure developments against the standards. He explained that the City's current plan requires that an LOS E be maintained at all signalized intersections. He noted that there are six LOS grades, A through F, with LOS F being a breakdown of the intersection. LOS E is just one step above that. The current standard basically lets development happen without any hang ups or without the City being able to stop the developments based on level of service. He advised there are many newer thoughts for approaching concurrency and level of service. At this time the City does not have an impact fee program. Instead, their policy has been to support development in order to increase the economic base. He suggested it would be appropriate for the Commission and staff to have a policy discussion regarding this issue as the process moves forward, and it would be important to work with an outside consultant who has experience in these matters.

Commissioner Piro asked what staff anticipates the Planning Commission's role would be throughout the master plan process. He recalled that the last time the Transportation Master Plan was updated, the Commission formed a subcommittee to work through the issues.

Commissioner Piro recalled past reports that the majority of traffic in Shoreline during peak periods does not have an origin or destination in the City. Instead, it is pass-through traffic. He asked if the modeling effort would capture this aspect. He takes issue with the idea that somehow the City has gotten itself in a bind that requires developers to go through additional rigor as a result of traffic compromise issues associated with the way the City has defined concurrency. If this traffic is coming from other communities, he questioned why the City should be required to deny development projects in Shoreline.

Commissioner Piro recalled that the last time the plan was updated, a lot of emphasis was placed on defining level of service and concurrency more in terms of people-moving capacity. However, he does not believe they were as successful as they could have been. He welcomed staff's recommendation that concurrency be looked at more innovatively, particularly since a multi-modal approach to concurrency is now the law. Ms. McIntire said there is also a lot of literature and thought about the idea of regional concurrency and how development from one jurisdiction can impact another. Commissioner Piro noted

that the Puget Sound Regional Council can provide written material regarding regional concurrency. He suggested the City also consider the option of tailoring concurrency to address the different objectives of various parts of the City, which is allowed by GMA.

Commissioner Behrens said that regardless of where a bus stop is placed, the real problem is that the three transit agencies do not work together. The goal should be to develop a seamless system that lets people move across county lines without changing busses. He suggested the City forcefully advocate integration of all the bus systems in the different counties into Sound Transit in order to create a density base that would allow transit and density to function well together. He expressed his belief that 185th Street is probably the one street that comes closest to running all the way east and west across the City. He pointed out that the Point Wells property is located at the other end of 185th, so this street would have to become a very major arterial that runs east and west to connect the City. This project would cost a significant amount of money because the right-of-way is very narrow.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that Shoreline is one of the few cities that does not use impact fees. For example, the City of Bothell used impact fees effectively to create transit corridors through cities. Bothell identified three major places in the City that would have to be redeveloped for transit, and then they assessed a fee for every building that was developed within or adjacent to one of the corridors. These funds were put into an account, which allowed them a system where they could schedule concurrency and fund capital improvement projects. He suggested that requiring no impact fee does not necessarily encourage developers to come to the City. The occupants of the development would suffer the consequence if the road network does not function adequately. Someone has to pay for this work, and the City needs to stop trying to shift all of the profit in one direction and all of the costs in another. The City, the developers and the community must work together to realistically assess the costs and figure out how they can be evenly distributed.

Vice Chair Hall requested that staff provide additional feedback on the following issues and concerns raised by the Commission:

- **Impact fees.** He noted that the Long-Range Financial Planning Group decided not to recommend impact fees, but he would like more information from staff regarding this policy issue at some point in the future.
- **Moderating cut-through traffic.** Much of the cut-through traffic on Meridian Avenue is Snohomish County residents who bypass the metered ramps at 205th and 175th Streets to get onto I-5 southbound at 145th Street. He suggested a partnership with WSDOT to stop using three miles of Meridian Avenue as an on-ramp. Chair Kuboi suggested the update also take into consideration the cut-through traffic that takes place through neighborhoods.
- **Level of Service.** Commissioner Piro's suggestion of using level of service as a way of measuring the movement of people instead of just automobiles has merit and should be considered further.
- **Bicycle and pedestrian pathways.** He agreed this should be an element of the plan update.
- **De-emphasizing single-occupancy vehicles.** Interstate-5 and Highway 99 will probably not have more capacity in 20 years. Even if they triple the number of lanes on roads within Shoreline, they would end up with bottlenecks at the city limits. The plan should strongly emphasize that the growth opportunity for transportation has to be moving more than one person in a vehicle.

Mr. McKinley said staff would enjoy working with the Commission as the Transportation Master Plan update progresses, and he invited the Commissioners to share their thoughts about how they want to participate in the process.

Chair Kuboi noted that the Transportation Master Plan was last updated in 2005. He questioned if the update would be a recurring program every five years into the future. He asked if staff plans on moving in a new direction with this update. Mr. McKinley said staff plans to use the existing master plan as a base, but there are some areas that need a lot more work such as transit, pedestrian/bicycle access, concurrency, and a new set of land use impacts to consider. The existing master plan includes some good policies and systems that might not be changed, and that is where they will start.

Chair Kuboi asked if staff has plans to employ a citizen's advisory committee to work on the vehicular portion of the plan, too. Mr. McKinley said staff has not had that discussion, but they know they must work with the three transit agencies. He suggested the Commission consider this element of the plan as their domain. They also know they must work with the bicycle and pedestrian communities because they have firsthand knowledge that staff might not have.

2009 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket Study Session

Mr. Szafran referred the Commission to the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket that was assembled up to the deadline of January 31, 2009. He noted the amendments were gathered from the general public, as well as some that were proposed by staff. Mr. Cohn explained that the purpose of this review is to prepare the Commission for the public hearing that is scheduled for March 19th. He suggested the Commission focus on asking clarifying questions so they are prepared to accept public comment and make a recommendation to the City Council on March 19th about the items to include in the docket.

Commissioner Kaje noted that he is the proponent of one of Comprehensive Plan amendments and inquired if he would be allowed to participate in the discussion and final recommendation related to this item. Mr. Cohn said he does not foresee an appearance of fairness issue associated with Commissioner Kaje's participation in the process of voting for amendments to be on the docket. He agreed to check with the City Attorney's Office for clarification of Mr. Kaje's role in the March 19 discussion.

Mr. Szafran reviewed each of the suggested Comprehensive Plan amendments that were submitted by citizens as follows:

- **Suggestion 1** – This amendment was proposed by Greg Logan to modify the Development Code. Staff recommends the amendment be considered when the Commission takes up the next round of Development Code amendments.

Commissioner Piro questioned if Mr. Logan's concern could be satisfied with references to State Law related to compatibility and consistency. Mr. Szafran agreed that it's an idea worth looking into. He said he believes Mr. Logan's suggestion would be better addressed as a Development Code Amendment than as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, since it deals with Conditional Use criteria.

Commissioner Wagner suggested staff clarify the different processes with Mr. Logan prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner Behrens agreed that while the issue raised by Mr. Logan is legitimate, an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is not the appropriate avenue for addressing the concern. He suggested that perhaps staff could explain to Mr. Logan that the concern could be better addressed as a Development Code amendment. Mr. Szafran agreed this would be the appropriate course of action.

Vice Chair Hall asked if there is a method for citizens to submit Development Code amendments other than the docket process. Mr. Cohn explained that while GMA requires cities to create dockets for Development Code amendments, the process is not limited to once a year. Typically, Development Code amendments are presented to the Commission three or four times each year. Citizens have the ability to submit amendments, and the Commission would decide whether to move them forward through the process or not.

Commissioner Wagner clarified that it was not her intention to remove the proposal as an important topic because the Commission has heard a lot about the issue of compatibility. If there is something that could be addressed via a Comprehensive Plan amendment, it would be important for the Commission to capture that idea.

- **Suggestion 2** – This amendment was proposed by Les Nelson. The recommendation is to update Land Use Policies 17, 18 and 19 to clarify whether Regional Business (RB) zoning should permit residential density greater than 48 dwelling units per acre. It also requests clarification of Land Use Policy 19 as to why the area between 185th and 192nd Streets was chosen for a Comprehensive Plan Designation of RB rather than Community Business (CB).

Commissioner Pyle suggested that this issue is a matter of interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan's definitions and descriptions of each of the types of land use designations. Because only R-48 is listed, some people interpret this to mean that the maximum cap on density is 48 units per acre for residential. It is not apparent that there are other land use designations cited in each of the categories. However, if a property were zoned as RB or CB, far more than 48 units per acre could be allowed. The density becomes a space issue or how many units can be fit in the box as opposed to what the density derivative is of the lot area to the density allowed through R-48. He summarized that clarifying this interpretation would help. In addition, the Commission should also discuss whether or not the City should allow more than 48 units per acre in any of their zones.

- **Suggestion 3** – This amendment was proposed by Scott Becker. The request is for a site-specific map amendment for a parcel located at 346 North 148th Street. Mr. Becker proposes that the designation of this property be changed from Low-Density Residential (LDR) to Mixed-Use (MU). The amendment would be accompanied by a rezone application.

Commissioner Behrens pointed out that the Commission recently considered a rezone application that was submitted by the James Alan Salon in which two pieces of property were rezoned from CB to RB. The R-12 zoning on the third piece of property remained intact. A development proposal has been

submitted for a Regional Business Building that would be partially located on the R-12 zoned property. Mr. Cohn clarified that the R-12 property would be used for parking and townhouse development. Commissioner Behrens expressed concern that a parking lot is not a residential use. Mr. Szafran pointed out that the parking would be used by the residential uses developed on the three properties. Commissioner Behrens asked why Mr. Becker is required to submit a Comprehensive Plan amendment to rezone a piece of property that is in the same zoning designation as the piece of property that is adjacent to the James Alan Salon. Mr. Cohn explained that Mr. Becker wants to put additional density on the second piece of property, which is currently zoned R-6. The adjacent property is zoned Neighborhood Business (NB).

Commissioner Wagner cautioned that this amendment would be accompanied by a rezone application, which is a quasi-judicial issue, and it may not be appropriate for the Commission to have a discussion regarding the appropriateness of the rezone at this point in time. She reminded the Commission that the purpose of the discussion is to determine whether or not to move the four suggested Comprehensive Plan amendments forward to a public hearing. Mr. Cohn agreed.

Commissioner Kaje clarified that, in the different case referenced by Commissioner Behrens, there was no request to change the underlying Comprehensive Plan designation. The request was to change the zoning only. In this case, the proponent wants the Comprehensive Plan designation change from LDR to MU in addition to a concurrent rezone, and that is why the matter is coming before the Commission as a potential Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Szafran added that leaving the suggested amendment on the docket would allow the applicant to submit a Type C quasi-judicial application for a rezone, which would come before the Planning Commission in the future for a public hearing.

Commissioner Pyle suggested that, at some point in the future, the Commission should hold a discussion about the criteria for a Comprehensive Plan amendment, specifically a site-specific change to the land use designation map within the Comprehensive Plan. They should discuss how this change would fit within the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding land use patterns. They should also discuss how the change fits in terms of transition, density, proximity to transit, employment, etc. Mr. Cohn pointed out that these issues would be considered for this specific property if the amendment is placed on the docket. A general discussion of the criteria would be more related to the Development Code.

Mr. Cohn clarified that as a proposal moves forward through the amendment process, the Commission could conceivably decide it should involve more than one property. However, it would not be appropriate to come up with a totally different suggestion as part of the docketing process. Commissioner Perkowski asked for clarification about why the Commission would be limited in this regard. Mr. Cohn said that, in his experience, planning commissions have come up with different recommendations after discussion, but the docket always moves forward based on the recommendation that was originally submitted.

- **Suggestion 4** – This amendment was proposed by Janne Kaje. The proposal is to revise the language that relates to the Ballinger Neighborhood. Mr. Cohn explained that in the current Comprehensive

Plan, the Ballinger Neighborhood is only referenced to a couple of times and some of the references are incomplete. The proposed amendment would give recognition to a neighborhood that has existed in the City for quite some time. Commissioner Kaje said the amendments are intended to clean up the existing language.

Chair Kuboi referred to the recommendation that the reference to North City being in the northeast corner of the City be stricken. Commissioner Kaje pointed out that North City is no longer the northeast corner of the City. Ballinger was annexed after the City was incorporated. Commissioner Pyle suggested they look at different language for this change. He agreed they should delete the reference to the northeast corner, but the balance of the language should be updated to make sure it is accurate.

Mr. Cohn advised that in addition to staff's proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment related to the Point Wells site, they are also recommending an amendment related to visioning. He explained that while staff anticipates the City would move forward with sub area planning in the near future, these amendments are not required to be part of the docket.

Mr. Cohn advised that the six Comprehensive Plan amendments would be the subject of a public hearing before the Commission on March 19th. The proponents of the amendments would be invited to attend the hearing. In addition, staff would ask Mr. Logan if there is another approach that would better address his concern.

Chair Kuboi asked Mr. Cohn to recap the process that was used to notify the public of the January 31st deadline for submitting Comprehensive Plan amendments. Mr. Cohn answered that a notice was placed in the local newspaper and in *CURRENTS*. A short announcement may have also been on the cable television station. He suggested they need to discuss ways to improve the process.

Commissioner Broili said his understanding is that part of staff's goal for the future regarding Comprehensive Plan amendments is to clarify the criteria for judging proposals, as well as the schedule for how the process should work. Mr. Cohn explained that, currently, the process and criteria are not clearly outlined in the Development Code, and staff intends to correct this situation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in the audience.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Cohn had nothing to report during this portion of the meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Debrief of March 2nd Visioning Town Hall Meeting

Mr. Cohn reported that Vice Chair Hall and Commissioner Behrens attended the Town Hall Meeting. He referred to handouts of notes that were taken by those in attendance and reminded the Commission that they have been tasked to develop a final version of the Vision Statement and Framework Goals by their March 26th meeting. The goal is to publish the two documents on the City's website by March 27th. He invited Vice Chair Hall and Commissioner Behrens to share their thoughts about what needs to be done next.

Vice Chair Hall said that while there were fewer people in attendance at the meeting, all of the City Councilmembers were present, along with numerous City staff. He said that as he visited the various discussion tables, he created a list of changes that could strengthen the Framework Goals. He reviewed the changes as follows:

- The current Framework Goals are preceded by text that says they are supposed to be balanced, not prioritized. He suggested they preserve this text or provide new text to make it clear that the goals were not prioritized.
- Framework Goals 2 and 18 could be merged to say "Provide high-quality public services, utilities and infrastructure that accommodate anticipated level of growth, protect public health and safety, and enhance the quality of life."
- Framework Goal 4 references the term "demographic," and many people did not know what that means. He suggested the language be changed to say, "Make decisions that value Shoreline's social, economic and cultural diversity."
- The City Council felt the Framework Goals were not clear enough about expanding the economic base (tax base and physical health). This concern could be incorporated into Framework Goal 13 by adding, "to serve the community and expand our economic base."
- A lot was discussed about volunteers. He suggested the Framework Goal related to partnerships could be changed to insert the word "volunteers." While some indicated a desire to call out churches and faith-based groups, he felt that "non-profit" organizations was a broad enough term to include the YMCA and churches. A valid point was made that many churches in Shoreline are extremely active in the community and provide important services.
- Being respectful of cultural, economic and social diversity is already covered in Framework Goal 4. Therefore, he suggested the final clause of Framework Goal 17 be deleted.

The Commission discussed Framework Goal 5 related to conserving and protecting the environment and natural resources and encouraging restoration and Framework Goal 6 related to applying innovative and environmentally sensitive development practices. The Commission discussed that these two goals work together in that redevelopment offers an opportunity to restore and improve the environment by applying modern environmentally sensitive development practices. Commissioner Broili suggested the language be improved to include a statement that development can provide better environmental services. He expressed concern that if the Framework Goal doesn't specifically say that, they may miss an opportunity to drive the point home.

The Commission considered whether it would be appropriate to combine Framework Goals 5 and 6. Commissioner Piro said he would prefer a two-step approach. He pointed out that Framework Goal 5 focuses on the natural environment and ecosystems, and Framework 6 is geared towards ensuring the development is done in an environmentally sensitive manner.

Commissioner Behrens recalled that most of the people who attended the public meetings really appreciated how much time the Commission spent on the project. It was apparent that the Commission really cares about the community. He cautioned that the Commission must keep in mind that the Framework Goals are intended to be an outline document. They should provide enough language to cover the ideas, recognizing that more specific language would be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan. He recalled that a representative from the historical museum asked that a goal related to arts and heritage be added. Other than that, he did not hear any other suggestions that were not already covered in one Framework Goal or another. Commissioner Kaje agreed with Commissioner Behrens that an arts and heritage goal would be an appropriate addition.

Commissioner Kaje expressed concern about losing momentum after the vision language has been adopted. He suggested the Commission spend time to identify a process for how the Vision Statement and Framework Goals would play out as they deal with some of the City's more vexing issues. Chair Kuboi agreed and recalled that the Commission was originally asked to consider how the Vision and Framework Goals could guide the issue of allowing unlimited density on Aurora Avenue, but he is not sure the draft language provides any additional direction in that regard since it does not touch upon what density really means. One of the vexing issues before them is how to deal with density, and he believes some citizens are locked into the idea that Shoreline is a bedroom community and anything that deviates from that direction causes significant concern.

Vice Chair Hall agreed it would be appropriate to create an additional Framework Goal related to the arts and heritage. Secondly, he expressed concern that adding more narrative to the Framework Goals would end up deemphasizing the key points. Instead, the Framework Goal language should remain concise. However, he suggested staff prepare a graphic illustration of the process and timeline that would be used to implement the Vision and Framework Goals. He said it is important for the community to understand that adopting the Vision is not the end of the project, but the beginning. He recommended the diagram outline the following process for implementing the new Vision for Shoreline:

- Vision
- Framework Goals
- Goals
- Objectives
- Policies
- Development Code
- Capital Projects

Vice Chair Hall questioned if a proposal, such as a rezone application, would be required to not only be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, but with the

narrative text, as well. He cautioned that trying to explain a concept in narrative text could result in a situation where a court or hearing examiner could interpret the language differently.

Commissioner Piro agreed that the diagram recommended by Vice Chair Hall would be an appropriate approach. He agreed with both Commissioner Behrens and Vice Chair Hall that the Vision is designed to be an aspirational statement of the future, and specificity would come through future work with the Comprehensive Plan. He agreed that it is important for the public to understand that the Vision is not the end of the process.

Commissioner Kaje said that, at a future meeting, he would like staff to identify a strategy for incorporating key concepts identified in the Vision Statement and Framework Goals into the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code as soon as possible. The process should move forward while the issues are still fresh in the minds of the community, the Commission and the City Council. Commissioner Broili agreed with Commissioner Kaje that the next step should be to identify a strategy for achieving the Vision. While Vice Chair Hall laid out many of the steps, he would like the staff and Commission to create a more defined strategy.

Commissioner Piro thanked Commissioner Behrens and Vice Chair Hall for attending the Town Hall Meeting on behalf of the Commission. He also thanked staff for quickly compiling the meeting notes for the Commission's discussion.

Commissioner Perkowski said that while he understands the intent of the Framework Goal related to developing partnerships, he suggested more language be added to explain the purpose of the partnerships.

Mr. Cohn recalled there was some confusion amongst the City Council regarding the tense that was used in the Vision Statement narrative. He suggested a few Commissioners review the narrative and address this concern. Secondly, Mr. Cohn announced that the Commission would have an opportunity to discuss the Vision and Framework Goals at their March 19th meeting. He suggested it would be useful for Commissioners to come up with changes for the Commission to consider at that time. Lastly, Mr. Cohn clarified that the public hearing regarding the Vision and Framework Goals would be conducted at the City Council level in April.

The Commission agreed that the issue of arts and heritage should be addressed by an additional Framework Goal. Vice Chair Hall noted that the City Council discussed this issue, but he did not recall a clear direction about whether it should be addressed as part of the Vision Statement or as a Framework Goal. The Commission recalled a City Council discussion suggesting that language also be added to the narrative to acknowledge how much has already been done in Shoreline to improve the community over its first decade of existence and that the vision would continue to guide the controversial and difficult decisions for the benefit of the community.

NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Wagner recalled that the Commission changed their practice of having people give their address when they come up to speak. However, the packet of information that was provided prior to the meetings provided both address and telephone information. She suggested staff block out this personal information before it is distributed as a public document. Mr. Cohn agreed to do that.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Kaje asked staff to share the next steps in the Financial Committee's timeline. Mr. Cohn said the Financial Committee presented a set of recommendations to the public in three public meetings. He said he anticipates they are fairly close to being ready to report to the City Council. He agreed to provide the Commission with more information regarding their timeline.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Ms. Simulcik Smith reviewed that the agenda for the March 19th meeting would include a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments and continued work on the Vision and Framework Goals in preparation for the public meeting on March 26th.

ADJOURNMENT

**COMMISSIONER WAGNER MOVED THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED AT 9:18 P.M.
COMMISSIONER PYLE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.**

Sid Kuboi
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission