

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING MEETING

February 1, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Montero
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Chair Craft
Commissioner Maul

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Montero called the public hearing meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Vice Chair Montero and Commissioners Malek, Mork and Thomas. Chair Craft and Commissioner Maul were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 4, 2018 minutes were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Ryan Hager, Katerra Construction, said he was present to brief the Commission on the project that Katerra Construction is currently doing at the old post office site at 175th and 15th. He explained that Katerra is a technology company that is trying to change the way construction is done by prefabricating

as much as possible. The company sources most of its materials and building products, and the goal is to get to a point where the company can self-perform and self-supply everything for its jobs.

Addison Melzer, Katerra Construction, said he is the project engineer on the project at the old post office site. He reported that demolition just started and mass excavation is scheduled for mid-February. They intend to move into concrete work in April, and the cross laminated timber (CLT) panels will be delivered in August. He explained that CLT is a growing trend that is new to the Northwest, and this will be their first CLT podium project. The expected date of completion is November of 2019. He invited the Commissioners to contact them with any questions or comments. He concluded by stating that Katerra wants to be good neighbors to all of Shoreline.

PUBLIC HEARING: SUBDIVISION CODE AMENDMENTS

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reviewed that subdivision processing in the current Development Code is not specific and very unclear. Staff feels it is necessary to articulate the subdivision process to meet State requirements, to respond to the development community, and to provide consistent City administration. He explained that the purpose of a subdivision is to divide land for the purpose of development or sale. Currently, the City has three subdivision categories: short subdivision, formal subdivision and binding site plan. The current code includes criteria for approval, but there are no formal procedures for processing and reviewing applications.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Board that they reviewed the proposed amendments in a study session on January 4th. Since January 4th, staff has not received any comments from the Commissioners or the public regarding the proposed amendments. He reviewed that the proposal is to develop three separate options:

- **Option A – Subdivision without Development.** Land would be subdivided with development to follow separately at a later date. Typically, this process is used when a property owner wants to subdivide land with the intention of selling the newly created parcel(s).
- **Option B – Subdivision with Development.** This option is similar to Option A, but it allows submittal of the building permit, too. The intent of this option is to allow concurrent review of the site development, building, and right-of-way permits after approval of the preliminary plat. The option would benefit developers who want to start the subdivision process, but may not be ready to submit the development permits at the same time.
- **Option C – Consolidated Subdivision.** This option is similar to Option B, but with a concurrent review of the preliminary plat, building, site development and right-of-way permits as one application. For applicants who are ready for full development, this option could potentially save up to seven months in review time.

Mr. Szafran advised that, in addition to the amendments described above, staff is proposing changes to the definitions for “formal subdivision” and “short subdivision.” In 2015, the City Council adopted an ordinance that amended the number of lots in a formal subdivision, but the change was not picked up in

the definition. As proposed, a formal subdivision would be “10 or more lots” and a short subdivision would be “9 or fewer lots.”

Public Testimony

There was no public testimony.

Commission Deliberation and Decision

Commissioner Thomas said she contacted Mr. Szafran prior to the meeting to clarify the differences between Options B and C. Her understanding is that:

- Option A would be utilized by applicants who just want to subdivide a piece of property. Currently, this action would require both a site development permit and right-of-way permit.
- Option B would be utilized by applicants who want to subdivide a property pending development at some point in the future. These applicants may not know exactly what they want to develop on their properties at the time they are subdivided. In this case, the applicant is asking for a preliminary plat application, but he/she will not submit applications for site development, right-of-way or building permits. Once the preliminary plat is decided, an applicant would submit applications for the other permits.
- Option C would allow an applicant to submit applications for all permits at the same time.

Commissioner Thomas suggested that an Item d should be added to Option B to address what happens if an applicant chooses not to proceed with a building permit. Perhaps the application should revert to a subdivision without development (Option A). She felt this would make the difference between Options B and C clearer.

Commissioner Mork asked what would happen if an applicant chooses Option B but then decides not to proceed with building, site development and right-of-way permits for a variety of reasons. Mr. Szafran answered that the applicant could either withdraw the application and start over again or subdivide the property without a building permit (Option A). Commissioner Mork asked how the City would know if an applicant decides not to submit the permits required for Option B, and Mr. Szafran answered that there are time limits, and applications will have to be submitted by certain dates. As the dates approach, the City sends letters to applicant to provide further direction. If a subdivision application expires before the required permits have been obtained, the applicant would be required to start over again.

Commissioner Thomas asked Commissioner Malek to respond to her suggestion to add clarifying language. Commissioner Malek agreed that the language could be changed in a variety of ways to make it easier to use and more transparent. However, he would support the proposed language, as written, if staff is confident and comfortable with its application.

Mr. Cohen said the current code refers to criteria and procedures, but then no procedures were provided. Over the past several years, staff has administered the subdivision code in a traditional way (similar to

Option A), starting with preliminary short plat approval, followed by the site development and right-of-way permits that are required before the final plat is approved. Option B is similar, except following the preliminary short plat approval, an applicant can submit applications for site development, right-of-way and building permits at the same time. Option C allows an applicant to submit applications for the short plat, site development, right-of-way and building permits at the same time. All four permits would be reviewed concurrently. The idea is to accommodate the various needs of developers. With all three options, recording of the final plat must be done separately at the end. He explained that as projects move forward, lot lines sometimes have to be adjusted, and having final plat approval at the end allows the wiggle room necessary to make these slight changes.

Commissioner Malek asked how difficult it would be to revise the language if developers find it difficult to understand. He likes the idea of making the language more intuitive and descriptive, but he does not have any proposed language for the Commission to consider. He suggested that they move the amendment forward as presented, recognizing that changes can be made at a later date to provide greater clarification.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the Planning and Community Development Department offers handouts at the front counter for potential applicants that are more descriptive and written in layman's terms. A handout could be created to provide more descriptive information relative to subdivisions. These handouts are also available on the City's website. Mr. Cohen said the City is working to implement more opportunities for on-line applications, and the intent is to start electronic plan review sometime this year, as well. He agreed to review the terms used in the proposed language again to make sure they are clear and easy to explain to applicants.

Mr. Cohen explained that the review process for short plats and formal plats are different. Currently, formal plats must be reviewed by the Hearing Examiner and approved by the City Council. The 2018 batch of Development Code amendments will include an amendment that simplifies the process to be consistent with recent changes in State law that allow cities to administratively approve formal plats. This change will significantly reduce the time of processing.

Mr. Cohen also pointed out that the current code uses the terms "long plat" and "formal plat" interchangeably. Staff will also put forth an amendment to clean up the language, using the term "formal plat" only.

Given that the subdivision code will be revised again before the end of 2018, Commissioner Thomas said she would support the language as proposed in the amendment, recognizing that it could be updated and made clearer if necessary. Mr. Cohen suggested that when the proposed amendments are presented to the City Council, it might be helpful to back up and provide more details about the subdivision process, right-of-way permits, site development permits, building permits, etc.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ACCEPT THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION CODE AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THEM AS WRITTEN. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

STUDY ITEM: 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCKET

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of Comprehensive Plan amendments to no more than once per year. The State also requires that the City create a list or docket of amendments that may be considered each year. Nine amendments have been proposed for 2018. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** would amend the Comprehensive Plan for the 145th Street annexation and change all applicable maps. The amendment is a carryover from the 2017 docket. Staff is recommending that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 2** is also carried over from the 2017 docket. As proposed, it would consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that may have applicability to reflect outcomes of the Richmond Beach Transportation Corridor Study. It would also consider amendments that could result from the development of interlocal agreements. Staff is recommending that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 3** would consider amendments to the Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies and update of the Surface Water Master Plan. The Public Works Department is in the process of updating these two documents. Staff is recommending that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 4** would consider deleting Appendix D (Master Street Plan) from the Transportation Master Plan and replace it with references to the Master Street Plan in the Engineering Design Manual. Deletion of the Master Street Plan will allow flexibility for the Public Works Department to make adjustments to the Master Street Plan anytime during the year without the limitations associated with Comprehensive Plan amendments. Staff recommends that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 5** would consider amending the land use designation for all parcels designated Low-Density Residential and Medium-Density Residential between Freemont Avenue N, Ashworth Avenue N, 145th Street and 205th Street to High-Density Residential. Conversely, the amendment would consider changing the zoning of all parcels between previously-mentioned streets from R-6, R-8, R-18 to R-24. This amendment was privately initiated. Staff believes this proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and concurrent rezone is an interesting idea that complies with many of the goals land policies in the Comprehensive Plan. However, a change of this scope and size is a major work plan item, and staff would be responsible for creating a plan for public-involvement because the amount of properties within the area are substantial. Staff would also be responsible for evaluating the environmental impacts of a rezone this size, which may require the services of a consultant that would impact the department's budget. Because the amendment would require a considerable amount of staff time and resources, staff is not recommending that it be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 6** is a private request to consider amendments to Transportation Policy T44 to clarify how an arterial street's volume over capacity ratio (V/C) is calculated. The applicant's

interpretation is that neither the AM or PM peak one-directional traffic volume may exceed 90% of the arterial's peak AM or PM one-directional capacity. In addition, the amendment would clarify other items in Policy T44 as outlined in Attachment C of the Staff Report. Staff is recommending that the amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.

- **Amendment 7** is also a private request to consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan. The applicant states that many changes have occurred since adoption of the plan in 2010, and the proposed changes are shown in Attachment D of the Staff Report. Staff recommends that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 8** would consider amending land use designations Mixed-Use 1 and Mixed-Use 2 in the Land Use Element to provide clarification. Staff received concerns from certain Council Members that the policies are vague and unclear when it comes to conforming zoning designations, and it is difficult to distinguish between the two designations when trying to determine which zoning categories implement each of the designations. Staff recommends that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.
- **Amendment 9** would update the Pedestrian System Plan of the Transportation Master Plan. The Pedestrian System Plan updates key arterial and local streets in need of improvement in order to create a network of sidewalks. The Public Works Department has started a year-long process to create a sidewalk prioritization plan, as directed by the City Council. Major components of the process will be to create a system for identifying projects, as well as researching and recommending ways to fund them. Staff recommends that this amendment be placed on the 2018 docket.

Commissioner Mork asked if the public would be able to comment on future amendments to the Master Street Plan if Amendment 4 is adopted. Mr. Szafran answered that if the Master Street Plan is moved to the Engineering Design Manual, changes could be made administratively at any time without a public hearing. He explained that the Master Street Plan contains technical information such as sidewalk widths, etc. Director Markle said the idea is that citizens would comment relative to the Transportation Master Plan, which contains the policies that direct how the Master Street Plan is ultimately implemented. However, it is her understanding that amendments to the Engineering Design Manual are published on the website, and citizens would be invited to provide comment. However, there would not be a formal public hearing.

Commissioner Mork asked if the same thing would apply if Amendment 9 related to the Pedestrian System Plan is approved. Mr. Szafran clarified that the Pedestrian System Plan would remain in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that, at this time, they are only being asked to make a recommendation relative to whether or not an amendment should be included on the 2018 docket. Those items that are included on the docket would be studied further and a public hearing would be held before the amendments are ultimately approved by the City Council.

Commissioner Mork recognized that the proposed Amendment 5 would require significant staff time and resources. She asked if staff has talked with the applicant regarding an alternative process for moving the request forward. Commissioner Malek commented that the applicant spent a considerable amount of time, energy and thoughtfulness to develop the amendment. He asked what process is in place so that the proposal can eventually be considered rather than simply shelved.

Public Comment

Tom Mailhot, Shoreline, said he submitted proposed Amendment 7, which asks the City to do a general revision of the Point Wells Subarea Plan to recognize changes that have occurred since the plan was originally written. He said he identified over 20 different areas where the wording should be updated to account for recent changes, such as the Town of Woodway annexing the upland portion of the property and Snohomish County now requiring a second access road for the lowland portion of the property through Woodway. He summarized that Amendment 7 is good housekeeping, and he urged the Commission to follow the staff's recommendation to place the amendment on the 2018 docket for further review.

Mr. Mailhot also urged the Commission to follow the staff's recommendation to place proposed Amendment 6 on the 2018 docket. This amendment by Mr. McCormick asks for some changes to Transportation Policy T44 to clarify how the volume over capacity (V/C) ratio is calculated for arterial streets. He explained that the V/C ratio is a key tool the City uses to recognize when a proposed development will cause one of the City streets to function unreliably. It's important that the ratio be carefully calculated because an inaccurate calculation can cause the City to allow more traffic than a street can safely handle.

Continued Commission Discussion and Action

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE AMENDMENTS 1 THROUGH 4 ON THE 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET. COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Mork said she understands staff's concern about the time and resources required to implement Amendment 5. However, given the amount of time and thought put into preparing the amendment, it would be appropriate for the City to provide feedback to the applicant as to what could be done to move the concept forward at some point in the future.

Commissioner Malek asked what it would take for staff to conduct a cursory review of the proposed amendment. Mr. Szafran responded that if the Commission recommends that it be placed on the docket, the City Council would look at the City's work plan to determine if staff has the time and resources to evaluate the proposal. Moving the amendment forward would require a process similar to what was used for the Light Rail Station Subareas, which took 2.5 years. If the City Council sees capacity and time in the department's work plan, the proposal could be added.

Vice Chair Montero noted that community support would be needed to bring the concept forward. Commissioner Thomas pointed out that, unless people have been paying very close attention to the

Commissioner's agenda, they would not know about the proposed amendment. She reminded the Commission of the significant discussions that need to go forward about housing and housing choice. Perhaps the concept outlined in the proposed amendment could be part of that discussion. She expressed her belief that City staff is very respectful and responsive in how they communicate to the members of the public who propose amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Staff can explain that although there is insufficient time and resources to move the concept forward in 2018, the applicant could resubmit the proposal for consideration the following year. She noted that there are still some hot-button topics that have not been included on the 2018 work plan, and the concept outlined in Amendment 5 is something new. She said she does not support including it on the 2018 docket with the expectation that it would move forward next year.

Commissioner Mork reviewed that the Commission is being asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not the nine amendments should be on the 2018 docket, but the City Council will make the final decision. If the Commission recommends that Amendment 5 be included on the 2018 docket, the City Council could pull it off if they do not feel the City had the depth to move it forward. She asked if the City Council could add it to the 2018 docket, even if the Commission recommends that it not be included. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively and noted that all nine of the proposed amendments would be presented to the City Council, and they will set the final docket.

Commissioner Malek said he is enamored with the concept proposed in Amendment 5. In the past, the Commission has discussed the idea of allowing duplexes, accessory dwelling units, etc. in the single-family residential (R-6) zones as a way to provide more housing opportunities and types. He said he would much rather see the density within walking distance of commercial property and along Highway 99. He expressed his belief that the City cannot afford not to look at this option, given the goals and the timelines in the Comprehensive Plan for addressing housing needs. As mentioned by staff, the proposal is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. His feeling is that they should pass it forward to the City Council and let them make the decision based on budgetary constraints.

Commissioner Thomas reviewed that the City has done a lot of work over the last few years with subarea planning and densities near high-capacity light rail stations has been significantly increased. She voiced concern about changing the zoning in another area that is already mostly Mixed Business 1 and 2. With the current Comprehensive Plan land use designation, property owners within this area can already request an upzone. She reminded them that the budget gets passed in December for the entire year, and she does not see that the City Council could easily amend it to fund the amendment. She is also concerned about diluting the type of development the City may want near the light rail stations if such a wide area is opened up for high-density residential. She would not support moving the amendment forward to Council at this time. The Commission's job is to think about what is reasonable given their thought processes and knowledge of the budget and staffing. She agreed with staff that the amendment should not be included in the 2018 docket.

Commissioner Montero agreed this is a huge task to take on this year, given all of the items already on the work program. He suggested that the amendment come back next year. In the meantime, they could test out the community to see if there would be support for the proposed changes.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO SUPPORT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO NOT INCLUDE AMENDMENT 5 ON THE 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED 3-1, WITH COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Commissioner Thomas suggested that Amendment 5 could be resubmitted next year with demonstration of community support. If the concept has strong support from the community, there is an opportunity to move it forward as part of the 2019 docket. She thanked the person who submitted the proposed amendment for the thoughtful process that was used.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE AMENDMENTS 6 THROUGH 9 ON THE 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET. COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle reported that last October Snohomish County sent the developer (BSRE) of the Point Wells site a letter saying they needed all of the missing information and that all corrections to the permit application must be made by January 8th. BSRE submitted a letter on January 12th requesting an extension, and the County responded on January 24th that there would be no more extensions and the application must be processed by June 30th. Snohomish County's process has the application going before the hearing examiner in mid-May. Shoreline staff is working to understand what needs to be reviewed and preparing to participate in the public hearing before the hearing examiner. The application is going forward with no Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is a requirement for the project. It will be interesting to see what the ultimate recommendation looks like. There is a chance that the developer will try to appeal the decision for no extension, so that may change the timeline. The City is currently seeking to "gain standing" to enter into interlocal agreements with Snohomish County for annexation of the area.

Director Markle briefly reviewed the development list, which is over \$1 million in valuation. She highlighted the Alexon Project; the Shoreline Development Company Project at the old post office site; the new fire station; a 3-story, 16-unit apartment building in the 145th Street Station Subarea; a 3-story, 31-unit apartment building in the 185th Street Station Subarea; and an 84-unit townhome project in the 145th Street Station Subarea.

Director Markle announced that the Lynnwood Link Extension had a pre-application meeting for its Critical Area Special Use Permit on Ronald Bog mitigation. A lot of environmental mitigation for the light rail project will be focused in this area.

Director Markle advised that the Sears property has been sold, and staff has met with the developer. It is anticipated that redevelopment will move forward quickly, with permits coming in starting in late 2018. The buyer has seen the City's vision and is interested in hearing more feedback from the community. She encouraged Commissioners to participate in the community survey related to the project at www.shorelineplace.com.

Mr. Cohen provided additional information on the status of the Alexon Project, which consists of a new set of plans. While similar to the previous proposal, there have been some minor design changes and the number of units has increased from 309 to 324. The applicant has gone through administrative design review and submitted building plans. Staff will complete its initial review of the building plans within the next few weeks. The applicant must still obtain a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determination, which will focus primarily on transportation mitigation. The applicant is working with the Public Works Department to come up with a design for the changes that will be needed at the triangle. A boundary line adjustment will also be needed to reduce the internal property lines before a permit can be issued. At this point, there is no timeline for when development will start.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports or announcements from Commissioners.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING


As there were no agenda items for the February 15th meeting, the meeting may be cancelled.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.



William Montero
Vice Chair, Planning Commission



Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission