

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

March 26, 2009  
7:30 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

---

---

### Commissioners Present

Chair Kuboi  
Vice Chair Hall (arrived at 8:15 p.m.)  
Commissioner Broili  
Commissioner Kaje  
Commissioner Perkowski  
Commissioner Wagner

### Staff Present

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services  
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services  
David Levitan, Associate Planner, Planning & Development Services  
(arrived at 8:20 p.m.)  
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

### Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Behrens  
Commissioner Piro  
Commissioner Pyle

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kuboi called the special meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:34 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Kuboi and Commissioners Broili, Kaje, Perkowski and Wagner. Vice Chair Hall arrived at 8:15 p.m. and Commissioners Behrens, Piro and Pyle were excused.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission added Item 10.a (Finalization of Vision Statement and Framework Goals) to the agenda. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

### DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tovar indicated he would hold his comments until the Director's Report, when he would update the Commission regarding the Shorewood High School Design Concepts and a proposed Development Code amendment to increase building heights. In addition, he would report on a public hearing that took place before the City Council on March 23<sup>rd</sup> related to a proposal to increase density for a portion

of the Regional Business (RB) zone along Midvale Avenue. The City Council will continue the public hearing on April 6<sup>th</sup>.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes available for Commission approval.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Doug Reid, Shoreline**, distributed his written comments, along with pictures to illustrate his concerns related to property located at 14927 Aurora Avenue North where a great deal of soil is being removed. As illustrated by the pictures he provided, he pointed out that the soil residue spreads across the sidewalk and Aurora Avenue. He recalled that the property is the former site of the Skyline Motel, which was never hooked up to the public sewer system. He summarized that residents in the area have concerns about contaminated soil since their children play and ride their bikes in the area. He asked if a soil test has been done on the subject property or if permits have been pulled.

Commissioner Kaje asked Mr. Reid if he reported this situation to the City. Mr. Reid said he called the City earlier in the afternoon prior to taking the photographs. Since he did not have a specific address, he was told no information could be given. He said he plans to visit the Planning and Development Services Office to review the permits and soil tests associated with the property. Mr. Tovar agreed to look into Mr. Reid's concern tomorrow.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that this is not the first time he has seen a situation such as the one illustrated by Mr. Reid. He said he reported the same scenario at another site and expressed concern that residue was going into the storm drain, which goes into the creeks and streams. He said he would like the City to take permanent action to address these unacceptable situations. Mr. Tovar said he would ask the Building Department Staff or Community Response Team to visit the site as soon as possible. Chair Kuboi expressed concern that when Mr. Reid contacted the City, staff did not make more of an effort to figure out the correct address. Again, Mr. Tovar agreed to look into the situation.

**Laethan Wene, Shoreline**, questioned where the students and teachers would hold classes while Shorewood High School is being redeveloped. He expressed his belief that the students need to have a place to continue their regular classes.

### **STAFF REPORTS**

#### **Point Wells Comprehensive Plan Amendment Study Session**

Mr. Tovar advised that the Commission would conduct a public hearing regarding the Point Wells Comprehensive Plan Amendment April 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. He referred to the staff's proposed amendment to the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan, which consists of two pages of text and a map. He explained that while the text of the Comprehensive Plan identifies Point Wells as a potential annexation area for Shoreline and that the use should be a mixture of uses, it does not talk about building form, building height, unit count, or other details.

Mr. Tovar reviewed that Snohomish County has been processing a proposal to amend their comprehensive plan to re-designate Point Wells from Industrial to Urban Center, which is a new Snohomish County land-use designation that allows a variety of uses. He explained that staff has reviewed Snohomish County's draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and prepared an evaluation of the likely environmental consequences of approving the proposal by the property owner (Paramount Northwest). He noted that Paramount Northwest owns the old industrial use area to the west of the tracks and the office/industrial use area to the east of the tracks. The only access to the property comes from Richmond Beach Road.

Mr. Tovar reported that the Snohomish County Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the draft SEIS, and Councilmember Hansen attended on behalf of the City of Shoreline to express the City's concerns about the magnitude of development that would be permitted by a designation of Urban Center. He said the amendment associated with the draft SEIS describes a potential future project of up to 3,500 dwelling units and between 80,000 to 100,000 square feet of commercial space and does not talk about water related activities. In addition to attending the public hearing, Mr. Tovar advised that the City submitted a letter taking issue with a number of the facts, assumptions and conclusions in the draft SEIS. For example, the City has asked the Council to respond to Shoreline's concerns about the flaws in their methodology and conclusions before the final SEIS is issued.

Mr. Tovar further reported that the City's comment letter to Snohomish County noted that the County has not discussed how police or fire services would be provided to the property if it were to be developed under an Urban Center designation in unincorporated Snohomish County. The letter points out that both the Shoreline Fire District and Shoreline Fire Department have also submitted letters in opposition, indicating they would not be providing fire or police services to a more intense development on the property if it is not part of Shoreline. In addition, the Town of Woodway filed comments indicating their concern about the character of whatever is developed on the property. Woodway is proposing specific design criteria and guidelines that would factor into the shape, configuration and activities on the property if Snohomish County were to permit redevelopment at some point in the future.

Mr. Tovar announced that the comment period for the draft SEIS has been closed, and the final SEIS would be issued at some point in the near future. The Snohomish County Council would then consider the matter and take action on the final SEIS. The Snohomish County Planning Commission did not formulate a formal recommendation for the County Council because they were unable to obtain the six votes necessary to approve a motion to recommend approval or denial. All of the public testimony and the Commission's discussion would be forwarded to the County Council for consideration at some point this summer. He summarized that staff would provide comments before the Snohomish County Council when the opportunity becomes available.

In addition to Snohomish County's proposed comprehensive plan amendment, Mr. Tovar advised that the City of Shoreline has proposed a separate amendment to the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan related to the Point Wells site. He explained that Shoreline's proposed amendment is to identify on a map the Point Wells property (approximately 100 acres), which is currently an unincorporated island of Snohomish County. The map also shows the boundaries of the Town of Woodway and the City of Shoreline, as well as the location of the King/Snohomish County line. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment text makes reference to two areas on the maps that were distributed: lowland (purple)

and upland (white). The lowland area can only be accessed by vehicle via Richmond Beach Road, and there is no access into the upland area because of the steep, heavily-vegetated slope. Because this is a critical area, creating vehicular access would be very expensive and probably not permitted under current environmental laws.

Mr. Tovar pointed out that the Town of Woodway touches and actually includes about 200 feet of Richmond Beach Road. In the recent past, the Town of Woodway annexed this right-of-way. To leave the unincorporated island, you have to travel through Woodway for 200 feet and then you are into Shoreline on Richmond Beach Road for the next three miles until you reach the regional road network. He summarized that the only access to this property, which the amendment proposes to designate as the Shoreline's future service and annexation area, is through Shoreline. The segment of roadway that is in the Town of Woodway does not connect to any other road in Woodway or the County.

Mr. Tovar said the City's current Comprehensive Plan identifies all 100 acres of the Point Wells site as the City of Shoreline's "potential annexation area," which is a phrase adopted by King County to describe the interest that cities adjacent to unincorporated areas in King County could declare. He pointed out that while King County has identified potential annexation areas for all the cities in the County, Snohomish County has no such thing as a "potential annexation area." The term they use to describe the relationship of an unincorporated area to an adjacent city is "a municipal urban growth area." The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would describe the Point Wells Property as the City's proposed "future service and annexation area." The Comprehensive Plan amendment would also clarify the City has no interest in annexing or serving the upland portion of the island because it is not accessible from the City of Shoreline. In addition, it points out that since neither Woodway nor Snohomish County has access to the lowland portion of the island, it shouldn't be in their service area.

Mr. Tovar announced that he has met with Snohomish County staff to review their official position. They indicated that Snohomish County's comprehensive plan policies actually state that cross county annexations are disfavored and/or would be opposed. County staff referred to the Town of Bothell, which annexed across the County line a number of years ago so that half of the City of Bothell is now in Snohomish County. Snohomish County felt this was problematic for a number of reasons, and they adopted their basic policy position that no more cross county annexations should be allowed. Mr. Tovar recalled that Woodinville attempted to annex across the County line a number of years ago, and Snohomish County expressed opposition and the proposal was abandoned. Mr. Tovar said he would respond to a letter he received from Snohomish County regarding their policies by explaining that while the City can understand the County's reluctance to support an annexation on the order of magnitude of Bothell or Woodinville, Shoreline's situation is very different. There is no issue of annexation by the City of Shoreline further up into Snohomish County, and there are no service delivery dilemma's for Snohomish County because they don't provide any services to the area. Mr. Tovar said he also knows of other law by the growth boards and appellant courts, and he does not believe the County would prevail if they tried to enforce their policies.

Mr. Tovar summarized that the City's interests are best served by clarifying, via a Comprehensive Plan amendment, the City's interest and reasons for articulating that the Point Wells property should be served by the City of Shoreline if it is going to develop into a mixed-use or more intense urban configuration than what has been there in the past. In addition, the City would continue to oppose it being developed in Snohomish County as an Urban Center, which would allow up to 3,500 dwelling

units. The City's current map identifies the property as mixed-use, and the proposed amendment does not suggest the appropriate density at this time. Questions regarding the appropriate scale of development would be addressed in a pre-annexation ordinance, and environmental information would be prepared to describe the impacts.

Mr. Tovar concluded by stating that the draft amendments are ready to move forward to a public hearing, and the City Council has asked staff to initiate the action. They won't adopt any final language until they receive a recommendation from the Commission and have an opportunity to review the entire record. Mr. Tovar cautioned that the Commission's public hearing may need to extend beyond April 16<sup>th</sup> since the City's environmental review cannot be completed until Snohomish County has finished their environmental review, which would describe the impacts associated with a mixed-use center that provides up to 3,500 dwelling units. He emphasized that the final environmental documents would be presented to the Commission before they close the public hearing and formulate a final recommendation to the City Council. Once the Comprehensive Plan amendments have been adopted by the City Council, staff would begin to prepare the pre-annexation ordinance that would get into more detail. This process would involve a public hearing before the Planning Commission and final adoption by the City Council.

Commissioner Broili clarified that the environmental review would only look at the impacts of an Urban Center type of development. Mr. Tovar answered that Snohomish County's environmental review would look at an Urban Center of up to 3,500 units. The City would utilize the County's environmental review as a starting point, but they would conduct their own analysis to address points where they disagree with the County. For example, the City would conduct its own traffic analysis and adopt the document as a supplement to Snohomish County's document. Commissioner Broili summarized that the City's environmental review would only consider the impacts of future development on the site. He pointed out that the Point Wells property has historically been used as a fuel loading dock, and he questioned what sort of environmental cleanup issues would arise as part of any development proposal. Mr. Tovar said the County's draft SEIS talks at length about the contamination of soil and what would be required to remediate the site.

Commissioner Kaje questioned if it is possible to access the upland portion (white) from the sliver of lowland area (purple) that is located on the east side of the track. He wondered where the actual road network barrier is located. Mr. Tovar said the SEIS provides a detailed contour map to illustrate the steepness of the slope throughout the whole area. He noted that Richmond Beach Road used to continue up the hillside using switchbacks all the way to 238<sup>th</sup> Street in Woodway. However, this road washed out a number of years ago. The old right-of-way was vacated in the early 1960's, so there is no public road coming through the upland (white) area.

Commissioner Kaje requested clarification about whether Snohomish County's proposal to allow up to 3,500 dwelling units refers to what would be allowed on the entire island (both the white and the purple). Mr. Tovar clarified that Snohomish County's proposed amendment is related only to the lowland (purple) portion of the island, which is owned by Paramount Northwest. The County is proposing to allow up to 3,500 dwelling units on the 60-acre lowland area.

Commissioner Kaje invited Mr. Tovar to explain why the City is proposing to change the designation of the property to "Future Service and Annexation Area." Mr. Tovar answered that there has been some litigation regarding the planning and designation of Point Wells. Previously, the City of Shoreline

designated the property as a “Potential Annexation Area,” and then the Town of Woodway designated it as a “Municipal Urban Growth Area,” Shoreline filed an appeal to the State Growth Management Hearings Board arguing that allowing both cities to identify the property for future annexation created an impermissible inconsistency. The Court of Appeals eventually determined that both cities could show the annexation in their comprehensive plans. He recalled that during this dispute, Snohomish County and the Town of Woodway were put off by Shoreline’s use of the term “Potential Annexation Area” because they felt it inappropriate to use a King County term to describe a Snohomish County property. Regardless of the term that is used, the notion is that Shoreline should serve this property since all the access comes via Shoreline.

### **Growth Management Act (GMA) Targets Background Update**

Mr. Cohn explained that, every five years, the State Office of Financial Management (OFM) issues population projections for each county in the state as a basis for Growth Management Act (GMA) planning. In addition, under GMA, King County and its cities must adopt comprehensive plans that accommodate 20 years of anticipated population and employment growth. He announced that the State has just recently issued new growth targets for King County. While local governments have discretion as to how they accommodate the growth targets, they must update their Comprehensive Plans at least every seven years. The deadline for the next plan update is December 2011. He cautioned that the purpose of tonight’s discussion is to provide background information regarding the process of allocating the growth targets. The discussion would not involve specific target numbers at this time.

Mr. Cohn said the last OFM forecast, which was completed in 2007, showed King County growing faster over the long term than in previous forecasts. He provided a graph to compare the 2002 and 2007 forecasts. He noted that by the year 2025, the 2002 forecast showed 2,019,000 and the new forecast shows 2,114,000, which is a sizeable difference.

Mr. Cohn explained that King County allocates growth targets via the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC), which is a body of elected officials from King County, Seattle, Bellevue, other cities and towns, special purpose districts, and the Port of Seattle. These representatives would work jointly to develop target allocations for King County, and each jurisdiction would be required to take their fair share of the growth. He said that the Countywide Planning Policies, which were originally adopted by the GMPC in 1994, establish the policy framework for allocating growth targets. The policies include:

- Limiting the growth in Rural and Resource areas.
- Focusing growth in Urban Growth Area, within cities and within Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.
- Fostering a pattern of growth that ensures efficient use of infrastructure and can be served by public transportation.
- Improving job/housing balance within the four planning subareas.

Mr. Cohn explained that the GMPC divided King County’s Urban Growth Areas as follows: Sea-Shore (Seattle and Shoreline), the Eastside, and South County. They considered the PSRC’s forecast for job growth and how much of the growth would go into the three areas, and then they divided the household growth using the same percentage as the forecasted growth in jobs. He explained that the intent was to focus growth in the urban and manufacturing centers. He noted that Seattle’s Urban and Manufacturing

Centers are solid and have been growing for a number of years. While the Urban and Manufacturing Centers on the Eastside are not quite as solid, they have also been growing for a number of years. However, the Urban Centers in South County have not been growing for a number of years, and many jurisdictions do not have Urban or Manufacturing Centers. This makes it more difficult to divide households fairly.

Mr. Cohn said that in addition to considering the State's 25-year growth forecast, the GMPC must also look at the Regional Growth Strategy, which is the PSRC's 40-year growth forecast. The growth target allocations must be consistent with both documents. He explained that the PSRC used a different strategy (other than jobs/housing balance) to allocate growth. Their strategy calls for increased growth in mid to large cities, especially cities with designated centers, decreased growth in rural areas, urban unincorporated areas, and smaller cities, and increased job-housing balance in the region.

Mr. Cohn summarized that staffs from cities throughout the County have been reviewing and providing input on a range of potential scenarios that allocate housing and job growth throughout the County. Based on this process, recommended draft targets may go to the GMPC as early as July 2009, with a vote for adoption possible at their September 2009 meeting. Once adopted, growth targets must be ratified by the County Council and a majority of cities before they go into effect.

Mr. Cohn said that while the OFM may come out with a new forecast in 2012, the PSRC is fairly confident that their forecasts are accurate, even considering the recent downturn in the economy. He briefly reviewed the following graphs that were developed by the PSRC:

- **Near-Term Population Growth Forecast.** This graph shows that the actual current forecasts are lower than the long-term growth forecast suggested.
- **Near-Term Job Growth Forecast.** This graph indicates that while the forecast was high, job growth has flattened out.
- **Long-Term Population Growth Forecast and Trends.** This graph provides data indicating that in terms of population, the PSRC forecasts are actually lower than the long-term trend over the last 50 years.
- **Long-Term Employment Growth Forecast.** This graph indicates that the PSRC forecast was actually less than the actual long-term growth trends. The graph shows that employment growth has its ups and down, unlike population growth, which tends to be relatively stable.

Vice Chair Hall arrived at the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no one present to provide public comment during this portion of the meeting.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **Shorewood High School Design Concepts and Pending Code Amendment to Increase Building Heights**

Mr. Tovar announced that both Shorewood and Shorecrest High Schools are going through some major design work. Shorecrest High School would be renovated and updated, and Shorewood High School would be replaced. He noted that the School District plans to continue to use the facilities while they construct a new high school on the same property. The existing buildings are currently located on the west half of the site, and the proposed new high school would be constructed on the eastern half.

Mr. Tovar displayed the zoning map for the Aurora Corridor, which identifies the specific location of the Shorewood High School site. He reported that the School District has conducted two public meetings to show four different schematic alternatives for how they might develop the property. The Old Ronald School (museum) would remain in all four scenarios. He reviewed each of the schematic alternatives and said City staff has asked the District to keep in mind that at some point in the future, the adjacent car dealership properties might be redeveloped into some type of mixed or commercial uses. Therefore, it might be appropriate to make the service road more of a "city lane" to integrate the high school and business district uses. He said that while it is unfortunate the Town Center Subarea Plan has not been completed, it is important to anticipate ways to create some connection between the high school site and the town center. Staff has also raised the idea of creating some public space between the museum and theater.

Mr. Tovar said the School District is asking for permission to build up to three stories in some locations. In addition, the new gymnasium would be as high as 55 feet, and the fly space for the new theater would be up to 68 feet. Three of the scenarios place the gymnasium and theater as far away from the residential neighborhood as possible and closer to Aurora Avenue North. The amendments that are scheduled to come before the Commission on April 16<sup>th</sup> will deal with code changes to enable the proposed building heights. He noted that the majority of the Shorewood High School property is currently zoned single-family residential, and the maximum building height is 35 feet.

Chair Kuboi recalled an earlier discussion that if the School District were allowed a greater height, there is a potential for other development. Mr. Tovar said the only additional height beyond three stories would be to accommodate the gym and theater. The District is not interested in having any office space or classroom space above three stories. He noted the City Hall Building that is currently under construction is four-stories or about 52 feet high.

Chair Kuboi recalled that the Commission had previously discussed this project as an opportunity to do something more with the site than just build a new school. Mr. Tovar said the School District seems to be open to the idea of the theater becoming more of a community facility rather than just for high school productions. He suggested that perhaps the City's Arts Council would be interested in talking about possible community use of the space, as well.



## **Proposal to Increase Density for a Portion of the Regional Business (RB) Zone Along Midvale Avenue**

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the interim RB zoning ordinance expires on May 12<sup>th</sup>, and their work program includes a process for developing permanent regulations for the RB zone. Extending the moratorium and interim ordinance would require the Commission to complete their work and forward a recommendation to the City Council for final adoption by November 12<sup>th</sup>. In the near term, staff has presented a proposal to the City Council to extend the moratorium and interim ordinance for all RB zoned lands throughout the City for an additional six months. In addition, staff's proposal recommends the City Council create a Regional Business Demonstration area on Midvale Avenue between 175<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Streets (between the Gateway Project and the new City Hall). Within this area (about 7.5 acres) staff proposes the City remove the unit density cap and apply the administrative design review and design standards that were reviewed by the Commission and ultimately adopted by the City Council for the Ridgecrest Commercial Center. He summarized that the demonstration area would provide flexibility for development to take place.

Mr. Tovar provided a bird's eye view of the area in question. He said he does not anticipate redevelopment of the warehouse portion of the site to occur right away. However, if mixed-use, mid-rise development occurs nearby to take advantage of the amenities and transit opportunities, redevelopment could eventually occur depending on the permanent RB and Town Center regulations that are adopted by the City Council. He summarized this is an area of opportunity, and redevelopment could take place within the next six months if the City Council adopts the revisions to the interim regulations for this one section of RB zoning.

Mr. Tovar referred to the Central Shoreline Subarea Study that was completed in 2003. The study focused specifically on Midvale Avenue and indicated that desirable characteristics for development include mixed-use, mid-rise, retail uses on the ground floor, pedestrian orientation, buildings up to the back of the sidewalk, etc. While the study was never formally adopted, it was presented to the City Council as a model of what citizens desire for the area. He noted that the Commission would not be invited to provide a formal recommendation regarding the interim regulation to create the demonstration area. However, Commissioners could provide comments at the public hearing before the City Council on April 6<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Kaje asked Mr. Tovar to identify the portion of the site that would most likely be redeveloped in the near future. Mr. Tovar said the most likely site to redevelop first would be the area immediately north of the warehouse site. He noted that while the Ridgecrest Commercial Center regulations required a developer to meet the Three Star Built Green standard, one Councilmember has suggested that developers be required to meet the Four Star Built Green Standard, which would require certification and a third-party review. Requiring electric vehicle charging facilities is another recommended condition.

Commissioner Kaje voiced concern about what the demonstration area would tell the rest of the community about the City's intentions for permanent regulations. It appears that the City is cutting a deal to get a developer on board. While he likes the idea of requiring Built Green Standards, he is concerned about the negative reaction the interim ordinance might receive, particularly from other RB property owners. He questioned if the interim ordinance would make it more difficult to get permanent

RB regulations in place that are more meaningful and ask more of developers. Mr. Tovar said the City Council did raise concern about whether or not the interim ordinance would become a precedent. They also questioned if allowing too much residential development would drive out retail uses. He said he pointed out to the City Council that this RB zoned area is unique because it is located adjacent to the Interurban Trail and has a green space in front of it. He informed the City Council that he did not believe the interim ordinance would set a precedent for other RB zoned properties unless there are similar circumstances. The staff report makes the point that the subject area is not a good place for auto-intensive uses such as car dealerships, fast food, etc. The lot size is not large enough and the circulation pattern does not lend itself to these uses. Mr. Tovar recalled that the Commission and staff have previously discussed that there are four or five discreet sub districts of the Aurora Corridor, and this area is very different than the others. The purpose of the demonstration area is to test out the concept.

Commissioner Kaje said he was not so concerned about the precedent of the details in the interim ordinance. His concern was more related to a precedent of the process of considering a demonstration area at the same time they are talking about creating permanent regulations. Mr. Tovar said that from his perspective, this is a unique opportunity for the City to be creative and seize opportunities that present themselves. He said he would not recommend this approach often, but the circumstances justify his recommending the interim ordinance to the City Council.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Formalization of Vision Statement and Framework Goals**

Mr. Levitan recalled that at their last meeting, the Commission reviewed an updated draft of the vision statement and framework goals that incorporated the recommendations made previously by the Commission. The Commission provided additional direction and staff incorporated those changes. He noted that arts and history were incorporated both into the framework goals and the vision statement. He recalled that staff presented a map that was not favorably received by the Commission because it focused too specifically on certain neighborhoods instead of addressing general principles, which is the goal of the vision statement. The Commission suggested that staff follow the example provided in the Corvallis, Oregon vision statement and incorporate images into the document. However, it might not be necessary to incorporate the images at this point. The Commission suggested they ask local artists in the community to submit drawings or images that they think fit the text.

Mr. Levitan said staff anticipates posting the draft documents that would be considered at the April 13<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing on the City's website. However, they need final input from the Commission before they move forward with this posting.

**VICE CHAIR HALL MOVED THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THEY ADOPT THE VISION STATEMENT AND FRAMEWORK GOALS WITH ALL THE CHANGES IDENTIFIED IN THE NEW DRAFT. WHERE THERE ARE CHOICES, THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WOULD BE INCORPORATED:**

- **THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VISION STATEMENT WOULD READ, "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."**

- **THE FRAMEWORK GOAL RELATED TO ARTS AND CULTURE SHOULD READ, “ENCOURAGE AN EMPHASIS ON ARTS, CULTURE AND HISTORY THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY.”**
- **INCORPORATE BONI BIERY’S RECOMMENDATION FOR FRAMEWORK GOAL 3 TO READ, “PROVIDE A VARIETY OF GATHERING PLACES AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AGES AND EXPAND THEM TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE POPULATION GROWTH.”**
- **INCORPORATE BONI BIERY’S RECOMMENDATION FOR FRAMEWORK GOAL 5 TO READ, “CONSERVE AND PROTECT OUR NATURAL RESOURCES; ENCOURAGE RESTORATION THROUGH INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC OUTREACH PROJECTS; AND APPLY INNOVATIVE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES.”**

**COMMISSIONER WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vice Chair Hall said he believes all of the alternatives are really great vision and framework goal statements. While it would be appropriate to make additional changes, he felt the Commission has affectively addressed the things he heard most strongly at the recent town hall meeting.

Commissioner Wagner agreed that the two documents are well-written. The Commission has spent a lot of time and energy being very thoughtful. The end result is a good product, but they still should address some of the remaining open questions. She suggested, and the remainder of the Commission concurred, that the framework goals should be renumbered sequentially before they are posted on the web.

Commissioner Perkowski referred to the second recommended alternative for the second sentence of the vision statement and suggested the language is awkward. **The Commission agreed to change this sentence to read, “This vision statement describes what you will see.”**

Mr. Levitan recalled the Commission previously discussed that the second sentence in the second to the last paragraph in the vision statement was awkwardly written, as well. He noted that staff provided two different alternatives and suggested the second alternative more accurately reflects the Commission’s recent comments. The Commission agreed to use the language contained in the March 20<sup>th</sup> draft, which would read, **“As the population ages and changes over time, the City continues to expand and improve senior services, housing choices and other amenities that make Shoreline such a desirable place to live.”**

Mr. Tovar said the City was recently notified by Sound Transit that the Environmental Impact Statement they are preparing for the light rail line has to look at alternatives, and one alternative is Highway 99. However, the “Signature Boulevard” section of the vision statement only makes reference to frequent regional bus rapid transit throughout the day. He suggested it would be appropriate to remove the word “bus” and say instead, frequent regional rapid transit throughout the day. This would allow the City to accommodate both bus and rail service. **The Commission agreed to this change in the second sentence in the second paragraph of “The Signature Boulevard) section to read, “As a major transportation corridor, there is frequent regional rapid transit throughout the day and evening.”**

Commissioner Wagner referred to the language proposed for Framework Goal 3 and suggested the word “changes” replace the word “growth.” This would incorporate both aging and other demographic changes. **The Commission agreed to change Framework Goal 3 to read, “Provide a variety of gathering places and recreational opportunities for all ages and expand them to be consistent with population changes.”**

The Commission discussed the proposed framework goal related to arts, culture and history. They agreed it should read, **“Encourage an emphasis on arts, culture and history throughout the community.”**

The Commission recalled their earlier discussion to combine Framework Goals 5 and 6. They referred to the language suggested by Boni Biery, which combines the two framework goals. Commissioner Kaje said that while he likes Ms. Biery’s recommendation, he suggested the words “through innovative development” be deleted since the intent is captured in the third clause. In addition, he questioned what is meant by the term “through public outreach projects.” He noted that public outreach is just one way to encourage restoration.

Commissioner Broili said he is not opposed to striking the term “public outreach projects”, but he likes the idea of leaving “innovative development” in. It’s more than just restoration; they want Shoreline to be a place where innovation is embraced and encouraged. Commissioner Perkowski suggested another option would be to further simplify the language to read, “Preserve, protect and restore our natural resources and apply innovative and environmentally sensitive development practices.

Commissioner Wagner said the language does not talk about the City’s desire to encourage development, except in high-density areas. She expressed concern that if large areas of land become available for development, the proposed language could imply that the City would protect 100% of the property. Commissioner Broili said his concern with development, in general, is that it be done sensitively and with a thought towards innovative design. He said he does not see a conflict with the current language. Commissioner Wagner provided an example of a school that becomes available for redevelopment. Would the City require that all of the lawn or field area be retained in its current state, or would they allow a portion of this area to be developed into a mixture of uses? She noted that the proposed framework goals encourage density and redevelopment in places that are already paved or have concrete. Commissioner Broili pointed out that the Built Green and LEEDS Standards emphasize innovative design that actually encourages preserving the green spaces and redeveloping the brown fields first. He said he believes the language is already in place to address Commissioner Wagner’s concern about flexibility.

Vice Chair Hall expressed his belief that the proposed framework goals provide an appropriate balance between development and the need to protect the environment. For example, meeting the affordable housing goals will likely require the removal of at least some trees. Also, if the City were to tell businesses they must protect every inch of undeveloped land, they would not be creating a business friendly environment.

Vice Chair Hall expressed concern about a framework goal that would require the City to restore natural resources. Although he previously recommended that Framework Goals 5 and 6 be combined, he

recommended they be separated again in order to clarify the intent of each one. The remainder of the Commission agreed.

Mr. Tovar suggested the intent of the term “public outreach” in Framework Goal 5 is to culture some type of individual stewardship and environmental awareness. Much of what can happen will not be done by developers as they build projects under best practices and innovative techniques. It will be up to the individual homeowners to decide how they will manage their properties. Commissioner Broili pointed out that an educational element would be extremely important as part of a public outreach program. The City must provide leadership through education and modeling. Commissioner Perkowski suggested that Framework Goal 5 be changed by deleting everything after “resources” and add “and encourage restoration, environmental education and stewardship.” **The Commission agreed that Framework Goal 5 should read, “Conserve and protect our environment and natural resources and encourage restoration, environmental education and stewardship,” and Framework Goal 6 should read, “Apply innovative and environmentally sensitive development practices.”**

**The Commission continued to support the deletion of Framework Goal 15, since the intent was already addressed as part of Framework Goal 3.**

The Commission discussed Framework Goal 16 and recalled earlier concerns regarding its intent. Vice Chair Hall reminded the Commission that the intent of each of the framework goals is to support the vision statement. Commissioner Kaje referred to Framework Goal 16 and suggested the term “non-governmental” should be used instead of “non-profit.” **The Commission concurred that Framework Goal 16 should be changed to read, “Strengthen partnerships with schools, non-governmental organizations, volunteers, public agencies and the business community.**

Commissioner Wagner referred to Framework Goal 17 and suggested the intent is already addressed by Framework Goal 2. Vice Chair Hall said the intent of this goal is to deal with underserved populations and support non-governmental (faith based) organizations that might provide human services. He expressed his belief that a thriving community is one where services are available to everyone who needs them. He said that while Framework Goal 17 is similar to Framework Goal 2, Framework Goal 2 seems more mechanical in terms of the basic functions of the City. Commissioner Wagner suggested that Framework Goal 17 be moved next to Framework Goal 2 so it is apparent that they represent two different things. Vice Chair Hall pointed out that some felt human services was lacking in the initial draft framework goals. **The Commission agreed that Framework Goal 17 should be placed after Framework Goal 2, and the language should be changed to read, “Support the provision of human services to meet community needs.”**

The Commission noted that the framework goals would have to be renumbered. However, they emphasized that the goals were not intended to be listed in order of priority.

**THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THEY ADOPT THE VISION STATEMENT AND FRAMEWORK GOALS WITH THE CHANGES IDENTIFIED IN THE NEW DRAFT AND AS AMENDED (SEE BOLD TEXT ABOVE).**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was scheduled on the agenda.

## **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Development Impact Fees**

Commissioner Kaje expressed concern that the Long-Range Financial Planning Committee has recommended not to implement development impact fees in the City of Shoreline, particularly given the economic downturn and the fact that the City has inherited aging infrastructure facilities from King County. He asked if the Long-Range Financial Planning Committee was specifically charged with answering that question. If so, is the City Council looking to the Committee to tell them whether development impact fees are reasonable or would they also look to the Planning Commission for a recommendation? Mr. Tovar said the City Council specifically asked the Long-Range Financial Planning Committee to focus on the question of impact development fees, along with a broader ray of questions related to potential revenues. He suggested the Commission raise this issue in their joint meeting with the City Council.

Commissioner Kaje suggested that staff provide examples of how other jurisdictions deal with development impact fees, especially from jurisdictions that have impact fees and primarily deal with infill or redevelopment. This could help the City understand exactly what it is they have chosen not to do. Mr. Tovar agreed to send the Commissioners the materials that were provided to the Long-Range Financial Planning Committee. In addition, staff could research with the MRSC. Vice Chair Hall pointed out that information could be obtained from the Master Builders Association. Commissioner Wagner recalled that Commissioner Behrens has done extensive research on the topic of development impact fees. She suggested that rather than asking staff to duplicate the work, they could invite Commissioner Behrens to share his findings.

Vice Chair Hall reminded the Commission that they have discussed at length “sidewalks to nowhere” and their desire to connect the pedestrian and bicycle networks. He said he would like to explore the possibility of using development impact fees to fund these projects. Mr. Tovar agreed there are a lot of aspects associated with the question of impact fees. They must not only identify how much money could be generated via impact fees, but how much it would cost the City to administer the program. They must also consider the negative aspects associated with impact fees, such as discouraging development the City might want to encourage. The Commission agreed they would like more information and discussion about development impact fees.

### **Ballinger Open Space**

Commissioner Kaje referred to the Ballinger Open Space, which is a sliver of open space nested between 200<sup>th</sup> and about 203<sup>rd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Northeast. A creek goes through the property, but it is completely choked by blackberry bushes, etc. No trails or public amenities are provided, and the property has become a dumping ground. He said he used the City’s website to report specific dumping, but nothing has been done to date. He asked staff to provide feedback about the City’s management plan for this non-recreational park. While kids play in the area, it is a very unsafe and unclean situation.

Mr. Tovar suggested the Commission invite a representative from the Parks Department to meet with the Commission and answer their park-related questions. Another option would be to conduct a joint meeting between the Park Board and Planning Commission. As far as code enforcement, Mr. Tovar suggested Commissioner Kaje contact the Code Response Team to report illegal activities.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Ms. Simulcik Smith referred the Commission to the agenda packet that was provided for their April 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. The agenda includes a study session for a proposed Development Code amendment for building heights for high schools. The agenda would also include an update regarding the Tree Regulations and an opportunity for the Commission to prepare for their joint meeting with the City Council on April 13<sup>th</sup>. In addition, the Commission would hold elections for Chair and Vice Chair.

Commissioner Wagner suggested it might make sense to have a joint meeting with the Parks Board to discuss the proposed tree regulations and how they would impact the park properties. The Commission and staff agreed that a joint meeting would be helpful.

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that he previously invited them to provide their thoughts about agenda items for the joint meeting with the City Council. While staff can come up with some ideas for the Commission to consider on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, he would like the Commissioners to contact staff with their ideas, as well.

Ms. Simulcik Smith asked the Commissioners to identify whether or not they would be present at the joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting on April 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. Commissioners Hall, Wagner, Kaje and Perkowski indicated they would be present.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

---

Sid Kuboi  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith  
Clerk, Planning Commission