

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

October 4, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Montero
Vice Chair Mork
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Maul

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Davis
Commissioner Malek

Staff Present

Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Uki Dele, Surface Water Utility and Environmental Services Manager
Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Montero called the Public Hearing 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: Chair Montero, Vice Chair Mork, and Commissioners Lin and Maul. Commissioners Craft, Davis and Malek were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: 2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

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

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to once a year. To ensure the public can view the proposals within a citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket that lists the amendments to be considered in the “once a year” review. He advised that the City Council set the final list in March, with eight amendments. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1** would amend Policy LU-47 to read, “*Consider annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the existing southern border of the City.*” The amendment was carried over from the 2017 docket. Due to a legal complexity, the timeline has been extended for the project. Design is currently underway for portions of the roadway, but it has not been completed. Staff is recommending the amendment be placed on the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Docket.

There were no public comments related to Amendment 1.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND AMENDMENT 1 BE CONTINUED TO THE 2019 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 2** is to “*consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan that may have applicability to reflect the outcomes of the Richmond Beach Transportation Corridor Study as described in Policy PW-9.*” The amendment would also “*consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that could result from the development of Interlocal Agreements as described in Policy PW-13.*” The City anticipated that the corridor study on mitigating adverse impacts from BSRE’s proposed development would be completed in 2018, but delays in Snohomish County’s review of the Environmental Impact Statement and Snohomish County’s denial of BSRE’s building permit have delayed the City’s review and completion of the corridor study. Staff is recommending the amendment be placed on the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Docket.

Tom Mailhot, Shoreline, noted that this amendment has been on the docket for the past five years. He pointed out that the corridor study would have been funded by BSRE. With Snohomish County’s denial of BSRE’s building permit, it is not likely that the corridor study will ever be completed. If a future development plan comes forward, the amendment could be placed back on the docket, but it seems pointless to move it forward year after year.

Vice Chair Mork asked about the consequences of not carrying the amendment forward to 2019. Mr. Szafran responded that the amendment could be removed from the docket for now and put back on if and when a development proposal comes forward in the future. Assistant City Attorney

Ainsworth-Taylor said removing the amendment from the docket could impact the City's continuing relationship with BSRE. The amendment was in relation to BSRE's appeal to the Growth Management Hearings Board, and the City stipulated to keep the amendment in a holding pattern as it is considered for the GMA settlement extension. She recently declined to enter into another settlement extension with BSRE and the case had started to move forward. However, the City Attorney decided to put it back into the hold status. She agreed that if the amendment is removed from the docket, it could be put back on the docket in 2020, if necessary. She recommended they leave the amendment on the docket for the time being, since it would not require any action.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND AMENDMENT 2 BE CONTINUED TO THE 2019 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 3** is to *“consider amendments to the Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies and update of the Surface Water Master Plan.”* Over the past few years, staff has been working with consultants to update the City's 2011 Surface Water Master Plan, which is a supporting component of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The primary purpose of the 2018 master plan is to address drainage and water quality, challenges associated with growth, increasing regulations and aging infrastructure. The 2018 master plan will guide the City's surface water utility for the next 5 to 10 years, including recommendations for capital improvements, programs, long-term asset management and a financial plan that sustainably supports the utility. Staff is recommending approval of Amendment 3.

Vice Chair Mork asked if the Commission has the authority to recommend review of the Surface Water Master Plan in 5 years as opposed to 10 years. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor answered that the amendment would simply bring the master plan into the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan can be updated on an annual basis, so changes to the master plan could also be done on an annual basis. Ms. Dele added that the master plan would be updated again in 5 years.

There was no public comment regarding Amendment 3.

Vice Chair Mork commented that she was impressed with the amount of work that was done on the Surface Water Master Plan. With all of the construction and new things happening related to surface water, she thanked staff for their attention to detail. She also appreciates that the plan will be updated every 5 years.

VICE CHAIR MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 3 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 4** is to *“consider deleting Appendix D – Master Street Plan from the Transportation Master Plan and replace with reference to the Engineering Design Manual pursuant to SMC*

12.10.015.” The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) serves as a Transportation Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The TMP speaks to a Master Street Plan. Recommended Transportation Improvements (Chapter 9) and the Master Street Plan (Appendix D) both include elements that are detailed and specific, similar to a development regulation as opposed to a goal/policy that a Comprehensive Plan is supposed to contain. Amendment 4 would revise the text within Chapters 7 and 9 of the TMP and remove the Master Street Plan (Appendix D). Both of these elements are too specific for a policy document.

Vice Chair Mork asked if the amendment is consistent with neighboring municipalities. Ms. Daley-Peng answered that it is consistent with the City of Seattle. Discussion with the City Attorney emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan is a guiding document of goals and policies and not regulations. The current Comprehensive Plan is a duplicate of the Street Matrix in the Engineering Design Manual. This is redundant and leaves the City open to conflict when one document gets updated and the other does not. It is staff’s recommendation that the Master Street Plan reside in the Engineering Design Manual only.

There was no public comment regarding Amendment 4.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 4 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER LIN SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 5** was withdrawn by the applicant.
- **Amendment 6** is to “*consider amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan.*” This amendment originally started as a privately-initiated amendment. However, when reviewing the request, staff identified other necessary amendments. Amendment 6 incorporates both the private and City amendments and would include the following:
 - a. Rename the plan from “*Subarea Plan 2*” to “*Point Wells Subarea Plan.*” Staff recommends approval of this change.
 - b. Delete the last sentence under “*Geographic and Historical Context,*” which reads, “*The island is bisected roughly north/south by the Burlington Northern Railroad (BNRR) right-of-way.*” With Woodway’s annexation of the upper bluff, the BNRR no longer bisects the unincorporated portion. Staff recommends approval of this change.
 - c. Revise Figure 1 to delete the depicted upper bluff area and to show it instead as being part of the Town of Woodway. Staff recommends approval of this change.
 - d. In the section titled, “*Geographic and Historical Context,*” strike the language describing the lowland area of Point Wells (2nd paragraph) and change the remainder of the paragraph to read, “*The only vehicular access to Point Wells is via Richmond Beach Road and the regional road network via the City of Shoreline. However, there is potential easterly access through the Town of Woodway connecting to 116th Avenue West.*” The amendment

recognizes that a second access road is likely to be required by Snohomish County. Staff recommends approval of this change.

- e. Strike Figure 2 as there is no longer a need to identify the upland area vs. the lowland area. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- f. Delete the language that describes the upland portion of Point Wells. Since Woodway has annexed the upper bluff, this paragraph is no longer needed. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- g. Move the language related to Point Wells being a Potential Annexation Area to the section titled, *“Designation of a Future Service and Annexation Area (FSAA) at Point Wells.”* Staff recommends approval of this change.
- h. Add a new sentence at the end of the paragraph under *“Snohomish County’s designation of Point Wells as an Urban Center.”* The new sentence would read, *“Despite the City’s opposition in 2009 Snohomish County rezoned Point Wells as an Urban Center, and in 2010 adopted an Urban Center Development Code that applies to all Urban Centers in Snohomish County.”* The proposed new privately-initiated language is intended to confirm the fact that the area has been designated as an Urban Center in Snohomish County’s Comprehensive Plan. However, in light of the Hearing Examiner’s June 29th decision to deny BSRE’s application, the Point Wells site is zoned Planned Community Business and the future land use is Urban Village in Snohomish County’s Future Land Use Map.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor explained that, as drafted, this section of the Subarea Plan contains a lot of history, which is not typical for a comprehensive plan. In addition, the language is not consistent with the current situation. Instead of the language proposed by the private citizen, she recommended the following language to replace this entire paragraph: *“Point wells is not currently located within the municipal boundaries of the City. Therefore, Snohomish County is responsible for assigning a land use designation and implementing zoning for the area. In 2010, Snohomish County designated and zoned the area Urban Center. In 2012, Snohomish County amended that designation to Urban Village and assigned Planned Community Business zoning to the majority of the area in order to implement that designation. Thus, Snohomish County’s present vision for Point Wells is a neighborhood-scaled node with a mix of retail and office uses, public and community facilities, and high-density residential.”* She suggested that this proposed language summarizes the history of the property and provides an accurate picture of its current land-use designation and zoning, as well as Snohomish County’s vision for the area.

- i. Replace the 1st paragraph in the section titled, *“Designation of a Future Service and Annexation Area (FSAA) at Point Wells.”* Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor commented that the language proposed in the citizen-initiated amendment contains a lot of history, which is not necessarily appropriate for a Comprehensive Plan. Instead of the privately-initiated changes, she suggested that the section be titled, *“City of Shoreline’s*

Intent to Annex Point Wells.” The paragraph could read, “*In (year), the City originally designated Point Wells as a Potential Annexation Area and in (year), the City changed the designation to a Future Service and Annexation Area. The purpose and function of the Future Service Annexation Area is to (describe the purpose and function of that).*”

- j.** Change the 2nd paragraph in the section titled, “*Designation of a Future Service and Annexation Area (FSAA) at Point Wells,*” to recognize that there is no longer a need to refer to a lowland portion as the upland portion is no longer part of the unincorporated island. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- k.** Change the 3rd and 4th paragraphs in the section titled, “*Designation of a Future Service and Annexation Area (FSAA) at Point Wells,*” by deleting “lowland portion.” This change recognizes that the lowland portion of the site no longer applies. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- l.** Figure 3 would be renumbered to Figure 2. It would also be revised to delete the indicated acreage figures, which are now incorrect. In addition, the white Upland Area should be shown as being part of the Town of Woodway since Woodway recently annexed the land east of BNR. Lastly, the Public View Corridor graphic from the previous Figure 2 and its 100-foot and 200-foot elevation contours would be added to the new Figure 2. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- m.** Add, “*once a permit is approved to develop the site,*” at the end of the 1st sentence in the 1st paragraph under “*A Future Vision for Point Wells.*” Since the Hearing Examiner denied BSRE’s development applications and upheld Snohomish County’s request to deny the development applications because of substantial conflicts with their code, the actual development of Point Wells would be years after development applications are approved. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- n.** Add the following at the end of the 4th paragraph under “*A Future Vision for Point Wells*” to read, “*and that generated traffic after mitigation does not exceed adopted citywide level of service standards and does not exceed the traffic limit for Richmond Beach Drive that is specified in this Subarea Plan.*” Staff believes this citizen-initiated amendment is an overreach. The proposed language is trying to limit traffic on Richmond Beach Drive to what the subarea set (4,000 Average Daily Trips), which is not necessarily what the City anticipated indefinitely. It also restricts traffic on the roadway more heavily than other comparable roadways within the City. Staff recommends replacing the citizen-initiated proposal with the following, “*and that any transportation Level of Service failures, in accordance with Shoreline Municipal Code, are mitigated to maintain the adopted standard.*” Staff’s proposed language confirms that the City’s vision includes maintaining the City’s Level of Service (LOS) standards.
- o.** Delete the last sentence of the paragraph below Policy PW-4 since some of the trees at the top of the slope are likely to be cut down as part of a recently-approved single-family development on the upper bluff. Staff is recommending approval of this change.

- p.* Change Policy PW-5 to read, “*New structures in the NW subarea should rise no higher than elevation 150 or be no taller than 90 feet, whichever is less.*” Building to the full 200-foot elevation would make the buildings visible to the residents of Woodway and Richmond Beach, and the City should recognize the 90-foot building height limit contained in the County’s Planned Community Business zoning regulations. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- q.* Add a new sentence at the end of Policy PW-7 to read, “*New structures in the SE and SW subarea and the southwest portion of the NW subarea should rise no higher than six stories.*” The height limitation in the view corridor helps preserve the views from existing neighborhoods. Staff recommends approval of this change.
- r.* Rather than the citizen-initiated change, staff is recommending alternative language in the 2nd paragraph below Policy PW-10, which would read, “*The City re-channelized the Richmond Beach Road corridor from 24th Avenue NW to Dayton Avenue N from four (4) lanes to three (3) lanes. This re-channelization further reduced existing capacity along the corridor. Any changes proposed to the land use within the subarea should be carefully studied to ensure that the trips generated do not exceed the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio standard of over .90.*” Staff is not recommending that a specific number of daily vehicle trips be included in the amended language because background volumes will change over time and the daily trips are not what the City uses for concurrency. Staff is also recommending denial of the last sentence, which reads, “*This would be an unacceptable impact, incapable of being mitigated with Richmond Beach Road remaining as three lanes.*” The City cannot assume traffic on Richmond Beach Road cannot be mitigated. Staff believes the proposed statement is premature and recommends evaluating traffic when the property owner submits a building permit for Point Wells.
- s.* Change Policy PW-12 by striking the last sentence. The City does not have a LOS standard based on daily trips, and it is not consistent with citywide standards. The City should evaluate deleting the entire policy since the 4,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) is inconsistent with the citywide standards. Staff supports this proposed change.
- t.* Add a new Policy PW-13 related to traffic on Richmond Beach Road. Staff believes the new policy is an overreach. Staff does not support limiting this corridor beyond what the rest of the City is limited to from a concurrency perspective. The language proposed is further limiting than the City’s adopted LOS standard in that it says no segment can exceed 0.90 v/c. City code says that one segment may exceed the 0.90 v/c as long as the intersection meets LOS. Staff also believes the proposed new policy would limit Council when they decide in the future whatever land use changes are proposed at Point Wells and what mitigation might warrant exceeding the 0.90 v/c, which was done on 15th Avenue NE for example. Staff recommends denial of this change.
- u.* The applicant has suggested changing the 1st paragraph in the “*Interjurisdictional Coordination*” section by adding “*and Edmonds*” at the end of the 1st sentence and deleting

the last two sentences as they are no longer accurate given the likelihood of a second access road through Woodway. Staff recommends approval of these changes.

- v. Renumber the policies if Policy PW-13 is adopted.
- w. Delete the last two sentences of current Policy PW-13. Since the Hearing Examiner has denied BSRE's development applications, any new application will be required to complete State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review, which includes transportation analysis and mitigation. Staff recommends leaving the language as is.

Tom Mailhot, Shoreline, thanked staff for helping him prepare the amendments, as well as the time they spent reviewing the proposed changes. He said he accepts many of the changes recommended by staff, with the exception of two (Items n and t). Staff recommended denial of Item n because the 4,000-vehicle traffic limit for Richmond Beach Road was not intended to be permanent. He said that, although it may not have been intended to be permanent, it is in the subarea plan. If the City does not want to follow the limit, it should be removed from the subarea plan. It seems inconsistent to include the limit, but not allow it to be mentioned.

Mr. Mailhot said the intent of proposed new Policy PW-13 (Item t) is to codify what the City has consistently said, that traffic from the development must not cause a failure over LOS. While the City welcomes mitigation of any increased traffic from the development, it won't acquire property to widen Richmond Beach Road, and it won't convert the road to four lanes. He noted that staff altered his proposed language for Policy PW-13 so that the proposal would not allow any leg of an intersection fail, and he is willing to accept that change back to what the policy currently is. However, with that change, he doesn't see any problem with adoption of Policy PW-13. Staff argues that it would limit the Council's ability to allow a slightly higher LOS down the road, but that is exactly his point. He wants the Council to enforce the City's current standards unless they actually change the standards through a public process. He said it is important that the subarea plan clearly states the City's current policies for mitigating additional traffic on Richmond Beach Road, and that is what Policy PW-13 would do.

Mr. Szafran said the Traffic Engineer has voiced concern that the City doesn't have control over what happens at Point Wells, and limiting the traffic on Richmond Beach Road would limit the growth that can happen in the City and not just Point Wells. She believes the Council should have the flexibility to change it. Commissioner Maul pointed out that the LOS standards are outlined in the City's Transportation Master Plan. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor added that they are also in the Development Code. Any modification to either document would require a public process.

To further clarify for Vice Chair Mork, Mr. Szafran explained that v/c is a citywide standard, and the Traffic Engineer is concerned about making an exception for one roadway and not the rest of the City. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor added that the code calls out a couple of intersections that are allowed to exceed v/c. Although she doesn't know the rationale for these exceptions, a full analysis was done to support the decision. The Traffic Engineer is concerned about making an exception for Richmond Beach Road without a thorough analysis to support it.

Mr. Mailhot said he was recently told that the two intersections were excepted not because they were failing or exceeding the v/c ratio today, but because they were expected to fail by 2030 if they didn't have a higher ratio. The City's future forecasting showed that eventually the roads would go above 0.90 v/c, so the exception was added to allow that to happen. He noted that there is no real concern that Richmond Beach Drive will exceed the 4,000 ADT limit, as its current volume is about 500 cars and the street is only a mile long. A good portion of the beachside of the roadway cannot be built on because it is either the pump station or the tracks. It's hard to imagine enough development on that road to get it up to 4,000 ADT based on what the City allows.

Mr. Mailhot suggested there is confusion between two arguments. The argument that there should not be a 4,000 ADT limit is separate from his assertion that, as long as the limit is in the subarea plan, his amendment should be able to say the City is going to enforce it. If the City doesn't want to enforce the limit, it should be removed from the plan.

Commissioner Maul felt that the proposed new Policy PW-13 (Item t) is redundant since it addresses issues that are already covered. If there is little possibility for development to cause the street to exceed the 4,000 ADT limit, he is not sure what the concern is.

Commissioner Lin asked if a 0.90 v/c ratio would be greater than the 4,000 ADT limit. Mr. Szafran pointed out that a 4,000 ADT limit would equate to a v/c ratio of about 0.30. Therefore, a 4,000 ADT limit would be a much stricter standard. The Traffic Engineer is concerned because the City measures traffic by LOS and not ADTs.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 6 AS ADJUSTED BY STAFF AND DISCUSSED BY THE COMMISSION. VICE CHAIR MORK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 7** is to “*consider amending Land use Designations Mixed-Use 1 (MU1) and Mixed-Use 2 (MU2) in the Land Use Element in order to provide clarification.*” This is a minor amendment proposed by the City Council to provide clarification so that each use can stand alone rather than having MU2 referenced in the MU1 designation. As proposed, Policy LU-9 would remain as is, and Policy LU-10 would be amended by deleting it entirely and replacing it with the language shown in Attachment 7 of the Staff Report.

There was no public comment regarding Amendment 7.

VICE CHAIR MORK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 7 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- **Amendment 8** is to “*consider updates to the Pedestrian System Plan in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP).*” As proposed, the following sections would be amended as shown in Attachment 12 of the Staff Report:

- Update Chapter 5 – Pedestrian Plan: Figure L (Pedestrian System Plan) and Figure N (Pedestrian Projects Plan).
- Update Chapter 9 – Recommended Transportation Improvements: Pedestrian Project Improvements Criteria text and Table 9.3 (Priority Pedestrian Projects Recommended for Funding) based on the 2018 Sidewalk prioritization Plan.
- Remove Table 9.3 (Priority Pedestrian Projects) and Appendix H (Pedestrian Projects Prioritization Matrix) because their level of detail is too specific for the TMP and their content is outdated based on the Sidewalk Prioritization Plan that will live as a planning document outside of the TMP. While the TMP sets policies to direct the prioritization of the Pedestrian System Plan, it does not need to direct the details of the Pedestrian System Plan’s implementation.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments as outlined in Attachment 12 of the Staff Report.

There was no public comment regarding Amendment 8.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT 8 AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER LIN SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Cohen provided a brief report on current development activity. He distributed a chart showing projects valued at over \$1 million that were either issued permits or are under review since mid-2017. He noted that the projects will result in approximately 850 multifamily residential units. The Alexan Project, which was approved a few weeks ago, will provide approximately 324 multifamily residential units, and the Vale Apartments will result in about 120 multifamily residential units. In addition, about 50 units of townhouse development is in the works, and the City anticipates an application in the next month for another 170-unit townhouse development in the MUR-45’ zone. The City has issued permits for one self-storage project and will issue permits for a second one soon. Staff is also having pre-application meetings for potential projects in the MUR-70’ zone, with an intent to build just before the stations open.

Mr. Cohen reported that staff has started the negotiation process with the developer at the Sears site/Shoreline Place, and the scope is approximately 1,300 multifamily units and 84,000 square feet of retail space. The developer has proposed a phased, market-driven approach, and a Development Agreement will likely be required. The Development Agreement would come before the Commission for review and a recommendation to the City Council prior to final adoption.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor reported that she attended a public hearing before the Snohomish County Council relative to Point Wells. There was a well-represented citizen turnout from both Shoreline and Woodway. In the end the Snohomish County council affirmed the Hearing Examiner’s

decision, with modification of just one finding. The council will enter its final motion on October 8th, and it is likely that BSRE will appeal the decision.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chair Mork reported that the subcommittee assigned to review the Planning Commission By-laws (Mork, Malek and Craft) has not yet met. The Commissioners concurred that if the work is not completed by the end of 2018, they can inform the Council that the work will be on their 2019 work schedule.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohen reviewed the Commission's meeting schedule for the remainder of 2018, noting a public hearing on October 18th regarding the Green Built Commercial Amendments and a public hearing on November 1st for the 2018 Development Code Amendments. The Commission will discuss potential amendments to the Shoreline Master Program on either November 1st or 15th. The Commission's last meeting of 2018 will be on December 6th and will include a discussion about the joint meeting with the City Council, which is scheduled for January 14th.

ADJOURNMENT

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

William Montero
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission