

Archived: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 8:27:18 AM

From: [Dean Williams](#)

Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 2:47:19 PM

To: [City Council](#)

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment: Aug 3 Agenda Item 8(a)

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[922-001 Proposed CUP Conditions Aug 3 Study 8-3-20F.pdf](#) 

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We submitted these comments using the public comment portal, but due to the formatting limitations in the portal, we feel the need to provide the attached PDF of our comments.

Thank you,

Dean Williams

Dean Williams
Johns Monroe Mitsunaga Kolouřková, PLLC
11201 S.E. 8th Street, Suite 120
Bellevue, WA 98004
(425) 467-9967
www.jmmklanduselaw.com

THIS MESSAGE AND/OR THE DOCUMENT(S) ACCOMPANYING THIS ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, BE AWARE THAT ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION OR USE OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS TRANSMISSION IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE, MAIL OR ELECTRONIC MAIL, AND DESTROY THIS COMMUNICATION.



Robert D. Johns (*Retired*)
Michael P. Monroe
Darrell S. Mitsunaga
Duana T. Kolouskova
Vicki E. Orrico
Dean Williams

Via E-Mail

City Council
City of Shoreline, City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue N
Shoreline, WA 98133

August 3, 2020

Re: Agenda Study Item (a) Ordinance 896 CUP Conditions

Dear Councilmembers:

As you know, we represent Melissa and Joseph Irons and Irons Brothers Construction, Inc. regarding the approved City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan Amendment to allow professional offices in the R-8 and R-12 zones.

The Irons provide the following general comments on the proposed development regulations. First, we support the decision to make a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) run with the land as a matter of default. Second, we believe that, whenever the Director determines a CUP should be revoked immediately and without going through the ordinary Notice and Order process, it should be because the Director finds there to be “an imminent threat to the public health, safety, or general welfare.” *See* 20.30.300 C.3. Finally, we believe that if an applicant meets the applicable criteria, the Director shall grant (instead of “may”) the CUP, because any other standard will make the applicant subject to potentially arbitrary decisions.

The Irons also believe there should be more eligible parcels in the City. Considering the goal of these amendments, to create more business opportunities within the City of Shoreline, the currently proposed 92 parcels does not seem enough. Until the final iteration, the conditions allowed for a CUP on R-8 or R-12 zoned property within a certain number of feet from an arterial, but now the parcels must directly abut a CB or similar zone.

The Irons provide the following comments regarding the indexed criteria under 20.40.475, 8a-22–23 in the agenda packet.

Condition 5 currently reads:

5. The office may use or store a vehicle for pickup of materials used by the office or the distribution of products from the site, provided such vehicles shall not exceed a gross weight of 14,000 pounds, a height of nine feet and a length of 22 feet.

We believe the restriction to one overnight large vehicle is unwarranted and unnecessary. Given the restrictions on location, the limited number of effected parcels, required landscape buffers, no on-site transfer of commodity, and the location of such parking, we believe that the holder of such a permit should be allowed to fill the allowed six parking spaces as they see fit. Larger vehicles are simply more convenient when a business brings its commodities directly to consumers and must have the tools necessary to install them on

arrival. The distinction between a vehicle used for distribution of materials and one that is not can also be an arbitrary one, since, for instance, tile can be piled in the back of a sedan almost as easily as a truck.

We recognize and appreciate the attempt to parallel the allowances for home-based business and professional offices, but it should also be taken into consideration that the reason for these amendments is to permit a more intense use provided that the conditions are met. The indexed criteria ensure that the location of a professional office will have as little impact on the abutting residential parcels as possible by, for instance, only locating such offices on the outskirts of R-8 and R-12 zones and requiring a fence or landscape buffer between office-related parking and those zones. Given these factors, and the general goal of these amendments, allowing overnight parking for additional vehicles that pickup or deliver materials used by the office will not have adverse effects.

We propose the following language to replace the above:

5. The office may use or store ~~a~~ vehicles for pickup of materials used by the office or the distribution of products from the site, provided such vehicles shall not exceed a gross weight of 14,000 pounds, a height of nine feet and a length of 22 feet.

Thank you, for your time. We look forward to the upcoming discussions.

Sincerely,



Dean Williams
Direct Tel: (425) 467-9967
Email: williams@jmmlaw.com