

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
(Via Zoom)

March 18, 2021
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Malek
Commissioner Callahan
Commissioner Galuska
Commissioner Rwamashongye
Commissioner Sager

Commissioners Absent

Chair Mork
Commissioner Lin

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Planning Director
Nora Gierloff, Planning Manager
Sara Lane, Administrative Services Director
Christina Arcidy, Management Analyst
Dan Johnson, Parks, Fleet and Facilities Manager
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Malek 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 Malek and Commissioners Callahan, Galuska, Rwamashongye and Sager. Chair Mork and Commissioner Lin were absent with notice.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 4, 2021 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: PRESENTATION OF SHORELINE PROPOSITION 1

Ms. Arcidy played a pre-recorded PowerPoint presentation, which was prepared for the community information sessions. The presentation emphasized that City staff cannot speak in favor of or against the proposition, as it is up to Shoreline voters to determine whether they are in favor or opposed to the measure. The presentation advised that:

- The City Council adopted the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan in 2017, which set a trajectory for parks, recreation and cultural programming for the City for the next 20 years. The PROS Plan includes 11 Strategic Action Initiatives, including various park improvements to expand and enhance outdoor recreation opportunities for the Community, and Proposition 1 addresses several of them.
- Between 2017 and 2019, beginning with PROS Plan outreach, the public shared input in the design of park improvements. The outreach included the use of surveys, focus groups, dot exercises, stakeholder meetings, open houses, online comment forms, social media, resident committees, and the Parks Board. The park improvements reflect the public's comments over this three-year period.
- Starting in September 2018, a resident committee spent seven months studying various options and making a recommendation on funding for park improvements, and the Park Board made a recommendation to the City Council in 2020 to place a park improvement and parkland acquisition ballot measure before the Shoreline voters.
- After several discussions, the City Council ultimately voted on January 25, 2021, to approve placing Proposition 1, to fund park improvements and parkland acquisitions, on the April 27, 2021, special election ballot.
- If approved by Shoreline voters, Proposition 1 would authorize improvements to 8 parks and the acquisition and improvement of new parkland. The five parks (Brugger's Bog, Hillwood, Richmond Highlands, Briercrest and James Keough) selected for significant improvements represent geographic equity, are in neighborhoods that need gathering places, and did not receive funding in the 2006 park bond measure.
- Funding from Proposition 1 would create Briercrest Community Park out of the east arm of Hamlin Park. Improvements would include a new play area, splash pad and picnic shelter to provide gathering space for the neighborhood and also serve the wider community.
- The playground at Brugger's Bog Park is currently underwater several months of the year, and the park improvements would relocate the playground to a dryer area and install additional features such as a multi-sports court, picnic shelter and park restroom.

4a. Draft Minutes from March 18, 2021

- Improvements to Hillwood Park include a splash pad and expanded play area, a new picnic shelter and a perimeter trail.
- A new off-leash dog area would be built at James Keough Park, along with a new perimeter trail, picnic shelter, and park restroom. The existing play equipment would be replaced.
- The Richmond Highlands Recreation Center houses Shoreline’s Specialized Recreation Programs. Adding accessible amenities in this location would provide the possibility to expand programming for people with unique physical and mental challenges. While all Shoreline Park playgrounds meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, this playground would be designed with enhanced accessibility features that provide a place for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy a day in the park.
- If approved by voters, Proposition 1 would also fund additional investments in three other parks (Kruckeberg Botanic Garden, Ridgecrest, and Shoreview). At Kruckeberg Botanic Garden, the education center and children’s garden would be made accessible to people of all abilities. At Ridgecrest, a new off-leash dog area and play area would be constructed. At Shoreview Park, the off-leash dog area would be upgraded and the dirt soccer field will be converted to grass.
- Approval of Proposition 1 would allow the City to invest in public art throughout the City in accordance with the City’s public art plan.
- Proposition 1 would also enable the City to purchase new park land and make baseline improvements upon that land. Park land acquisition and improvements would expand Paramount Open Space, Brugger’s Bog, and Rotary Park, and would include additional park land acquisitions in the light rail station areas and other parts of the City.
- For Proposition 1 to pass, it must meet two critical thresholds. It must receive a minimum 60% yes vote and there must be a minimum voter turn out of 40% of the voters who cast ballots in the last general election within the City.
- Current estimates show the cost of the park improvements are \$35.8 million. If the measure is approved, the City would issue General Obligation Bonds. Debt service on the bonds would be paid with an increase in property taxes over the next 20 years. The owner of a median-valued home (\$517,000 in 2020), would expect to pay approximately \$112 per year or \$9 a month in property tax for the park bond. This represents a \$36/year or \$3/month increase over what property owners are currently paying on the 2006 park bond, which will be fully repaid in 2021.
- State law allows for certain exemptions and deferrals for this type of excess property tax levy to senior citizens, disabled persons, and disabled veterans meeting certain income thresholds and other criteria.
- More information about Proposition 1 can be found at www.shorelinewa.gov/prop1.

Ms. Arcidy emphasized that, when acting in their official capacity as Commissioners, they cannot support or oppose Proposition 1. However, they can provide factual information. If Commissioners want to speak in support or opposition to Proposition 1, they must make it clear they are speaking on their own behalf and not as a member of or on behalf of the Planning Commission or City. Commissioners may not direct staff to do any campaign activities in support of or opposition to the proposition, and they cannot use public facilities, equipment and materials to engage in these activities, either. They cannot use their City email addresses to talk to people about supporting or opposing the proposition. While they can respond to factual questions, she encouraged the Commissioners to invite staff to respond to questions that come to them.

Commissioner Sager asked if the community has provided any feedback about the proposal to remove ball fields from two of the parks. Was there any concern that there won't be enough space to meet the demand? Ms. Arcidy said they did receive this feedback, and staff did some research prior to putting together the package for the City Council. As proposed, the lined baseball fields would be removed from two parks. Data indicates that baseball and softball participation is decreasing on a local, state and national level, whereas, participation in other sports that are currently renting these fields is increasing. She reported that, overall, the City's system has enough fields to meet both the current and anticipated future demand. Proposition 1 also looks to convert a dirt field at Shoreview Park to a grass field, as playing sports on a dirt field is not as desirable and the field is not used to capacity. Once it is converted, it could be used for multiple sports that do not require lined fields. Commissioner Sager asked if the field would be converted to grass and not turf, and Ms. Arcidy answered affirmatively.

Commissioner Rwamashongye voiced concern that meeting the voter threshold may be extremely challenging because the requirement is based on participation in the last general election where the consequences at stake were much higher. With the April election, the issues at stake are very different. Ms. Arcidy responded that the threshold is a technicality of law, but she doesn't have the history of when, how and why it was established. Every year, the general election sets the validation requirement for all elections the following year. Ms. Lane added that the threshold recognizes that voter turnout in special elections will not be as high, and the law is an attempt to ensure there is enough representation to validate the election.

Vice Chair Malek requested details on the walking trails that are proposed as part of Proposition 1. He recalled the Commission's previous discussions about connectivity between the light rail stations, the Interurban Trail, parks and neighborhoods. Ms. Lane said the walking trails proposed as part of Proposition 1 are not necessarily designed to connect with other parks and the light rail stations. However, the long-term vision is that the park system would be connected to the Interurban Trail, Burke Gilman Trail, etc. Mr. Johnson added that connectivity between parks and neighborhoods in a multimodal fashion will be part of the discussion when the Transportation Master Plan is updated in the near future. The trails in the concept designs that are part of Proposition 1 can generally be described as 8-foot wide (so two wheelchairs can pass) with a good transitory surface. The trails will connect to all the elements within the parks to create equitable ingress and egress. Ms. Lane pointed out that walking trails were ranked very high in the PROS Plan. While it is not called out as a separate design element, it is included in each of the parks where improvements will be made.

Nancy Pfeil, Shoreline, asked if the plan for park improvements associated with Proposition 1 has already been set. Ms. Arcidy answered that the drawings give the general public an idea of what the design elements might look like in each of the parks, but the final designs have not been chosen yet. Because design work is costly, it will not move forward until after Proposition 1 has been approved. Ms. Pfeil asked why a basketball court is proposed for this park when there are open basketball courts at the high school one block to the north. She noted that the park is heavily used by soccer teams and asked if the proposed new design would allow this activity to continue. She also pointed out that the proposal would remove the baseball diamond that is frequently used instead of the one that is used less frequently.

Ms. Pfeil voiced concern about the covered shelter that is proposed at Richland Highland Park when there is an enhanced shelter just 1,000 yards away and studies show that covered shelters attract drug use at public parks. Lastly, Ms. Pfeil reminded them that the land for Richland Highland Park was donated with the specific intent of having fields for children to play on, and there were specific requirements attached to the donation. She asked if the City has researched to make sure the proposed improvements are consistent with these requirements.

PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS TO ALLOW ENHANCED SHELTERS IN THE MIXED BUSINESS (MB) ZONE

Vice Chair Malek explained that the proposal before the Planning Commission is a code amendment defining Enhanced Shelters and permitting them as a use in the Mixed Business (MB) zoning district subject to certain index criteria. The MB zone, along with Community Business (CB) and Town Center (TC) 1, 2 and 3 zones, already allows homeless shelters. Enhanced shelters have different operational criteria, and therefore, are being defined and regulated separately.

Vice Chair Malek reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing. He advised that the Commission is being asked to accept public testimony and then formulate a recommendation to the City Council. He clarified that decisions related to the current enhanced shelter have already been made.

Commissioner Rwamashongye asked if staff has prepared more than one definition of an enhanced shelter for the Commission to consider. Vice Chair Malek responded that staff has prepared one definition, and the terms of that definition are outlined in Attachments A through D.

Ms. Gierloff said this is a public hearing on Zoning Code amendments related to enhanced shelters. She reviewed that in early 2020, the City Council identified a gap in the homeless services provided in North King County. While there are shelters that are seasonal or serve specific populations, there was no 24/7 shelters available for single adults. Funding through the Department of Commerce to expand homeless shelter capacity became available in June, and the City of Shoreline was asked to support a grant application by King County and Lake City Partners for a site at 165th Street and Aurora Avenue N. The site is currently zoned Residential (R) 48, with a smaller parking lot that is zoned R-18. Most of the properties along Aurora Avenue N are zoned MB, and behind the corridor is residential zoning of various densities.

Ms. Gierloff advised that, in response to the grant opportunity from the Department of Commerce, the City Council adopted interim zoning regulations last October that allowed siting of an enhanced shelter in the R-48 zone. The interim regulations are effective for up to six months unless renewed. Under the interim ordinance, King County established an enhanced shelter on the site at 165th Street and Aurora Avenue N.

As opposed to the interim ordinance, Ms. Gierloff advised that the permanent amendments currently before the Commission for consideration would allow enhanced shelters in the MB zone. There is also a concurrent application to rezone the property at 165th Street and Aurora Avenue N to MB. The rezone proposal is a separate application, with the public hearing occurring before the Hearing Examiner on March 17th. The Hearing Examiner will provide a recommendation within the next two weeks, and the rezone application will then go before the City Council for a final decision. The Planning Commission's recommendation on the Zoning Code change will also be presented to the City Council for a final decision.

Ms. Gierloff reviewed the proposed Zoning Code amendments as follows:

- **SMC 20.20.018(E).** A new definition for Enhanced Shelter would be added to the Zoning Code. The proposed definition is very similar to the definition that was developed for the interim ordinance. It clarifies that enhanced shelters are open 24/7, and people are assigned specific rooms for the duration of their stay. They are low-barrier shelters, in that people are not disqualified based solely on their history. As proposed, the definition would read: *“A 24-hour-a-day facility which is open to adults experiencing homelessness regardless of prior criminal history, addiction or mental health challenges, as long as the individual is able to live safely in community with others and abide by established program rules. The purpose is to provide safe shelter and access to resources, including, but not limited to, housing, basic needs, hygiene, case management and social programs as they transition to permanent housing.”*
- **SMC 20.40.120 (Table).** An additional line would be added to the use table to allow enhanced shelters in the MB zone. Although homeless shelters are operationally different than enhanced shelters, they are already allowed in the CB, MB and TC zones.
- **SMC 20.40.355.** The proposed index criteria in SMC 20.40.355 would place the following conditions on the enhanced shelter use.
 - A. *It shall be operated by state, county or city government, a State of Washington registered corporation, or a federally-recognized tax exempt 501(C)(3) organization that has capacity to organize and manage an enhanced shelter.*
 - B. *It shall permit inspections by City, Health and Fire Department inspectors at reasonable times for compliance with the City's requirements. An inspection by the Shoreline Fire Department is required prior to occupancy.* The intent is to ensure that the facility meets all of the safety requirements.

- C. *It shall develop and enforce a code of conduct acceptable to the City that articulates the rules and regulations of the shelter. The rules must include, at a minimum, prohibitions against criminal activities, threats, violence and consumption of drugs and alcohol.*
- D. *It shall be located with frontage on a principal arterial and within ¼ mile of a transit stop with frequent all-day service as defined by King County Metro Transit. Many of the residents will be transit-dependent and the shelters will need to be located in areas where residents have access to the services they need.*
- E. *To avoid a concentration of uses, enhanced shelters must be located at least a mile from any other enhanced or homeless shelters, calculated as a radius from the property lines of the site. This is a new criterion that doesn't occur in the interim ordinance. This is a new criterion Staff feels it is important to limit the number of enhanced shelters in any given area.*
- F. *The maximum number of residents in an enhanced shelter shall be determined by the general capacity of the building and the level of staffing to be provided, but shall in no case exceed 100. This is also a new criterion that doesn't occur in the interim ordinance. The maximum number would be determined by building code and operational requirements, but this criterion would establish a maximum capacity of no more than 100 residents.*
- G. *A solid, 6-foot-tall fence shall be provided along all property lines that abut residential zoning districts. The required fence has already been installed at the existing site, as it was a condition of the interim ordinance.*
- H. *Submittal of a parking plan acceptable to the City prior to occupancy. The intent is to make sure there is enough on-site parking to handle to the demand.*
- I. *The primary funding organization and shelter operator shall enter into a memorandum of agreement with the City regarding operational issues that shall include:*
 - 1. *Staffing plans.*
 - 2. *Requirements for regular reports to the City on how the shelter is meeting performance metrics.*
 - 3. *An agreement that if calls for law enforcement service exceed an agreed upon threshold in any given quarter, the shelter operator will work with the City to reduce calls below the threshold level.*
 - 4. *A coordination plan with the Shoreline Police Department which shall include protocols for police response to the shelter and to shelter clients throughout Shoreline.*
 - 5. *Requiring adherence to a good neighbor plan that addresses how the shelter operator will address litter, noise, security procedures, and other issues that may be of concern to the surrounding community. The plans will be customized to the particular location and neighborhood where a shelter is located.*
 - 6. *Criteria to determine if/when to discontinue the shelter use if documented violations of the operational agreements are not addressed in a timely manner.*
 - 7. *Provisions for City approval of any proposed change in shelter operator.*

Ms. Gierloff provided a map that identifies all of the properties that would meet the criteria for the siting of an enhanced shelter, which are clustered along Aurora Avenue N. The existing enhanced shelter site is identified in blue, and the circle drawn around the site indicates the 1-mile radius where no other enhanced shelter would be allowed.

Vice Chair Malek suggested that the use could be expanded to include the 15th Avenue Corridor where there is open and vacant land. Ms. Gierloff agreed the Commission could consider additional zones that might be appropriate for enhanced shelters. However, this might also require relaxing the transit requirement, as high-frequency transit currently only serves limited areas of the City.

Renee Dillon, Shoreline, asked if the scope of the Commission’s recommendation to the City Council is limited to deciding on the definition for Enhanced Shelter, or if it will also address the criteria in SMC 20.40.355. Vice Chair Malek responded that the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on all of the proposed amendments, including the criteria in SMC 20.40.355.

Ms. Dillon referred to the proposed definition for enhanced shelter. While she strongly agrees that homeless residents should be allowed a certain level of privacy, the shelters should at least screen residents who have exhibited serious behaviors such as felony assault. The current shelter is located within close proximity to an existing daycare center, a youth baseball organization, and schools. She also asked if Criterion I.3, related to law enforcement service, would apply to just the property where the facility is located or to all properties in the vicinity. While there is a reference to the appropriate consequences that a resident might incur, there aren’t any details. She suggested that issues related to resident conduct need to be clearly outlined to ensure that the shelter works well in the long-term. She pointed out that towards the end of last year, both Renton and SeaTac pushed back on King County in regards to the impact these types of shelters have on criminal activity in the communities where they are located.

Lastly, Ms. Dillon stressed the importance of the City having some recourse in the event that a shelter is not abiding by the rules outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement. She said she doesn’t support the definition, as written, because it leaves too many gaps for shelter operators. There needs to be more protection for the surrounding communities.

Jackie Curl, Shoreline, expressed her belief that the current proposal lacks specificity as far as requirements for enhanced shelters. For example, the proposed amendment doesn’t codify exactly what is meant by “regular reporting.” Would it be required monthly, quarterly, yearly, etc. This is important in order to monitor the successes and challenges associated with the shelter. She also voiced concern that not a lot of visibility has been brought to the existing enhanced shelter’s proximity to various child-oriented sites. The discussion has focused more on Aurora Avenue N, rather than the residential sites behind the shelter. It would be helpful for City staff to provide a better view of where the shelters might locate and what the potential impacts to the adjacent residential properties might be. She agreed with Vice Chair Malek’s suggestion that the use could be expanded to the 15th Avenue Corridor, where there might be areas that are a better fit. She suggested that there are still a lot of unknowns to be explored before a final decision can be made on the amendments.

Nancy Pfeil, Shoreline, said she was speaking on behalf of Shoreline Neighbors in Favor of Proper Placement of Shelters. From the Commission's February 18th workshop discussion, she was under the impression that the Commission doesn't have to recommend that enhanced shelters be allowed in the MB zone because they are already allowed in the R-48 zone via the interim agreement. In theory, the City could simply extend the interim regulation. She reviewed that the decision to allow homeless shelters in certain zones was made in 2018. Based on the extensive research done by the City at that time, there were requirements to screen sex offenders and prohibit drug and alcohol use. She pointed out that, in order to adopt the amendment, the City is required to submit all documentation to the Growth Management Hearings Board. However, in the case of the current proposal, there is no evidence or documentation of any research into what the impacts might be.

Ms. Pfeil recalled that the Planning Commission had a conversation on November 1, 2018 about whether to allow drug and alcohol use at homeless shelters, and the recommendation was no. As proposed, residents of an enhanced shelter would be allowed to continue to use drugs and alcohol, and many of them have untreated mental health conditions. There is no expectation that they will get clean, and that is part of the low-barrier system. While programs are available, the residents are not required to take advantage of them. Drugs are not allowed to be used at the facility, which means that drug use will occur in the areas surrounding the shelters. Since the interim regulation already allows enhanced shelters in the R-48 zone, and it can be renewed, she suggested the Commission postpone a decision on the permanent regulation until the City has more experience with the use. In the haste to qualify for the grant, staff didn't do very much research. The index criteria proposed is nearly a copy of the index criteria written for the interim regulation. It was not based off the idea of mitigating impact. Instead, it was based off the terms of the grant, with a few pacifiers thrown in. In order to be eligible for the grant, the definition was written so there would be no screening process to identify a resident's prior history.

Ms. Pfeil summarized that the Commission has a unique opportunity. They can experience things to learn what will work and what needs to be fixed without the risk of long-term damage. The interim regulation is not permanent. The City should get its feet wet first before biting off more than it can chew. Business is important to Shoreline from a tax revenue standpoint, and there isn't a lot of commercial property in the City. The City cannot afford for the amendments to result in negative impact. If the City is dead set on moving the amendments forward now, she recommended they limit the number of residents to 40. There is already one individual in the area who has untreated mental health and/or drug addiction issues, and he can be heard up to a block and a half away yelling obscenities at the air. This will not go away, and there is no requirement that the residents seek treatment. Imagine how this will impact nearby businesses if that one individual is multiplied by 100. She summarized that 40 would be a reasonable number to start, and the limit could be increased later, as appropriate.

Commissioner Callahan expressed her belief that the proposed amendments strike a good balance between allowing for the special use and also addressing the concerns of the nearby residents. The City has gone through a number of iterations, and she believes the proposal has a good chance for success. She hopes other cities in the region will look to it as an example.

Commissioner Callahan recalled that the idea of requiring the facility to have a kitchen was brought up at the Commission's workshop discuss on February 18th. If enhanced shelters are intended to operate 24/7,

she suggested it would be appropriate to require an operator to address how food service will be managed as part of the Memorandum of Agreement. Food should be easily accessible to the residents.

Commissioner Callahan said she appreciates the listing of metrics as part of the Memorandum of Agreement criteria. However, she suggested that it also include metrics around volunteers and donations, which would tell a more complete picture of how well the facility is working.

COMMISSIONER GALUSKA MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ISSUE A FORMAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT THE CODE AMENDMENTS INCLUDED IN THE STAFF REPORT AS ATTACHMENT A. COMMISSIONER SAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Galuska said he would also like to recommend that the City Council consider including the CB zone and also maintain the transit requirement. This would eventually open up some of the commercial property on 15th Avenue, but only where it is served by high-frequency transit. This change would immediately open the property to the McDonalds, as well as the commercial properties along the highway to the north. Eventually, it may also open the property at 15th Avenue and 145th Street, which is a future location for bus rapid transit.

Commissioner Rwamashongye agreed that the City should consider expanding the use to the CB zones, as well. He expressed his belief that staff has done a good job with their findings, as outlined in the Staff Report.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor recommended that the Commission could include in their transmittal letter to the City Council that they should consider other zones at some point in the future.

Commissioner Sager expressed her belief that staff has done a great job preparing and presenting the proposed amendments, and she is excited about the new facility at 165th Street and Aurora Avenue N. She said she sees real potential for success, and she looks forward to learning more about it and engaging the community.

Commissioner Callahan asked if staff believes they have enough understanding of how the operator would manage food service so all of the residents' needs could be met at the facility. Vice Chair Malek noted that the operator of the existing facility has indicated that the kitchen would remain in case it is needed at some point in the future, but the plan is to use a cafeteria-type setting where food is brought in from outside. Ms. Gierloff said that is her understanding of the current facility. She cautioned the Commissioners to keep in mind that the amendments are general regulations that could apply to multiple different sites in the future. They need to focus on outcomes versus operations and how each particular site might function. Commissioner Callahan suggested it could be as simple as requiring a food-service plan. Vice Chair Malek asked that this discussion also be captured in the Commission's transmittal letter to the City Council.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Vice Chair Malek closed the public hearing.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Gierloff announced that this would be her last Planning Commission meeting, as she will be leaving the City to become the Community Development Director for the City of Tukwila. She thanked the Commissioners for the opportunity to work with them over the past couple years.

Commissioner Callahan reported that she attended a webinar last week titled “*Best Practices for Public Comment*” that was sponsored by the group Jurassic Parliament. She received a lot of good information, and it was great to see that the Commission already follows most of what they recommend. However, it was recommended to provide a handout to the public on tips for giving public comment. She noted that the City Council provides a handout called “*Procedures, Guidelines and Tips for Giving Comment During City Council Meetings.*” There is also information on the Planning Commission’s website, but it isn’t all in one place. She suggested the Commission prepare a handout so that all of the information is in one place. The remainder of the Commissioners indicated support for this suggestion. Ms. Hoekzema said she already spoke with Commissioner Callahan about this opportunity, and it has been added to her list of items to work on.

In light of the “*Race and Social Justice*” Class that the Commissioners participated in, Commissioner Rwamashongye said it is important to recognize the recent violence against Asian Americans. The Commission should indicate solidarity with the Asian communities in Shoreline and the entire nation. They need to all show empathy and concern and really stand up against violence. The Commissioners should recognize that excessive, deliberate and unprovoked violence is a concern.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no committee reports or Commissioner announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Director Markle announced that a public hearing on the first batch of Development Code amendments is scheduled for April 1st, if it has been determined the notice was sent out on time. If not, staff will spend more time with the Commission to study the items. The Commission will also hold elections for Chair and Vice Chair on April 1st.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

4a. Draft Minutes from March 18, 2021

Jack Malek
Vice Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT