

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 2, 2023
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Julius Rwamashongye
Commissioner Leslie Brinson
Commissioner Janelle Callahan (on Zoom)
Commissioner Andy Galuska (on Zoom)¹
Commissioner Christopher Mosier

Staff Present

Andrew Bauer, Planning Manager
Elise Keim, Senior Planner
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Chair Pam Sager (Excused)
Commissioner Mei-shiou Lin (Excused)

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Rwamashongye called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hoekzema called the roll.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 5, 2023 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

¹ Commissioner Galuska arrived at 7:04 p.m.

Susanne Tsoming, Shoreline resident, spoke regarding the Cottage House Development Code Amendments on the agenda tonight. She spoke on behalf of the Tree Preservation Code Team about their proposed development code amendment specific to cottage housing. The purpose is to direct an owner/builder to design cottages on lots around any established trees that remain after permitted tree removals. She encouraged consideration of this amendment which would guide planning and placement of cottage housing on suitable building lots to minimize and control the loss of our urban tree canopy.

STUDY ITEM: 2024 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE: DISCUSSION OF MIDDLE HOUSING WORK PLAN

Staff Presentation:

Senior Planner Elise Keim made the presentation regarding the middle housing work plan. She reviewed the definition, examples, and why it is being considered now consistent with the Housing Action Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. Grant funding from the State Department of Commerce will be utilized to study the appropriateness of middle housing types in low density residential areas and to develop draft policies and draft implementation concepts that can be further studied and considered concurrently with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update. Middle housing is just one component of the Comprehensive Plan's Housing Element. The work plan will include an existing conditions report, informational materials, policy analysis, racial equity analysis, public engagement, and draft policies and implementation concepts. The racial equity analysis is a new requirement of the state's Growth Management Act specific to the housing section. The city must examine racially disparate impacts of past and present housing. Cities must prepare policies to undo these harms and prepare anti-displacement policies. Ms. Keim reviewed the robust public engagement efforts the City will do to help inform policies.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye referred to the proposed tenant protection policies and asked how they are planning on engaging landlords. Ms. Keim wasn't familiar with any specific landlord interest groups in Shoreline but said she would check with the community engagement consultant. Commissioner Brinson said that the Rental Housing Association is statewide and might have information about this. Another group is the Washington Multifamily Housing Association which is a larger conglomerate of larger landlords.

Commissioner Callahan wondered if the Commerce Department had any sense of trends in the racial equity analysis. She would like to hear more about what other cities and states are doing. She also asked for more information about the possible phasing of policies for middle housing. Ms. Keim replied that the Department of Commerce is providing technical assistance to jurisdictions and they have offered to make themselves available to present to planning commissions and/or city councils if there is interest. There was interest in having a presentation from them. Regarding the phasing of policies, Ms. Keim noted that the work plan would include some draft implementation policies, and they can take a look at phasing as part of that. However, as far as the grant is concerned, they are looking at comprehensive plan goals and policies.

Commissioner Brinson asked how the two proposed state bills about middle housing might influence this effort. Ms. Keim stated she could do some research. Planning Manager Bauer replied that staff is

following this closely, but it is still too early to tell what is going to happen. He thought that was perhaps part of the intention of some of the Commerce grant funding being appropriated so that local jurisdictions can start studying this issue.

Commissioner Mosier suggested exploring what this extra housing might mean for others such as how an increased property tax base could interact with capital improvements and how more people would impact economic development.

STUDY ITEM: COTTAGE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Senior Planner Keim presented on the proposed Cottage Housing Development Code amendments. She reviewed what cottage housing is and why the City is looking at this. The Cottage Code looks at location, density, unit size, lot coverage, setbacks, parking, trees, landscaping, site design, and building design. She asked the Planning Commission to consider how cottage housing regulations can help meet Shoreline's housing needs.

Location: R-4, R-6, R-8, R-12, and possibly MUR-35.

Should staff explore cottages in MUR-35?

- Commissioner Mosier did not think so because that zone is meant to be a buffer.
- Commissioner Brinson said she hadn't had time to think about it much but thought keeping it as a transitional space made sense.
- Commissioner Callahan was not initially supportive but said she was curious about the rationale for suggesting it.
- Commissioner Galuska also spoke against it. He noted that the minimum allowed density in that zone is 12 units per acre. He didn't think it was appropriate to add a use to this zone that would barely hit the minimum density in a best-case scenario.

Density and Development Size: Twice the underlying density, minimum 2-units, maximum 24-units. Standards have been written with community priorities in mind including tree retention, sustainability, walkability, and single-level living.

Should any additional density bonuses be explored beyond the base density being doubled for cottages?

- Commissioner Brinson said she wasn't sure what the City would be asking for if what they already wanted was spelled out in the regulations. Ms. Keim explained they could ask for things like requiring certain levels of green building or affordability. Commissioner Brinson pointed out that the affordability option needs to come with a mechanism for ownership.
- Commissioner Callahan asked if it would be possible to do a density bonus for Community Land Trust. This could ensure the affordability piece.
- Commissioner Mosier agreed with providing an incentive for affordable housing.
- Commissioner Galuska thought a density bonus for affordability should be a standalone item. He questions what the market is for cottage housing and wonders if people really just want higher density single-family development. He asked if they could get to the same place by looking at upzoning single family zones. He expressed support for allowing higher density for a housing

non-profit or something like Community Land Trust. He thinks that having different density bonuses for each type of development is too complicated for developers. Ms. Keim suggested it could be more appropriate to have those regulations in the supplemental criteria for affordable housing. Commissioner Galuska wasn't sure if cottage housing would work for non-profit housing groups like Housing Hope. He thought keeping the regulations more general would make it easier to find partnerships.

- Commissioner Brinson expressed caution about having a target audience that was too small with just non-profit housing groups because there are for-profit developers who build publicly subsidized housing.
- Ms. Keim stated she would look at the existing affordable housing provisions and see how this might fit together.

Should cottage developments with more than 12 units be required to break up the development into smaller clusters?

- Commissioner Mosier thought this made sense because it could be handled through the site parking configuration.
- Commissioner Brinson also thought that the parking part makes sense. She also feels like the constraints of the site and the marketability of the development would drive the right output. She worries about constraining this and overdesigning something they don't have enough information about.
- Vice Chair Rwamashongye agreed with giving developers the latitude to figure out the right way to do this. He thinks that staff will be able to have input at the planning phase.
- Commissioner Callahan agreed with allowing more flexibility and not having restrictions on clustering.

Minimum Lot Size: Match underlying zone; meet cottage standards for open space, parking, and setbacks

Unit Size: Minimum 700 sf; maximum 1500 sf, 20% of lots to vary from average size by 250 sf, 60% of floor area on ground floor.

Maximum Building Height: 22 feet (two stories), greater than 15 feet (one story) requires roof pitch, 20% of cottages not higher than 15 feet (one story)

- Commissioner Mosier referred to roof pitch and spoke in support of allowing an asymmetrical shed roof.

Lot Coverage: Maximum building coverage 45% in R-4, R-6, and R-8 zones, 55% in R-12 zones; maximum hardscape 75% of lot area

Is an increase in impervious surface and building coverage appropriate for cottages?

- Commissioner Mosier thought that 75% seems like a lot of extra impervious surface, but he wasn't clear on what this would include.
- Commissioner Brinson said she was having a hard time visualizing this. It would be helpful to have some illustrations for reference. Ms. Keim concurred.

- Vice Chair Rwamashongye asked how they are handling runoff. Ms. Keim explained that it would have to meet the stormwater code. Vice Chair Rwamashongye agreed that having visuals would be helpful.
- Commissioner Galuska commented thought these seemed about right but agreed that visuals would help. In his experience these numbers seem to be in the right ballpark.

Setbacks: match underlying zone, no 15-foot setback increase, privacy fence, perimeter landscaping

Is there support for not increasing setbacks when there are three or more cottages on a site abutting an R-4 or R-6 zone?

- Commissioner Mosier agreed that they did not need to increase setbacks.
- Commissioner Galuska said that a 15-foot setback would kill any project in the R-4 or R-6 zones.

Tree Preservation: Utilize Existing Tree Code – 6-inch DBH, 25% retention (30% critical areas); incentivize further retention of large trees (>24” DBH)

- Incentives:
 - Large Tree Dripline = Common Open Space
 - Retention of:
 - More than minimum of 25%; and
 - Large significant trees (>24” DBH)
 - Reduction in Common Open Space Area
 - 5+ Large Trees = Amenity
- Public Comment:
 - Cottage-specific tree code
 - Allowed tree removal dependent on lot size
 - 7200 sf lot = 3 trees removed
 - Every additional 7200 sf = 1 tree removed
 - No other trees can be removed
 - Proposed update to tree code: Cottage housing structures and dwellings will be planned and designed around established significant trees.

Should staff study the proposed cottage-specific tree code recommended by public comment?

Does Planning Commission support a separate tree code for cottages?

- Commissioner Brinson asked why this specific housing type would be treated differently than the underlying code. Ms. Keim thought it was being seen as an opportunity to encourage thoughtful site design that preserves the maximum amount of trees.
- Commissioner Mosier commented on the impact of increased lot coverage to 75% to the amount of trees that could be removed.
- Vice Chair Rwamashongye thought an underlying tree code should apply to all places rather than writing code specifically for cottage housing.
- Commissioner Brinson thought that the proposed incentives made sense.
- Commissioner Callahan agreed that it doesn’t make sense to have a tree code specific to cottage housing. She also appreciates the incentives and wondered if there are any other incentives staff

can think of to help with tree retention. Ms. Keim noted they could take a look at incentives based on cottage-specific standards like height.

Parking Requirements:

- Cottage under 1250 sf = 1 stall
- Cottage over 1250 sf = 1.5 stalls
- Electric vehicle ready
- Require 1 garage per cottage
- Standard parking reductions apply – garages ineligible for reduction.

Should a garage be a required feature for a cottage development?

Should garages be subject to parking reductions or should that only apply to surface parking?

- Commissioner Mosier thought that garages should be a market-driven feature. They shouldn't be required.
- Commissioner Galuska agreed. Garages aren't required for a new single-family house. Why would they be required for a cottage house? He thinks in most cases the market will demand a garage but this should be left up to the developer.
- Commissioner Callahan concurred. She wondered about having a requirement for storage for bikes in order to accommodate cottage housing that is close to transit.
- Commissioner Brinson suggested possibly common storage areas to accommodate things like strollers and bikes. She has seen garages in HOAs cause major complications if there are a different number of units from garages.

Landscaping:

- Perimeter landscaping + fence
- Parking lot landscaping
- Internal landscaping standards minimal – pollinator habitat

Site Design:

- **Parking design** – minimize visual impact, screening, garages match cottages, parking lot landscaping
 - Commissioner Mosier expressed concern about the requirement for parking at the back of lots. He wondered whether it was more important to think about hiding the parking or to minimize impervious surfaces while still doing some landscaping.
- **Solid waste storage/staging** – individual bins in garages, screened dumpster enclosures
- **Common Open Space** – 250 sf per cottage; minimum dimension 20 linear feet, 500 sf; formally or informally programmed; amenities 1:4 units; community buildings
- **Private Open Space** – 300 sf per unit; minimum dimension: 6 linear feet; attached covered front porch (10% of cottage area, 6 linear feet, count as private open space)
 - Commissioner Mosier asked where the covered porch falls in terms of building footprint or hardscape. Ms. Keim said she would need to double-check. Commissioner Mosier recommended it be included in patio and outdoor hardscaping as opposed to the building itself because it would quickly limit the building footprint.
 - Commissioner Brinson noted that it also works as a storage space for mobility vehicles.

Should community buildings count as common open space? If so, should the square footage of a community building count for more, the same, or less square footage as outdoor common open space?

- Vice Chair Rwamashongye asked how a community building could count as open space when it is a closed space. Ms. Keim indicated they could think about calling it something else.
- Commissioner Brinson expressed concern about a community building taking over the courtyard space. Ms. Keim noted there is a maximum size of a proposed community building as 2000 sf. Commissioner Brinson asked about covered but open space like a gazebo or picnic shelter. Commissioner Mosier replied that is included in the open space category.
- Commissioner Mosier said he didn't think it should count against open space. He thinks bike storage should be able to count against community open space. He also thinks covered mobility storage (bikes, strollers, etc.) should be removed from the total hardscape count because it would be encouraging alternate transportation.

Building Design Standards:

- Architectural Consistency
- Not identical to neighbor cottage
- Offset cottages from each other
- Porches face common open space
- Two (2) cottages can be attached
 - Commissioner Mosier asked about requirements for street facing units. Ms. Keim explained that if this were to occur, staff is proposing giving an option of having their porch facing the street. Commissioner Mosier commented on the importance of having both internal community and external community.
 - Commissioner Brinson agreed with addressing street frontage. Ms. Keim concurred but noted this would be site specific.
 - Commissioner Brinson asked if the two attached cottages could be on any size project. She liked the idea but if there are only two cottages it just feels like a duplex. She thinks the scale matters, and maybe two or more could be allowed for larger projects.

Unit Lot Subdivision for cottages?

- Commissioner Brinson spoke in support of unit lot subdivisions but expressed concern about not having a reserve fund to contribute to maintenance expenses. She asked for more information and examples about how this would work out.
- Commissioner Mosier wondered if the unit lot subdivision would be a good mechanism to contribute toward affordability.
- Commissioner Galuska thought developers would generally prefer the unit lot subdivision because of financing. As far as maintenance, unit lot subdivision townhouse developments almost always have an HOA. Most detached unit subdivisions also have an HOA. Even if they don't, there is still the same liability for the owners. He wondered if it is still technically a cottage development if they are individually owned homes.
- Commissioner Brinson asked about how water meters would fit in with the unit lot subdivisions.

Graphics/illustrations for concepts?

- Ms. Keim noted there had already been several requests for illustrations about this throughout the presentation.
- Commissioner Mosier also asked for examples of what a lot layout would look like.

Cottages as infill vs. cottages as redevelopment?

- Commissioner Brinson wondered if there were even enough single-family homes on lots big enough to make it worth the effort to design a code for this. Ms. Keim said she could find out. Her sense was that most of Shoreline's lots would lend themselves to infill of accessory dwelling units and not necessarily cottage developments.
- Commissioner Mosier thought there might be some lots on the west side of Highway 99 where there is one home on a larger lot. They commonly get torn down and three large homes get built. In that instance he would support infill because he would rather see a large house remain with smaller cottages around it.
- Vice Chair Rwamashongye asked what common spaces would look like as infill.
- Commissioner Brinson wondered if this discussion would be better suited to the middle housing conversation.
- Commissioner Mosier asked how driveway regulations would apply if someone had a house and wanted to build two cottages behind it. Ms. Keim noted that there is a spacing requirement for driveways in the engineering development manual but there is also an engineering deviation protocol that may be granted by Public Works. She was not sure of how often this was granted or under what circumstances. Generally, a full redevelopment will need to come up to full redevelopment site requirements to the maximum extent feasible.

Ms. Keim reviewed next steps. Staff anticipates revising the code based on feedback received tonight and bringing it back for discussion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planning Manager Bauer stated that the recommended docket for 2023 will be going to City Council for the February 13 meeting. Senior Planner Steve Szafran will be presenting the Planning Commission's recommendation at that meeting. Hopefully they will be setting the final document at the subsequent meeting on February 27.

He also noted that the compensation topic for commissioners is moving ahead. They are flushing out the administrative procedures for that. This will tentatively take effect on April 1. Payments would be handled as a stipend and tentatively occur quarterly. More information will be shared as procedures are finalized.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Planning Manager Bauer reviewed the agenda for the next meeting which is scheduled for February 16. Staff will be presenting the draft public participation plans for both the Comprehensive Plan Update and

the middle housing work. After Council approval, staff hopes to launch public participation plans in mid-March.

Mr. Bauer noted that staff is also looking at scheduling a dinner meeting with the City Council on May 8.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.



Julius Rwamashongye
Vice Chair, Planning Commission



Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission