

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

October 5, 2023
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Julius Rwamashongye
Commissioner Leslie Brinson
Commissioner Janelle Callahan
Commissioner Andy Galuska
Commissioner Mei-shiou Lin (online)

Staff Present

Rachel Markel, Planning Director
Andrew Bauer, Planning Manager
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner
Elise Keim, Planner
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Absent:

Chair Pam Sager (excused)
Commissioner Christopher Mosier (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 September 21, 2023 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update: Discussion of Vision Alternatives, Racial Equity Analysis, and Phase 2 Engagement

Planning Manager Andrew Bauer, Senior Planner Steve Szafran, and Planner Elise Keim gave an update on the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update efforts related to the vision statement alternatives, racial equity analysis, and Phase 2 outreach and engagement.

Vision Alternatives:

Mr. Szafran explained that the current vision statement was drafted in 2012. Of the recent online open house participants, 85% thought the vision statement was still relevant or mostly relevant with a slight majority of respondents who felt that more needed to be added. Themes reflecting respondents' values, priorities, and concerns related to housing, safety, nature, and the structure or "feel" of the community.

Housing: Housing affordability was a primary issue. Respondents expressed concerns about the ability to age in place and the risk of displacement if they wouldn't be able to continue to live in their current homes. Other recurrent themes included housing diversity, more availability of smaller scale options, and proximity to services and amenities.

Safety: Mentions of safety occurred across multiple questions. The term was used to refer to personal safety as well as community safety. Respondents emphasized that the importance of an individual's sense of safety referred not only to safety from crime but also safety in mobility and accessibility as they are going throughout the city.

Nature/Environments: Respondents indicated they placed a high value on green space, parks, tree canopy, sustainability, and renewable building features.

The structure or "feel" of the community: Respondents felt that more needed to be added to the vision, especially around nature and green space; recreational opportunities for all ages (schools, community programs, and cultural activities); and neighborhood scale "feel" and walkability.

Based on responses, three vision alternatives were drafted as part of the Phase 2 engagement:

- Vision Alternative 1 – a slightly modified version of the existing statement.
- Vision Alternative 2 – focuses on the "place and environment".
- Vision Alternative 3 – focuses on the "people".

Discussion Questions:

1. Does the Commission agree with an abbreviated vision statement?
2. Does the Commission believe that the vision statement alternatives capture the comments and sentiment from the public?
3. Should staff use the language in the original vision statement somewhere else within the introduction of the Comprehensive Plan?
4. What alternative does the Commission prefer?
5. Changes or additions?

Commissioner Galuska said he agreed with the abbreviated version of the vision statement. He likes the idea of having something that would be easier to remember. He also recommended having a bulleted list rather than a longer paragraph.

Commissioner Callahan also liked the more concise statement which would make it more memorable. She can see with the revisions how they listened to the community feedback. She also liked the bulleted list idea. She wondered about including something about what differentiates Shoreline from neighboring communities. What makes this place special?

Commissioner Lin agreed about the shorter version and bullets. She pointed out that people's attention span for reading is shorter than it used to be, so bullets would make it easier for people to read.

Commissioner Brinson said she appreciated the shorter ones, but the longer text has a sort of storytelling narrative that she also appreciates. She said she would like a combination of people and place – a combination of 2 and 3 - because this document really is about both. She also likes bullet points.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye agreed with previous comments.

Planning Manager Bauer asked if there was a preference between alternatives 2 and 3.

Commissioner Brinson recommended pulling apart the sentences to compare. Her gut reaction is 3. The part she wasn't seeing was the part about localized business. This is a little more about the "feel".

Senior Planner Szafran suggested using 3 as the base (with bullets) and pulling parts over from 2.

Racial Equity Analysis:

Ms. Keim explained that recent changes in the Growth Management Act are directing cities to look at racial equity in housing with a lot more intention. With some grant funding from the Department of Commerce along with the guidance from Commerce, Shoreline has prepared a draft racial equity analysis looking at housing trends, demographics, and past and present housing policies and regulations to see if there are any racially disparate impacts in housing in Shoreline. She explained that she would be reviewing the data analysis and policy themes. The report examined both historic and existing housing regulations, policies, and practices for racially disparate impacts, exclusion, and displacement. The report includes an analysis of demographics, housing & race, spatial analysis, and displacement risk analysis.

Demographics: Shoreline has a median age of 42 and is 6% whiter than King County as a whole. Both the County and Shoreline are diversifying as they grow. In Shoreline, 295 members of the population have limited English proficiency with most non-English languages being Asian or Pacific Islander languages.

Shoreline's housing stock is primarily detached homes with some multifamily and some townhomes. 57% of the housing units were built between 1950 and 1980. Since 1995, most of the new residential growth has been in multifamily units. Shoreline's high-value properties are concentrated in the west

portion of the city, especially along the waterfront. 64% of homes are owner-occupied. White and Asian households have significantly higher homeownership rates than other racial groups. White households tend to experience less cost burden than other racial or ethnic groups.

Shoreline has a history of intentional racial exclusion. When Shoreline was still unincorporated King County, a number of subdivisions included restrictive covenants that prohibited the sale or occupation of properties within the subdivision to anyone not of the white or Caucasian race. Currently, the distribution of racial groups in the city is not uniform. The main driver of property differences appears to be property value and income.

In parts of the city where zoning is more mixed toward commercial; low, medium, and high residential; and mixed-use zoning, the population is more racially and ethnically diverse. In parts of the city with more limited zoning, with large portions of land zoned for low-density residential, are more racially homogenous.

The racial equity analysis also analyzed risk of displacement. To do this the City prepared a multifactor displacement risk analysis for different neighborhoods in Shoreline. Risk factors included sociodemographic factors, proximity to amenities, physical displacement, and future vulnerability. A composite map showed that the highest displacement risk is around Aurora. Lower income areas and attractive redevelopment areas are at a higher risk.

The equity analysis report details a number of potential policy approaches which are categorized into increasing affordable housing production, preserving existing affordable housing, stabilizing homes at risk of displacement by creating anti-displacement policies and programs, and ensuring that the benefits of development are distributed equitably throughout the city.

Discussion:

Commissioner Galuska commented that producing new low-income housing and protecting low-income housing seem to be in conflict with redevelopment. Ms. Keim agreed and indicated that staff is grappling with this tension. Commissioner Galuska thought it would be helpful to do an analysis of where capital spending has been throughout the city over the past five years or so and where it is proposed in the future.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye commented that the study is fair and shows that there is a lot of work to be done. If they are going to promote development, they should also be thinking about how they are going to accommodate the people they are going to displace. He referred to discussions about LCLIP and concerns about displacing rural areas. He wondered how they are connecting the two concerns while acknowledging that development is going to happen.

Commissioner Brinson referred to displacement and noted this is a really hard topic. In her experience it's more about people programs than physical development. Things like side sewer assistance, property tax exemptions, and a lot of things that are outside the built environment world can help stabilize folks so they can stay in their homes. As they are having necessary conversations about increasing densities, they need to realize there will be a movement of people. Ms. Keim said staff is working with colleagues

in human services to consider other factors related to this. Commissioner Brinson commented that there are a lot of creative things that can happen but they tend to be “one-off” type situations. She spoke to the importance of having a sort of menu of things that could come up as opportunities if someone is poised to take advantage of it.

Commissioner Lin referred to areas with a higher risk of displacement and asked if this data would help support other types of funding resources for low-income housing. Ms. Keim replied thought it could be important to use the information for policies and programs to focus on these areas that have demonstrated a need based on higher displacement risk.

Commissioner Callahan noted there was a strong theme among the commissioners around displacement concerns. She noticed that one of the recommendations is to monitor short-term rentals. She has been worried about this for a couple years because it is not tracked at all, so they don’t know if it is a problem or not. It seems urgent to be able to track those to get a sense of how many there are.

Commissioner Lin added that the data shows the west side of the city is predominantly less diverse. They have previously discussed some mixed-use possibilities on the west side. Those areas should be a high priority for having a high percentage of low-income housing options to balance things out.

Phase 2 Engagement:

Planning Manager Bauer summarized the Phase 2 Engagement process. They are applying lessons learned from Phase 1 with a focus on reaching a broader audience – youth, BIPOC communities, and renters. Phase 2 engagement events will include an online open house, an in-person open house, a Chamber of Commerce workshop, community-based organization interviews, and activities focused on key audiences.

Discussion Questions:

- Are the stated outreach methods appropriate for the next phase of engagement?
- Are there specific organizations that should be considered to engage with?

Vice Chair Rwamashongye said he was impressed with all the kinds of engagement they have done so far. He has attended three or four of the events. He has also seen signs all over the place when he is walking. He acknowledged that staff is trying really hard to get engagement. He reiterated his idea to reach people who have kids in school by using class assignments to ask parents questions and foster engagement with them. Overall, he has been very impressed with all the effort.

Commissioner Callahan asked if the outreach opportunities are more passive or intentional. Planning Manager Bauer said they are transitioning from summer festivals to more focused discussions such as interviews and getting more substantive input that will begin to inform the policy portion. Commissioner Callahan asked if there are any plans for incentives or any type of financial compensation for people that give their time for this. Mr. Bauer explained that staff has been working with a group of community consultants who were compensated for their time. Commissioner Callahan asked if they felt the compensation helped to get better participation. Mr. Bauer thought it depended on the venue and the

amount of time they were asking of people. Ms. Keim thought it was very important especially for the events with a larger time commitment.

Mr. Bauer reviewed next steps. On October 23, staff will be providing City Council with an update on what staff has been up to and the feedback the Planning Commission has given them. In late October/early November staff will issue the Determination of Significance and Scoping Notice and launch the online open house. The in-person open house will be on November 15. In early 2024, staff will identify growth alternatives for environmental review.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Staff reviewed the agenda for the next meeting – a public hearing for concurrency updates and two study items related to transit-base development code amendments and non-residential ground floor uses.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.



Julius Rwamashongye
Vice Chair, Planning Commission



Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission