

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING

Tuesday, January 18, 2005
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room

PRESENT: Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Chang, Fimia, Grace, Gustafson, and Ransom

ABSENT: none

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Hansen, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Hansen led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present, with the exception of Councilmember Gustafson.

Upon motion by Deputy Mayor Jepsen, seconded by Councilmember Chang and unanimously carried, Councilmember Gustafson was excused.

(a) Proclamation of Junior Chamber Week

Mayor Hansen presented the proclamation to representatives of the Junior Chamber, who described their latest project – a candlelight vigil at Ronald Bog Park to raise money for the victims of the tsunami.

3. CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

Robert Olander, Deputy City Manager, reported on several items: 1) the groundbreaking for the Gateway Plaza project; 2) upcoming renovation of the Fred Meyer store; 3) the police department’s recent DUI campaign; 4) the tree recycling event; 5) improvements to the entrance of Hamlin Park; 6) new rapid transit crowns installed by METRO along Aurora Avenue; 7) construction of pedestrian walkways at 150th and Wallingford and on the south side of 192nd between Fremont Avenue N and Dayton Avenue N; 8) the situation at Peverly Pond and the status of Aegis mitigation; and 9) the Townsend lawsuit.

Mayor Hansen commented favorably on the DUI campaign, noting that only one DUI citation was issued among 108 traffic stops.

DRAFT

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Fimia reported on the finalization of legislative redistricting, noting that Shoreline retained its position with the other north end cities of Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell, and a portion of Woodinville. She felt this would help the north end cities “speak with one voice,” but expressed dismay that the district now includes 82,000 Seattle residents, or 40% of the entire district.

Councilmember Ransom highlighted various topics discussed at an economic development presentation sponsored by Enterprise Seattle. He commented on the international trade imbalance and its negative effect on the U.S. economy. He reported that foreign investment in U.S. assets is declining, corporate profits are peaking, and the dollar is losing value compared to the euro and yen. He compared economic growth rates among northwest states, noting that Idaho ranks second in the nation at 3.6%. He pointed out that four western Washington counties comprise 52% of the state’s population, and 67% of the state’s jobs. He said Boeing, Microsoft, and the biotech industry would experience the majority of growth over the short-term.

Councilmember Grace noted that former Shoreline Police Chief Sue Rahr was appointed King County Sheriff.

Councilmember Chang also commented on topics at the Enterprise Seattle meeting, noting the emphasis on biotech investment in the Puget Sound area. He explained that the City of Edmonds held a forum to discuss the possibility of creating an international business district in Edmonds along Aurora Avenue. He suggested that Shoreline consider a similar plan to enhance its ability to generate more revenue in the coming years.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, addressed the issue of civility at Council meetings, advising that if elected officials “can’t stand the heat” they should “get out of the kitchen.” She felt the decorum problems at last week’s meeting came from the excessive use of police power to infringe on a citizen’s first amendment rights. She advised that elected officials’ duty is to sit “quietly, patiently, and tolerantly” during public comment periods. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that citizens are able to participate in the public process, urging the Council not to use the police force to intimidate them.

RECESS

At 7:07 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared a ten-minute recess due to lack of decorum (applause in support of Ms. Wacker’s comments). The meeting reconvened at 7:17 p.m. Mayor Hansen reminded the audience to be respectful of other speakers and the Council by refraining from clapping.

DRAFT

(b) Rick Stephens, Shoreline, commented favorably on the joint meeting between the Chamber of Commerce, Forward Shoreline, Shoreline Merchants Association, and City staff regarding the sign ordinance. He concluded that a majority of this group achieved consensus on removing “sharing common access,” from the proposed amendments, although business owners still have concerns about nonconforming signs. He expressed concern about the subjective standards for nonconforming signs and urged the Council to “grandfather in” existing signs. He felt this is only fair to owners who have invested thousands of dollars in signage. He said it makes no sense to stifle the functioning of a commercial zone by restricting commercial speech through stringent design controls. He said the commercial zone can function to its maximum economic capacity without directly conflicting with the goals and aesthetics and traffic safety.

(c) Larry Owens, Shoreline, commented on the activities of the Shoreline Solar Project (SSP) and its efforts to bring renewable energy systems to Shoreline. He noted that the SSP spearheaded the effort to bring solar power to the first public institution, Meridian Park School. He then commented on the properties of “biodiesel” as a clean, American-made alternative to gasoline. He provided statistics supporting his assertion of an energy-supply crisis over next two decades. He said the failure to meet this energy challenge will threaten our economic prosperity, national security, and change the way we lead our lives. He urged the City to actively support and promote the use of biodiesel through its policies as much as possible.

(d) Diana Stephens, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, commented on the election of new board members and encouraged the membership to get involved on Chamber committees. She noted that tourism would be a major Chamber emphasis, given the China-USA summit in June and the 2010 Winter Olympics in British Columbia. She also commented on the Chamber’s annual Dollars for Scholars fundraiser, which has provided nearly \$35,000 to Shoreline students over the past three years.

(e) Ken Cottingham, Shoreline, noted that the City is projecting budget deficits in coming years and urged the Council to live within its means. He encouraged a “pay-as-you-go” approach to spending, noting that future generations will be forced to pay for the “indiscretions” of today. He opposed borrowing or using bonds to finance future expenditures, urging the Council to be fiscally responsible and avoid debt. He felt that \$3 million could be cut in the first mile of the Aurora Corridor Project using this approach.

(d) Patty Crawford, Shoreline, pointed out that citizens are not afforded the same amount of time or resources that City staff has to address issues. She objected to Mr. Olander’s assertions regarding Peverly Pond and Aegis mitigation, noting that the City did not take the proper precautions to prevent sediment from entering the pond. She said the Aegis mitigation requirements are not being met, and that citizens do not want off-site mitigation in City parks done by developers. She said mitigation is worth money, and that the City will need mitigation if it intends to complete more projects. On another

DRAFT

topic, she asserted that the attorney representing the City in the Townsend lawsuit blamed Tia Townsend for her own death. She concluded that the City incorrectly blamed her husband for disrupting the meeting last week. She said the Mayor should have excused those who were there to comment on the City Hall project, as he did with those wishing to speak on the gambling issue.

(e) Tracy Tallman, Edmonds, explained that of the 81 historic Shoreline properties identified by King County, 8 have already been destroyed, and 4 more will be taken when Aurora Avenue is redeveloped. She urged the Council to do more to protect the City's historic sites and buildings, including the site of the proposed cottage housing development on 8th Avenue NW, the Wyman home on Echo Lake, and the Ronald red brick road. She said development of these three properties would decrease the historic properties in Shoreline to 66.

(f) Karana Hawkins, Shoreline, said that sometimes people get loud at City Council meetings because they want to be heard. She urged the City to consider the first amendment rights of citizens before it uses the police to suppress loud debate. On another topic, she commented on the inadequate childcare in Shoreline, noting that many people make too little to qualify for subsidized childcare. She encouraged the City to create a subsidized child care program for those who do not qualify for state or federal subsidies.

(g) Walt Hagen, Shoreline, referred to Councilmember Ransom's report on economic growth and jobs. He felt the emphasis should be on the vast majority (80%) of jobs created by small businesses, as opposed to Boeing and Microsoft. On another topic, he noted that elected officials demand respect but they do not always respect citizens. He said elected officials must be honest and forthright. He concluded that elected officials cannot permit staff input to override the concerns of citizens.

(h) Elaine Phelps, Shoreline, concurred with Ms. Tallman's comments and announced a candlelight memorial at Greenlake commemorating the 32nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. She noted that the police presence, not the speaker, was the intimidating factor at last week's meeting, and that there is no rule of behavior prohibiting applause. She said applause is an American tradition. She urged Council members to address their own frailties and help each other have a positive public presence.

(i) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, urged the Council to limit its spending plans, exist within its General Revenue budget, and not depend upon grants, bonds, or property tax increases for future needs. She asked for a conservative spending plan based on existing revenue sources that prioritizes maintenance and public safety. She noted that 57% of the budget is based on the expectation of grant funding, but that grants are highly risky due to deficit spending by county, state, and federal governments. She described the various debt capacity options available to the City, but urged the City to exercise restraint and live within the budget in order to remain financially solvent.

DRAFT

(j) Vicki Westburg, Shoreline, expressed sympathy with Ms. Crawford's frustration over the many years she has been presenting Council with facts supporting her case. She wished the Council would be more supportive of these views. She noted that the water level of Peeverly Pond has decreased due to the Aegis development.

(k) Michael Preston, Mill Creek, representing Goldie's Casino, described his experience on the Seattle School Board to illustrate the fact that elected officials must monitor staff to ensure they are doing good work. He said the staff work done thus far on the gambling tax issue is based on myth and not on reality. He said Goldie's Casino spends \$27,000 a year for independent audits conducted by certified public accountants. Over the last five years Goldie's has paid the City an average of \$700,000 in annual taxes, not including B&O and sales taxes. He said over the years that Goldie's has operated it has only shown a profit for two years. He urged the Council to consider decreasing the 11% gambling tax and not to kill "the goose that lays the golden egg."

(l) Donn Charnley, Shoreline, asked the Council to consider the written comments he submitted.

(m) Jerrilyn Hamley, Shoreline, provided her background as a member of the Turtle Mountain Indian Tribe, explaining that her family moved to Washington so her developmentally disabled brother could go to Fircrest RHC. She said a Comprehensive Plan amendment changes language related to the use of a large facility and eliminates public involvement. She supported regulations protecting indigenous graves and sites of historic and archeological significance through a Comprehensive Plan amendment. She felt the Comprehensive Plan should coordinate with local, state, federal governments, international agencies and non-profit organizations to protect and enhance the environment and ensure the voices of indigenous people are heard before "a fast track to land development is irresponsibly and possibly illegally approved."

(n) Janet Way, Shoreline, representing the Sno-King Environmental Council and Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, noted that a letter from attorneys representing TCLDF state that citizens should be given an opportunity to comment this evening on the Comprehensive Plan. She added that testimony should not be limited to individuals who had registered to comment at the previously held hearing.

RECESS

At 8:03 p.m. Mayor Hansen recessed the meeting due to concerns about unidentified odors in the Shoreline Room. The Fire Department responded to the scene to investigate. The meeting reconvened at 8:20 p.m.

(o) Janet Way, Shoreline, commented on the death of Kathleen Williamson, a long-time Shoreline activist and advocate for peace. On another topic, she explained that tonight's meeting was not advertised as a public hearing, so it is unclear how public comments regarding the Comprehensive Plan will be handled. She asserted that the City violated procedural requirements because a special meeting should have been convened.

DRAFT

Notice of such special meeting advertising the continuation of the public hearing should have been published and disseminated in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act. She asked the Council to confirm whether additional citizen input on the Comprehensive Plan would be received through the end of February.

(p) Brian Derdowski, Bellevue, representing Public Interest Associates (PIA), Sno-King Environmental Council (SKEC), and Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund (TCLDF), asserted that tonight's workshop on the Comprehensive Plan is not a lawful public hearing because nothing in the record indicates the last public hearing was formally adjourned. He said continuation of a public hearing requires proper meeting notification, and that the Mayor has no authority to require that written public comments be submitted by Friday. He said members of the public can legally provide oral and written comments right up to the time Council takes final action. He said the Council gave the impression that people could not provide further testimony.

Councilmember Fimia asked for clarification as to whether the testimony given tonight would be part of the Comprehensive Plan public hearing. She also felt that issues such as Aegis mitigation, Peverly Pond and flooding should be addressed in some way other than having citizens make statements at a Council meeting and then having the City refute them later. She asked that the process for handling these issues be discussed at a Council retreat.

Councilmember Ransom asked the City Attorney to respond to comments made by Ms. Way and Mr. Derdowski.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, stated that he had received the letter from Smith and Lowney, who represent three citizen groups. He said that tonight's meeting is not a continuation of the public hearing because last week the meeting was adjourned without continuing the hearing. He said because this is not a quasi-judicial matter, all public comment will be taken up to the time of decision. However, the public needs notice that for their comments to be considered fully, they should be submitted by Friday. He said tonight's meeting received proper notice as a workshop, and that those individuals who did not get a chance to speak at the hearing last week were contacted.

Mr. Olander affirmed that all comments made tonight would be part of the record on the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Noting that Council decided that deliberations would be postponed until January 31, Councilmember Ransom asked if written public comments would be received after Friday, January 28.

Mayor Hansen clarified that people can submit comments right up until the time the Comprehensive Plan is passed, but it would be advisable to have comments in by Friday so staff can fully respond to them. He said it should be made clear that additional public comment time will be available on January 31, but the Council would like as much as possible submitted by February 7.

DRAFT

Councilmember Fimia called attention to the apparent confusion regarding whether tonight was a continuation of the hearing, quoting a letter from the City Manager's office. She said that public testimony should also be taken at the special meeting on January 31, and it should be made clear that the public can continue making comments until Council makes a final decision, although it would be helpful if comments are submitted by February 7.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that Council owes it to those who signed in to speak tonight to allow them to comment. He said individuals from last week will be called first and then additional comments taken.

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

- (a) Continued public comment from the January 10 meeting on the 2004 Update of the Comprehensive Plan and the Master Plans for Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

- (a) Peter Henry, Shoreline, urged the Council to review the comments submitted by representatives of SKEC, TCLDF and PIA because the proposed plan is flawed. He said there are specific suggestions for 121 goals and policies, 46 general comments and critiques, 6 legal problems, 13 technical errors in the matrix, 14 or more incidents of "watered-down language," and 55 examples where development performance standards have been deleted. He urged Council members to invest the time to review the entire plan.

- (b) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, felt the plan could be refined to include regulations on air quality and pervious surfaces. She said trees help make the air fresher, and she "doesn't want the City covered over with asphalt." She said there are several pervious materials that can be used for sidewalks and driveways, and these alternatives should be identified in the code. She also suggested the new zoning designation "urban forest," emphasizing that forests are very special ecological systems. On the subject of affordable housing, she recommended the City adopt design standards to allow semi-detached dwellings, similar to those found in England.

- (c) Paul Tychsen, Shoreline, noted that a City is "first and foremost, a collection of people," that "nothing requires endless growth," and that "the City should serve the needs of the people who live there." He suggested that Land Use Policy LU24, Low Density Residential land use designation, should define the circumstances under which cottage housing will be allowed. He felt the word "should" in LU25 regarding infill standards for single family development was too vague. He recommended that Council correct the vague and indefinite sections of the draft plan and also consider any unintended consequences.

DRAFT

(d) Ken Cottingham, Shoreline, noted that although the Transportation Master Plan documents the past and present, it does not document the future. He pointed out that both north-south and east-west traffic is increasing, but the population of Shoreline is not increasing significantly. He said the City did not modify the transportation plan in response to his previously-submitted comments. He felt the potential annexation of Point Wells should also be considered in the plan.

(e) Clark Elster, Shoreline, said the draft plan should be called the "Shoreline Incomprehensible Plan" because it lacks clarity, cohesiveness and direction. He said the plan is inconsistent with federal standards, county legal requirements, and assumes several major tax increases. He said the plan increases traffic congestion by lowering road standards and allows development in flood plains and critical areas in violation of FEMA standards and the GMA. It removes policies to provide walkways for children, reduces design standards for housing and commercial development, and removes policies protecting neighborhoods from truck traffic. He said it removes policies authorizing road impact fees, policies regarding cell towers and utility lines, and reduces public participation. He said the plan allows major new developments without comprehensive plan amendments, and was written without meaningful, up-front citizen participation and review. He suggested that the plan be remanded back to the open citizen process that created the first Comprehensive Plan.

(f) Guy Olivera, Shoreline, expressed concern that the draft plan weakens development standards to the degree that developers will be allowed to remove trees and install pavement in order to increase profits while decreasing property values. He expressed concern that changes to land use policies EPF9 and EPF10 seem to be weakening rather than strengthening public participation on land use issues. He emphasized the importance of maintaining high property values, since many citizens must rely on the equity in their homes for retirement. He urged the Council not to cut public participation out of the process, noting that citizens need to be able to speak out about anything that affects their neighborhoods. He explained that under contract law, the Council is obligated to benefit the community through its policies. He urged the Council to ensure that development is good for everyone and to market Shoreline to those who can provide the greatest benefits.

(g) George Mauer, Shoreline, reiterated that the draft plan is incomprehensible, incomplete, and does not meet state/federal standards or GMA requirements. He said the plan does not conform to basic planning principles, and contains no effective standards for measuring when goals are achieved. He said if the output does not meet the required standards, then the direction given to staff was ineffective. He felt the City should petition the appropriate authorities for delay in order to effectively incorporate citizen input into the plan.

(h) Diana Stephens, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, read a letter from Myron Phillips, Shoreline, opposing changes to policies CD14-CD18 regarding commercial signage. The testimony emphasized that the character of the community is

DRAFT

January 18, 2005

business and commercial, and that large signs or billboard should not be prohibited. Furthermore, consolidation of multiple signs on a single structure does not work for most businesses, and current sign standards are arbitrary and discretionary. It would have been better if staff consulted with businesses that are impacted by the sign ordinance. She said the right to display signage is protected by the U.S. Constitution, and the City cannot destroy all economically viable use of property through exercise of police powers via land use regulations. She said businesses could be due just compensation if they become unprofitable due to restrictive signage regulations.

(i) Richard Ellison, Seattle, urged the City to evaluate what the loss of old growth trees on the Shoreline Community College campus would mean to the overall Shoreline community as a result of SCC's plan to build a parking structure, amphitheater, and sports fields. He explained that the SCC master plan and Environmental Impact Statement includes a number of significant trees on campus, similar to the environment and wildlife habitat found in City parks. He said the draft Comprehensive Plan contains no survey information or evaluation of what these values are to the community. He commented on the importance of educating the public on how to control invasive vegetation, and on the role trees play in stabilizing steep slopes. He also commented on the lack of a long-term improvement plan to address the problems in Boeing Creek created by pavement of the Sears parking lot.

(j) Pat Sumption, Seattle, stressed the importance of listening to the public on issues of environmental preservation. She said the current draft plan does not consider the future, the environment, or open spaces. She urged the Council to work with those who have a vision and want to create a Shoreline that everyone will love.

(k) Brian Derdowski, Bellevue, commented on the quality of public comments on the Comprehensive Plan, noting that citizens worked through the holidays on a very complex document and have come up with 121 suggestions. He said the Council should consider how this happened so close to approving the plan. He pointed out that the Planning Commission was only tasked with reviewing the three master plans, and did not deliberate on the Comprehensive Plan itself. He commented on the inadequacy of the Planning Commission's review, which he felt did not allow the public to fully participate. He proposed a process for Council to work with his experts to arrive at a consensus on the issues of disagreement, which he felt would result in a quality plan. He urged the City to engage in this type of deliberative dialogue in order to maintain mutual respect between the Council and the public.

(l) Janet Way, Shoreline, read into the record the titles of the following items she is submitting to the Council: 1) article by Jonathan Weisman "Bush Plans Sharp Cuts in HUD Community Efforts"; 2) Currents August 2003 "Preliminary Parks Survey Results Show Interest in More Trails and Walking Paths"; 3) Way testimony "For Shoreview Park Ballfield Project Hearing (7/7/99)"; 4) "Quality of Life in King County, A Random Survey of King County Households"; 5) Ulrich "Influences of Passive Experiences with Plants on Individual Well-being and Health"; 6) Coachman Declaration re: Shoreview Park (7/7/99); 7) Thompson to O'Conner letter (2/11/94) re: King County Shoreview Park, and related

January 18, 2005

Wildlife Concerns; 8) Goldsmith letter to Hearing Examiner re: Shoreview Park Little League Ballfield Project (6/30/99); 9) Lennox letter to Mayor Jepsen from Audubon Society re: Shoreview Park (11/19/98); 10) Article re: "Fading Song—Human encroachment pushing songbirds out of their territory"; 11) letter from Law to Brandt re: Shoreline Community College Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement; 12) Bird of Shoreview Park Checklist; 13) Seattle Parks and Recreation "Urban Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan; 14) letter from Stenberg to Blauman re: Shoreview Park (7/2/99) with attachments; and 15) Office of the Zoning and Subdivision Examiner of King County re: Decision on Appeals of Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance re: Shoreview Park.

(m) Tom Dunning, Shoreline, urged the Council to revise the Comprehensive Plan, which he felt was confusing and only contributes to citizens' distrust of government. He noted that he had to refer to several sections of the plan in order to understand one concept.

(n) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, urged the Council to consider Mr. Derdowski's proposal for an alternative process for updating the Comprehensive Plan. She felt such a process would be worthwhile if it results in cost savings to Shoreline taxpayers and property owners.

(o) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, stated for the record that she was present at the public hearing last week where it was announced that the public hearing would be continued to tonight's meeting.

(p) Elaine Phelps, Shoreline, pointed out that it is not City staff's responsibility to set policy, but to implement policy as directed by the Council. She urged the Council to consider whether it provided staff adequate direction on the Comprehensive Plan update.

Councilmember Fimia thanked all those involved in providing input on the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if, in order to meet GMA deadlines, the existing plan could be resubmitted with only the amendments that are critical to incorporate.

Mr. Sievers said the plan would need to include updated information on growth, population and capital facilities.

Councilmember Fimia asked for the difference between funding for the Capital Improvement Plan and what is proposed in the master plans. Mr. Olander said this data would be provided.

Councilmember Fimia reiterated that public comments would be accepted until the Council takes final action, but it would be helpful to receive them as soon as possible. She suggested modifying the process and possibly including the Planning Commission back into the process as well as a small citizens group.

January 18, 2005

(b) Review of the Gambling Tax Rate

There was Council consensus to defer this item until February 7 when the full Council will be present.

(c) Council Goal #7 – Code Enforcement Policies

Tim Stewart, Director of Planning and Development Services, reviewed the staff report and provided background on code enforcement practices in Shoreline. He provided a slide presentation illustrating examples of compliance and non-compliance with City codes. He outlined the staff recommendations for the following code enforcement categories:

1. Deteriorating properties;
2. Maintenance of planting strips;
3. Minimum housing standards;
4. “Junk” and abandoned vehicles parked on public rights-of-way;
5. “Junk” vehicles stored on private property;
6. Number of vehicles allowed on detached single family and duplex properties;
7. Recreation vehicles, boats and trailers stored on private property;
8. Mowing of weeds; and
9. Sign regulation.

Mr. Stewart concluded his presentation by describing the next steps and public process that staff envisions for any proposed changes.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:00 p.m. Deputy Mayor Jepsen moved to extend the meeting for 45 minutes. Councilmember Grace seconded the motion, which carried 6-0.

Mayor Hansen called for public comment.

(a) LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, encouraged the Council to consider health and safety issues as the highest priorities when developing code enforcement policies. She urged the City to regulate temporary, “A-board” signs, which can pose traffic hazards because they obstruct drivers’ views. She also favored codes requiring that vehicles be parked in garages, driveways or behind fencing.

(b) Brian Derdowski, Bellevue, suggested that the City coordinate with social service providers in code enforcement matters, noting that some people could be needlessly forced into a homeless situation. He suggested the City consult with the Noxious Weed Board regarding weed control. He strongly urged the Council to develop a work plan that considers environmental damage relative to clearing, tree trimming, and altering of streams and wetlands. He suggested the City focus on nuisance issues, environmental code enforcement, and development controls.

DRAFT

(c) Rick Stephens, Shoreline business owner, described the financial burden and other problems associated with graffiti vandalism at his business. He felt business owners, the police, and the City should work together to formulate a code addressing graffiti. On another topic, he suggested the City form a business community sign review board to address various signage issues, including nonconforming signs and safety.

(d) Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, emphasized the need to have large, clear signs to direct drivers to business entrances. She said although not all commercial signs are attractive, it is important that signs are clearly visible.

(e) Janet Way, Shoreline, provided examples of various environmental code violations and emphasized the need to implement enhanced environmental code enforcement. She advised the City to consult with the Washington Native Plant Society regarding on how to manage invasive weeds. She said weed control should not be arbitrary, but should be conducted on a case-by-case basis.

(f) Tom Dunning, Shoreline, commented on the difficulty of developing an effective sign ordinance that benefits all stakeholders. As a former business owner, he suggested that aerial signage is more effective and safer than ground signs, which tend to obstruct views of traffic. He advised the City to carefully consider the sign code, advising there would be problems no matter what kind of code is adopted.

(g) Cindy Ryu, Shoreline, urged the Council to consider the unintended consequences of any new legislation related to code enforcement. She related a story in which a person ignored a serious home repair issue due to a lack of finances. She explained that the repair was not covered by insurance because it was considered a regular maintenance item. She commented on the difficulty of balancing the needs of individuals, tenants, landlords, and the overall community.

Mayor Hansen pointed out that the King County Housing Repair Program offers grants and loans to income-eligible residents for home repair.

Councilmember Fimia expressed general support for the staff recommendations but said she would like more information on the exemption for owner-occupied homes, mainly because children might be living in dangerous situations. She recommended talking to citizen groups about weed control and dealing with the sign code in a more holistic manner through an ad hoc group of business owners and residents. She also wished to ensure that people are aware of the appeal process. She inquired about the City's resources for enforcing environmental codes.

Mr. Stewart noted that people can report potential code violations to the City's Customer Response Team (CRT), which responds to complaints immediately. CRT has the authority to take whatever action may be necessary to abate the problem. He said the more difficult cases have involved enforcing the critical areas ordinance, but most go through a successful process and are resolved.

DRAFT

Responding to Mayor Hansen, Mr. Stewart explained that the City maintains a revolving fund as part of the annual budget to abate code violations. He pointed out that staff spends 80% of its time on 5% of the cases. He commented on the particular difficulty of abating buildings that are in violation. He noted that staff would explore the exemption for owner-occupied homes in greater detail.

Councilmember Grace pointed out that this agenda item came up as a result of code enforcement issues addressed last year in the citizen survey. He said his priorities include categories 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. He felt that sign issues are a low priority. He also suggested contacting neighborhood groups for issues relevant to their neighborhood rather than holding generic workshops.

Councilmember Ransom said he felt most of these items could remain status quo. He said he hears about #4. He cautioned about issue #5, noting some people restore antique cars.

Councilmember Chang concurred with the staff recommendations and the suggestion to include social service agencies where appropriate for housing. He urged working with the business owners, Shoreline Merchants Association and Chamber on signage, since there could be unintended consequences as a result of the Aurora Corridor project. He asked for an analysis of the financial impacts of the staff recommendations.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen also requested financial data. He supported moving forward on items 1 through 7. He suggested consultation with the Council of Neighborhoods as a way to gather input on neighborhood-specific issues. He emphasized that safety issues should be the priority.

Mayor Hansen concurred with Councilmember Grace and Deputy Mayor Jepsen and said his priorities are items #1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Councilmember Fimia asked staff to explore the possibility of using a portion of the abatement fund for transitional housing.

Mr. Stewart noted that staff has worked closely with social service agencies to find adequate housing as part of the abatement process. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that displaced residents are adequately housed.

MEETING EXTENSION

At 10:45 p.m. Councilmember Ransom moved to extend the meeting for ten minutes. Councilmember Fimia seconded the motion, which carried 5-1, with Mayor Hansen dissenting.

Councilmember Ransom addressed item #7, noting that City code allows eight unrelated individuals to occupy one residence. He cautioned about limiting the number of vehicles

DRAFT

to six, because some homes have more than six adult residents who each own vehicles. He pointed out that the regulation does not distinguish between parking vehicles in the front and in the back.

7. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 p.m., Mayor Hansen declared the meeting adjourned.

Sharon Mattioli, City Clerk