

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Tuesday, July 6, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Council Chamber - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Hall, Councilmember Eggen, Councilmember McConnell, Councilmember Roberts, Councilmember Scott, and Councilmember Winstead

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:30 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Mayor McGlashan, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor McGlashan led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclamation of Parks and Recreation Month

Mayor McGlashan read the proclamation declaring the month of July, 2010 as "Parks and Recreation Month" in the City of Shoreline. Representatives from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department, including staff and participants, accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for this recognition. A brief video clip was played highlighting a performance at "Shoreline Live," an annual specialized recreation event.

3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER

Bob Olander, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects, and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Tracey announced that from now on she will be going by "Winstead" instead of "Tracey."

Councilmember Eggen reported on a Regional Transit Task Force meeting and the issues discussed, including transit service allocations.

5. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Proposed Amendments to the Development Code, Application #301606

Steve Cohn, Long Range Planner, and Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, outlined the amendments recommended by the Planning Commission. Several times a year, the Commission reviews amendments to the Development Code, and these amendments represent the Commission's latest review. Mr. Szafran noted that there are 30 amendments, and most are minor but a couple have policy implications. Mr. Cohn reviewed the six major revisions, which were that the Master Plan Vesting Expiration creates a process for a 10-year review of the plan; the Preliminary Subdivision review; Accessory Dwelling Units; Home Occupation; Setbacks; and the exemption from permit for removal of noxious weeds.

Mayor McGlashan opened this item to public comment. There was no one wishing to provide public comment on this item.

Councilmember Eggen said he is concerned about measures giving approval for the clearing of noxious weeds in parks with chemicals. He suggested the City not allow it to occur. Mr. Cohn replied that on page 22, Section 20.50.310, volunteers are under the supervision of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services (PRCS) Department when it comes to the removal of noxious weeds and any work done in the parks requires PRCS approval.

Councilmember Eggen commented on accessory dwelling units (ADU) on page 17, Section 20.40.210 and Mr. Szafran explained that an ADU is allowed to be 50% of the square footage of the principal residence.

Deputy Mayor Hall expressed concerns about the use of pesticides, especially in critical areas. He questioned the definition of senior citizen affordable housing on page 9, Section 20.20.046 and Mr. Cohn clarified that the language refers to the housing types.

Staff and Council responded to Councilmember Eggen's concern about the definition of "director" and the fact that it also includes "or designee." Mr. Szafran also responded to Councilmember Eggen's concern regarding a definition for "heavy equipment."

Councilmember Eggen suggested changing the language regarding developers being able to sign property over to the City for park land. This language, he felt, was intended to address land that was being mitigated or was required to make a development proceed. Mr. Szafran clarified that the language is on page 12, Section 20.30.410 and applies to large developments, not short plats, where SEPA applies.

The discussion then turned to home occupations in Shoreline. Councilmember Scott inquired what occurs if a home occupation owner uses heavy vehicles in their employment, but doesn't keep their vehicle at their home. Mr. Cohn replied that the code wouldn't affect them. Councilmember Roberts inquired how it would affect the independent contractor and Mr. Cohn said he would need to research that. Deputy Mayor Hall noted that home occupation is not a

distribution center. Mr. Cohn added that the main question is whether a business is contracted out.

Councilmember Roberts discussed Section 20.50.480 asking for an explanation on how this section works with the proposed tree regulations. Mr. Cohn replied that the only tree code being considered is for trees on private property, not in the public right-of-way.

Councilmember Eggen hoped that the inclusion of "fumes" in the definitions would prohibit the idling of diesel vehicles. There was a brief discussion about controlling noxious fumes and emissions.

Mayor McGlashan inquired about page 23 and wondered if the street frontage landscaping standards apply to new and redeveloped properties. Mr. Cohn responded that it applies to properties which undergo a remodel of more than 50%.

There was discussion concerning car dealerships and the need to buffer cars from the road when they undergo a significant remodel. It was concluded that the City staff will look at the language and bring back clarifying language.

RECESS

At 7:38 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a five minute break. The meeting reconvened at 7:44 p.m.

(b) Continued Discussion of the Transportation Master Plan: Sidewalk Maintenance and Design Issues; Bicycle Policies

Mayor McGlashan called for public comment on this item.

a) Catie Collier, Cascade Land Conservancy, said her group has a vested interest in complete streets and supported the recommendation for safer places to walk and ride bicycles.

Kirk McKinley, Transportation Services Manager, and Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner, continued the discussion of policy issues associated with sidewalk maintenance and design and bicycle transportation begun at the June 14 Council meeting. At that meeting, Council discussed items A through D in the sidewalk design policy section of Attachment B in the Council packet. Ms. McIntire stated that the final issue involves, under sidewalk maintenance and design policies, having sidewalks on both sides of street. She noted the staff recommendation to have sidewalks on both sides, with some exceptions.

There was discussion concerning having one side of non-arterial streets identified as a priority for sidewalks. There was also discussion about sidewalks on residential streets as opposed to arterials, sidewalks required for the frontage of developments, and how to prioritize, implement, and complete a sidewalk system. Mr. Olander summarized that this is a long-range vision and the preference is to have sidewalks on both sides where reasonable, but with exceptions.

Councilmember Eggen felt the City should emphasize that the sidewalks must go to the edge of the right-of-way which would allow the right-of-way to be 60 inches, allowing room for bike lanes and parking. He suggested offering homeowners a break to participate in the fee-in-lieu-of program.

Mayor McGlashan noted that sharrows help identify streets with shared bike lanes. Mr. McKinley noted that the challenge is retrofitting existing streets and how to fit all the needs into them without doing major construction. Adding bicycle lanes may mean a proposal to eliminate parking on one side of some streets, so there are future policy decisions that need to be made regarding sharrows.

Ms. McIntire discussed sidewalk repair and said the City staff suggestion is to have the City responsible for sidewalk repair. Councilmember Roberts determined that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program funds \$100-200K annually.

Deputy Mayor Hall questioned if there was any value in distinguishing between single family residential and other property sidewalks. Mr. McKinley responded that the general feeling is that the City is responsible and needs to maintain the quality of all the sidewalks in the City.

Ms. McIntire continued and discussed street tree removal. She noted that the City staff has a program and is conscious about not removing too many trees. Mr. McKinley described modern measures to contain/manage root growth and Mr. Olander noted the City's tree inventory. Councilmember Roberts noted that he supported a street tree removal program, but the City needs to ensure planting happens quickly and that there is public notice. Mr. Olander replied that it is done already. Councilmember Scott concurred with the tree removal plan and both noted that there are trees in Shoreline buckling sidewalks which stops disabled people from getting around the City. Councilmember Eggen suggested adding "and replacement" in the street removal language and favored the management of trees. Councilmember McConnell said it is clear that safety and liability are issues to consider. She added that educating the public is important and they need to know that there is a balance to maintain.

Ms. McIntire discussed sidewalk amenity zone locations and whether or not the City should have flexible design standards. Councilmember Scott said he favored Alternative 1 on page 91 of the Council packet with a caveat that an amenity zone is necessary on some streets like 175th. Councilmember Roberts also supported Alternative 1 and said the City should be flexible on what property owners can do in the amenity zone. He suggested they be allowed to have vegetable gardens, etc. Mayor McGlashan said he agreed, but felt this item needs more discussion. Deputy Mayor Hall commented that many property owners have privatized the public right-of-way, but when there is a sidewalk there, it's clear and easy to enforce. Councilmember Eggen also favored Alternative 1 and allowing property owners to utilize the amenity zone for attractive plantings. Mayor McGlashan noted that if the homeowner is allowed to have something in the amenity zone it will be maintained.

Ms. McIntire discussed vegetation maintenance in the right-of-way. Councilmember Roberts said he wanted the City to do more to remind citizens of their responsibilities in the right-of-way.

He added that the chart in the Council packet seems to suggest there are two classes of property owners and he wondered if the City should say property owners are responsible in all/most cases. Mr. Olander noted that some of the major arterials are contracted out for maintenance. Deputy Mayor Hall said it is easier to get a community to take ownership on residential streets and favored that approach. Mr. Olander added that most collector streets tend to be residential streets and asked Mr. McKinley about the process for placing it in the arterial category. Mr. McKinley replied that a collector is an arterial and he and Ms. McIntire felt that all arterials should be lumped together, but most are single family. Mr. Olander said he wants the City staff to look at collector arterials in more detail. Councilmember Roberts said he would like to see the City maintain right-of-ways more often if they are less to maintain.

Councilmember Scott favored Alternative 1 and not revising the collector and arterial language. Councilmember Eggen said he generally agreed with Alternative 1, but is concerned about maintenance on some smaller arterials. He felt the City should encourage homeowners to care for the right-of-way. Mayor McGlashan suggested removing the term "repair" in Alternative 1.

Ms. McIntire continued her presentation on bicycle policies. Deputy Mayor Hall strongly preferred having separate dedicated bike lanes instead of sharrows. He supported Alternative 1. Councilmember Roberts supported the complete streets approach and said it might make sense to think of bike lanes on arterials and sharrows on other minor streets which may be simple and consistent for cyclists. Councilmember Winstead also supported Alternative 1 and complete streets. She preferred dedicated bike lanes and felt that sharrows don't mean anything to motorists. Councilmember Eggen supported Alternative 1, but stated that the City doesn't have the capital funds so the question is whether this is realistic. He felt there is a need for some flexibility, but suggested the City continue to pursue the bicycle master plan to complete a network throughout the City. Mr. McKinley explained that the long term vision is to have a cohesive bicycle network that makes sense. Mayor McGlashan strongly favored bike lanes over sharrows.

Mr. McKinley noted that the next step is discussing concurrency and funding at the August 2 City Council meeting.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:50 p.m. Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.