**DRAFT**

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
## SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, August 2, 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 National Night Out Against Crime

Mayor McGlashan read the proclamation declaring August 3, 2010 as the 27th Annual National Night Out Against Crime in the City of Shoreline. Doris Hanson, representing the Highland Terrace Neighborhood, and Captain Ted Stensland, of the Shoreline Police Department, accepted the proclamation and thanked the City for this recognition.

3. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT & FUTURE AGENDAS

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

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Eggen stated that the Cedarbrook Task Force met and reviewed the materials that were provided by the City staff. He said they decided that the first step is to create a brief report for the School Board.

Mayor McGlashan said tonight's meeting was noticed as a Special Meeting because the Planning Commission was invited to attend. Three Planning Commission members in attendance

introduced themselves: Vice Chair Ben Perkowski, Commissioner Donna Moss, and Commissioner Cynthia Esselman.

**Upon motion by Councilmember Roberts, seconded by Councilmember Eggen and carried 7-0, the agenda order of items 5 (a) and 5 (b) were reversed.**

5.      STUDY ITEMS

        (a)      Continued Discussion of the Transportation Master Plan: Concurrency and Funding

Alicia McIntire, Senior Transportation Planner, discussed concurrency issues and funding options associated with the Transportation Master Plan. She introduced Randy Young, Senior Partner at Henderson Young & Co. who provided a presentation regarding concurrency and impact mitigation.

Mayor McGlashan opened the item to public comment. There was no one wishing to give public comment.

Councilmember Roberts confirmed that developers are still responsible for project improvements and that if a use is changed, mitigation would occur before the building is built or before the occupancy permit is issued. Responding to Councilmember Roberts, Mr. Young noted that the only problem he has experienced is when money is pooled from mitigation and used on highest priorities.

Councilmember Eggen inquired about the calculations and wondered why the City is projecting ahead to 2030 rather than looking at the road system capacity. Mr. Young replied that this logic involves using paid parking for a credit. He noted that cities adopt their own unique rate schedule. Mr. Olander pointed out that the rates and revenues generated have to bear some relationship to the impact fees. Mr. McKinley explained that the City models transportation impacts, comes up with list of projects to keep the system adequate, then takes the number of trips generated by growth and ends up with the cost per trip. After some discussion, it was noted that external to external trips must be paid for by the general taxpayer base and that agreements with neighboring jurisdictions would allow for reciprocal impact fees.

Vice Chair Perkowski said that the trips available calculation seems critical and the more sensible option seems to be the capacity model. Mr. Young explained that the standard practice is to leave trips available calculation model in place for a few years, and that is normal for concurrency programs is 3-5 years. Vice Chair Perkowski clarified that the City is not required to spend impacts fees on projects in the immediate area. SEPA, he explained, requires improvements in the immediate area and GMA impact fees allow for system-wide improvements.

Based on a comment by Commissioner Esselman concerning the high level of traffic in Shoreline, Mr. Young commented that the City is not allowed to capture that external impact unless SEPA is used or an interlocal agreement is negotiated with neighboring jurisdictions.

Responding to Councilmember Scott, Mr. Young said the federal government decides what credits will be issued and there have been specific credits given to reduce trips by King County, but they had issues with unenforceability and the amount of people who participated in the program.

Councilmember Eggen discussed the cumulative effects of small projects and wondered if cities are getting more funds out of this than what they are investing. Mr. Young replied that all of the entities who are in the program are making money.

Commissioner Moss confirmed that the trip generation calculator is based on national averages/studies and can be applied to any city in the United States. Mr. Young added that cities can introduce local information, trip length, land use, and pass-by trips. He added that some entities produce a traffic impact study to show their numbers don't match the national average, so they don't pay the impact fee.

Councilmember McConnell expressed concern with excessive trips on neighborhood streets. Mr. Young explained that the GMA impact fee is designed to look at the bigger picture, including arterials and collector streets. He added that the City would have to continue to use SEPA and look to the transportation staff to ensure the plan is well thought out.

Councilmember Roberts supported the PC and Planning Director's recommendation to move toward impact fees. Responding to Mayor McGlashan, Mr. Young noted that the level of service is not always done at intersections. Mr. McKinley pointed out, however, that the City staff has always measured intersections and asks consultants to look at segments as well. Councilmember Eggen also supported the use of this new mitigation proposal.

**There was Council consensus to direct City staff to pursue and refine the proposal.**

RECESS

At 8: 13 p.m. Mayor McGlashan called for a three minute break. The Council meeting reconvened at 8: 18 p.m.

    (b)    Implementation Options for the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan

Joe Tovar, Planning & Development Services Director, introduced Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, and Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, who outlined the implementation options for the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan.

Mr. Tovar discussed the zoning in the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea and the City. He said the contract rezones need to be worked out and specific regulations need to be tailored for special zones. He also reviewed the permits allowed in the City and said administrative design review should be implemented City-wide, adding that the citizen group recommended the administrative design review process for the Southeast Subarea.

Councilmember Eggen agreed with the staff recommendation to eliminate seldom-used zones and that the Comprehensive Plan (CP) should continue to guide the City's zoning.

Mr. Cohn displayed a map of potential Planned Areas (PLA) and reviewed the three City staff proposed options.

Mayor McGlashan opened this item to public comment.

a)      Diana Herbst, Shoreline, stated that single family neighborhoods do not have enough infrastructure to support the development, and the City needs gradual "step-downs" from zone to zone.

b)      Margie King, Shoreline, questioned why park areas are marked R-6, which is a residential density designation.

Mr. Tovar replied that most parks are located in single family zones, which is allowed in the Code.

Councilmember Roberts supported Planned Areas as an approach and disagreed with the City of Kirkland having quasi-judicial hearings for administrative design review. He felt that the corner from 30th to Bothell/Lake City Way is appropriate for a PLA.

Councilmember Winstead discussed the southeast corner and wondered if it is possible to reduce the density. Mr. Cohn replied that the issue is two-fold and property was bought under existing zoning and the CP may have implied a higher zoning could be available.

Deputy Mayor Hall said he is sensitive to the amount of time it takes to get a project done and doesn't want to keep experimenting. He suggested fixing this once and applying it universally throughout the City.

Councilmember Eggen agreed with Deputy Mayor Hall that the City needs to figure out what standards should be applied, not come up with a special zone for every area. He felt general principles need to be established to guide the zoning map.

Councilmember Scott said he doesn't see specificity and uncertainty as being the same. However, more general principles can be created, but that shouldn't affect certain areas that have specific guidelines, such as North City and Ridgecrest.

Commissioner Moss highlighted that Shoreline residents are desirous of transition areas and said it seems as if the transition has been lost in the area by the west side of 30th.

Mayor McGlashan discussed the transition from R-24 to R-48 and said there isn't R-48 on 30th except on 145th Street.

Mr. Tovar pointed out that the issue is trying to make sense of all the problems based on the zoning right now. He said the City staff could raise or lower the number based on the range in the high density zones by location.

Councilmember Roberts discussed the corner on 30th and the concerns about traffic flow. Based on the issues he felt this area is appropriate for a PLA. He felt PLAs make the permit process more predictable and they can develop things in a manner more consistent with traditional zoning.

Mr. Olander asked Mr. Tovar if there is a PLA model that applies standard principles. Mr. Tovar replied that MUZ2 might be a tool for the City to work on to create a more citywide application. PLA is an attempt to write the rules that are unique to that area which will allow the City to focus on the detail, but portability is limited.

Commissioner Esselman said it would be a benefit to the City to make this a PLA because there are so many factors impacting it, such as transit and the adjacency to Seattle.

Mr. Cohn outlined the three options for the Council to consider.

Councilmember Eggen said he could support either the PLA or general zoning principles for that corner.

Councilmember Scott highlighted that trying to create general zoning principles is difficult for a built-out Shoreline. He favored the idea of looking at other areas and best practices to craft general principles.

Mr. Tovar noted that it is easy to bring back MUZ2. He added that 2 or 3 alternatives could be written and the public process can begin.

Deputy Mayor Hall stated that he is concerned with efficient utilization of City staff time, believing that the process should be simple and predictable. He noted that his main concern is how development impacts the neighborhoods and taking care of the aging population in the City.

Councilmember Winstead agreed, noting that one-size fits all doesn't work in Shoreline. Transition areas and "third places" are important to our communities, she said.

Councilmember McConnell said her goal is to ensure there aren't zoning changes which decrease property values, as she doesn't want to go through another Ridgecrest process again. She added that she would like only 1 or 2 PLAs worked on instead of 3 or 4.

Mr. Tovar summed up the Council comments.

Councilmember Scott felt that PLAs will allow development to occur coinciding with the specifics needed for each particular area.

**DRAFT**

Mayor McGlashan asked the City staff to be aware of the number of zones that exist and the naming going forward.

Vice Chair Perkowski noted that the PC is working on condensing their minutes.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 p.m. Mayor McGlashan declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Scott Passey, City Clerk