

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF WORKSHOP DINNER MEETING**

Monday, November 8, 2010  
5:45 p.m.

Conference Room C-301 - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue N.

**PRESENT:** Mayor Keith McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Will Hall, and Councilmembers Chris Eggen, Doris McConnell, Chris Roberts, Terry Scott, and Shari Winstead

**ABSENT:** none

**STAFF:** Bob Olander, City Manager; Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager; Joe Tovar, Planning & Development Services Director; Steve Cohn, Senior Planner; Scott Passey, City Clerk

**GUESTS:** Shoreline Planning Commissioners: Michele Linders Wagner, Chair; Ben Perkowski, Vice Chair; Janne Kaje; Donna Moss; Cynthia Esselman; John Behrens (Planning Commissioner Michael Broili was absent)

At 5:54 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Mayor McGlashan, who presided. There were introductions around the table.

Mr. Tovar and Mr. Cohn provided handouts of the Planning Commission Work Program and explained the preliminary thinking as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan Update. Mr. Tovar outlined the progress on Task 1, Aldercrest Study and Zoning Implementation, noting Councilmember Eggen's participation on the Aldercrest Task Force. Councilmember Eggen noted that a similar process is being used for the Cedarbrook site and wondered if it could be included in the Work Program in January 2011. Mr. Tovar noted that it would have to be considered very soon to keep the timeline. Mr. Olander elaborated on the process for putting items on the Work Program.

Mr. Cohn discussed the progress-to-date on Tasks 2, 3, and 4 – Development Code Amendments, Design Review, and Code Amendments. He described the considerable efforts undertaken on the Southeast Neighborhood Plan and the tree regulations.

Councilmember Eggen pointed out that Lake Forest Park is working on a transit-oriented development (TOD) design overlay on Lake City Way, which may present an opportunity for a partnership.

Mayor McGlashan inquired about the City of Seattle's process for developing new tree regulations and if there is anything Shoreline can learn from their process. Mr. Cohn responded that Seattle has been working on them for a long time, and each city approaches the issue of trees differently.

Deputy Mayor Hall wondered if the Innis Arden litigation presents any problems for developing tree regulations in the City. Mr. Tovar replied that the Planning Commission's work would not have a direct bearing on the Innis Arden legal issue.

Commissioner Behrens noted the ongoing difficulty of reconciling the different approaches to trees taken by the Planning Commission, Planning & Development Services, and Public Works. He wondered if the Council could provide direction on an overall policy that could govern all three.

Councilmember Roberts asked about the likelihood of the Planning Commission reaching a consensus on the tree code within the Work Program timeframe. Mr. Tovar said he was not sure if the Commission will need more time. Chair Wagner commented that citizens are passionate about this issue, adding that it is difficult to apply broad policies to every situation.

A brief discussion followed about best practices, the difficulty of balancing multiple values, and the fact that cities are doing different things based on their adopted values. Councilmember Scott asked if there are any common themes or best practices among cities in the nation. Mr. Tovar responded that although there are some common themes, he would hesitate to call them "best practices." He said the City of Shoreline's tree inventory does not provide enough information to define exactly what the problem is.

Deputy Mayor Hall asked if there is evidence that the City is losing tree canopy at an unacceptable rate, to which Mr. Tovar responded in the negative. Councilmember Eggen pointed out that software programs can be used to make a quantitative analysis of the tree canopy. However, if the tree canopy was not good 10 years ago, the change is not as important as improving the quality of the canopy itself.

There was discussion about whether the City Council should deliberate on the tree issue and provide more direction to the Commission. Chair Wagner concurred with this idea because the value judgments should be reviewed and assessed by the policy makers. Mr. Tovar noted that preserving neighborhood character and allowing infill development were two conflicting values identified early in the process, so perhaps the Council should wrestle with those concepts first. He also noted that determining the acceptable amount of total tree canopy is a subjective process.

Commissioner Behrens felt it would be impossible to provide a recommendation to the Council until the Commission knows what it is trying to accomplish and how comprehensive to make the regulations. Councilmember Scott noted that trees are a "hot button" issue for the community, and there is not enough scientific evidence yet we need clear expectations. He felt the Commission should do the analysis and provide a

recommendation to the Council. Mr. Olander suggested that perhaps the Council could draw some boundaries on what is an appropriate balance between tree preservation and infill development. Councilmember Eggen noted that the Council must set goals for the tree ordinance, but it cannot wrestle with the details because it doesn't have the expertise.

Deputy Mayor Hall felt that given the current struggle with the tree code, it may be wise to make small changes as opposed to comprehensive changes. He pointed out that sometimes the status quo is better than having a divided community, referring to cottage housing as an example of a policy that divided the City. He referred to Aldercrest to illustrate the fact that there was broad agreement that people wanted more parks in the northeast corner of the City.

Chair Wagner then commented on Work Program Task 4.2, noting that rezones and the SEPA appeal process has become a "can of worms" and the Commission would like clear direction from the Council. She said the Commission recommendation is to permanently transfer rezones to the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Tovar discussed Task 5, Light Rail Alignment Planning. He noted that while there is no agreement on any particular alignment, the modeling shows the I-5 alignment to be five minutes faster than the Aurora Corridor alignment from Northgate to Everett. He noted that all three alignments will be considered in the environmental review process. Deputy Mayor Hall commented that getting light rail in Shoreline is a bigger priority to him than getting something less, such as expanded bus service.

Mr. Cohn discussed Task 6 and commented on the progress of the Transportation Master Plan Update, Shoreline Master Program, Parks Master Plan Update, and Comprehensive Plan amendment docket.

Mr. Tovar commented on the progress of Task 7, Point Wells, noting that this should be discussed in an Executive Session before November 18 because it is subject to the Growth Management Hearings Board. He also covered Task 8, Town Center, and outlined the community outreach effort, hearings, and Planned Action/EIS.

Mr. Cohn discussed the progress-to-date on Task 9, SE Neighborhoods Plan and Zoning Update and alluded to some new zoning categories that may come as a recommendation from staff. Deputy Mayor Hall noted his aversion to creating detailed zones, which tend to make the code more complex and discourage development. He pointed out that other areas such as Redmond and Eastgate have seen substantial development and revenues, even during the economic recession. He felt this was partly due to simpler development codes.

Councilmember Roberts asked if there was any particular urgency in completing the SE Subarea Plan quickly. Mr. Cohn responded that there is urgency in getting it done because some development could be waiting for the new regulations. He noted that some of the recommended tools could work and help simplify the code. He noted that although

some of the principles could be applied to other areas, this is primarily a focus on the SE Neighborhoods.

Mr. Tovar reviewed the progress on the Comprehensive Plan Update. Mr. Cohn touched on Work Task items 14.2a, 14.2b, and 14.2c. Mr. Tovar noted that staff and the Commission are looking for Council to provide the "big-picture" principles for the Comprehensive Plan Update up front. He commented that the Vision Statement already provides many of the guiding principles.

Councilmember Eggen said it is not at all clear to him that a simple code will encourage development, especially if it results in less development options. He felt the Council should schedule a future Study Session to discuss how zoning affects development.

Councilmember Roberts asked whether a new City Manager will affect the Work Program. Mr. Olander responded that since the vision and principles have already been established by Council goals and policies, a new City Manager will simply implement those policies.

Councilmember Scott pointed out that in order to have development like Redmond or Eastgate, the City needs some sort of linchpin of industry to attract other businesses.

The meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk