

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL
SUMMARY MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION

Monday, December 6, 2010
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber – Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue N.

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 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.

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 reported on the National League of Cities (NLC) Conference and highlighted a presentation on social media.

Councilmember McConnell reported on the NLC transportation infrastructure meeting and human development meeting.

5. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Public Comment Trial Period Review

Eric Bratton, Management Analyst, provided a brief staff report updating the Council on the public comment trial period.

Mayor McGlashan questioned general comments during study sessions and noted that people almost always come back the following week. He also discussed pro and con campaign endorsements during public comment.

Councilmember Scott asked how frequently people are using email to communicate with the Council. Mr. Bratton replied that the City receives approximately 400 pieces of correspondence per year through email, phone calls, letters, and other means.

Deputy Mayor Hall questioned if the City is tracking the number of inquiries by email versus letters and said it would be nice to know what tools people are using so the City can improve communication with residents.

Councilmember Eggen said that people have been telling him that they dislike the reduction in public comment, and that form letters aren't very satisfying. However, he stated that the revisions to public comment has not generated much vocal opposition, but a lot of people would prefer the more open public comment policies. He favored having more flexible open public comment policies. Councilmember Roberts agreed with Councilmember Eggen. However, he supported the proposed legislation presented by the City staff.

Deputy Mayor Hall said he realizes some people have been impacted by the changes, but a large number of residents appreciate the pace of Council meetings and he said he has been hearing positive things too. He said he appreciates the emails the City gets. He favored the proposed City staff recommendations.

Councilmember Winstead noted that the Council has shifted public comment to the beginning of business meetings and the rules concerning public comment are simplified now. She added that when people are happy there isn't any public comment. She supported the staff recommendation.

Councilmember McConnell said she is undecided about whether to have public comment at study sessions. She said she felt the public is happy with the way things are now and that is why they aren't coming to the meetings.

Councilmember Scott stated that the Council meetings are more efficient and inquired if there is a way to put an online survey on the City's website to gauge public satisfaction. Mr. Olander replied that surveying the entire community online probably wouldn't inform the Council about their level of satisfaction on this item.

Deputy Mayor Hall added that email use was efficient in the recent animal control issue involving the dog "Lucky." He further noted that no residents showed up to speak on this item and he is comfortable with the staff recommendations.

(b) Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Joe Tovar, Planning & Development Services Director, was joined by Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, and Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, who provided the staff report outlining proposed amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Cohn explained that the Comprehensive Plan amendments occur approximately once a year and he reviewed the amendments. He stated that the amendments affect 1) Ballinger

Neighborhood, 2) Public Open Space, 3) changing the Regional Business (RB) zone to Mixed Use (MU) zone, 4) modifying LU17, 18, 19, 5) and the Fircrest transfer of five (5) acres to the Public Health Lab.

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

Councilmember Eggen stated that the language "other mixed use and commercial areas include..." on page 8 implies that North City, Richmond Beach, Ridgecrest, and Ballinger are all mixed use areas. He suggested the language in the ordinance be clearer. Mr. Cohn responded that the revisions can be made and brought in front of the Council next week before formal adoption.

Councilmember Scott inquired about the "Ridgecrest Business District" language on page 8. Deputy Mayor Hall replied that these questions illustrate why he supports very succinct text, because when narrative text is added the City runs the risk of having something not allowed accepted. He suggested avoiding too much text because it avoids consistency issues. Councilmember Roberts suggested trimming the narrative to include the first sentence only.

(c) Development Code Amendments

Mr. Tovar, Mr. Szafran, and Mr. Cohn were joined by Jeff Forry, Permit Services Manager, who provided the staff report.

Mr. Forry identified areas in need of updates and gave a brief overview of each item. The amendments involve: 1) SEPA review within critical area and critical area buffers; 2) amending the local ordinances to correct inconsistencies with regard to appeals; and 3) removing the Engineering Standards from the Development Code. Mr. Cohn also highlighted that the annual amendment docketing process was added as an amendment.

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

Deputy Mayor Hall urged City staff to keep the Comprehensive Plan update in the forefront. He added that there have been hundreds of people who have helped Shoreline update the Vision Statement and Framework Goals. He stated that there are different types of public input depending on the decision. He asked the City staff to remind the Council, as these milestones are reached, about the opportunities for public comment. Plans come before the regulations, he highlighted, and the Council needs to make sure public comment opportunities are not lost. Mr. Forry responded that public comment is important at the beginning of the process.

Mr. Olander added that if the City continues on the path of more timely and predictable regulations, it will translate into timeliness for the public and for developers. Oftentimes, comments are made after development regulations are put in place, so this process helps manage expectations.

Mr. Tovar pointed out that the big task is to get the public to pay attention when the rules are being considered. He noted that the Town Center, Comprehensive Plan, and the draft proposals for each of them are important and the City staff has to use every mechanism to notify the public and get them involved.

Councilmember Eggen stated that SEPA review isn't quite public comment; a SEPA appeal of a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) says you didn't follow your own rules. Therefore, he questioned if the best course of action is to eliminate an administrative SEPA review in some cases. Additionally, he stated that an administrative SEPA review is much less expensive for citizens and can be dealt with fairly quickly. However, he felt the City shouldn't be forcing applicants to appeal to Superior Court because it would cost them thousands of dollars.

Mr. Forry responded that there are only two or three permits that would fall under this criterion and the City is not eliminating appeal/review opportunities. The Planning Commission hears rezones if they are part of pending subarea plan, he stated. Mr. Cohn noted that the Commission will have the authority to approve or reject rezones in any subarea plan. Mr. Tovar recognized that there are only two subareas, Southeast and Town Center, so the number of rezones handled by the Commission will be very small.

Councilmember Roberts clarified the recommended changes and Mr. Tovar explained the process for Type C permits, appeals, and Master Development Plan appeals. Mr. Tovar further explained that if someone isn't satisfied with SEPA, they have another chance to appeal it before the Council. If they aren't satisfied at that point, it would be heard in Superior Court on the SEPA Threshold Determination.

Councilmember Roberts expressed concern about the Council being the decision-maker on Master Development Plans. He would prefer the Council be out of the business of quasi-judicial action on master development permits. Mr. Tovar responded that the Council could allow the hearing examiner to handle such hearings.

Deputy Mayor Hall discussed the docketing process and said the newspaper of record is not a good way of getting information on projects within the City. He wondered if the City could reach more people through *Currents*, the City website, site postings, and so forth. He was curious to know how the Council feels about not putting this information in the newspaper and asked staff to consider it.

Ian Sievers, City Attorney, confirmed that because this is a docketing process and not a public hearing notice, the City is not required to publish it in its newspaper of record.

Councilmember Eggen concurred with Deputy Mayor Hall and stated the City should formulate press releases in addition to advertising the City's modes of communication. He added that page 34, Chapter 20.70.020, doesn't include language like "according to best practices" and wondered if that should be specified.

There was discussion concerning the many interpretations of “best practices.” Deputy Mayor Hall stated that he isn’t sure the community would embrace all standard practices of engineers and that the “best practices” should be consistent with development regulations.

The Council recommended that at a later date the City staff recognize and identify all of the notification requirements. Additionally, the Council recommended that City staff prepare an amendment to substitute noticing in the newspaper with publishing docketing process notices in *Currents*, the City’s website, and issuing a press release.

RECESS

At 8:35 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called for a five minute break. The meeting reconvened at 8:42 p.m.

(d) Public Health Lab Rezone and Master Development Plan

Mr. Szafran provided a brief staff report in which he highlighted the proposed building and its two-story parking garage as part of the Public Health Lab development plan. He stated that the proposed rezone adds five acres and he discussed the associated Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Councilmember Eggen questioned aspects of the redevelopment, and Mr. Szafran responded that the redevelopment was a modest 20-year plan addition, considering the size of this parcel. Councilmember Eggen questioned if this limits the development to biological safety level (BSL) 3. Mr. Szafran confirmed that it did. Deputy Mayor Hall also confirmed with Mr. Szafran that this has no impact on the Food Lifeline warehouse.

Mr. Olander stated that the new larger office building is intended to provide space for relocated staff in Kent over the 20-year period and helps consolidate their facility, which will bring jobs to Shoreline.

6. ADJOURNMENT

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

Scott Passey, City Clerk

This page intentionally left blank.