

CITY OF SHORELINE

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

Monday, April 25, 2011
5:45 p.m.

Conference Room C-104 - Shoreline City Hall
17500 Midvale Avenue North

PRESENT: Mayor Keith McGlashan, Deputy Mayor Will Hall, and Councilmembers Eggen, Roberts, and Winstead

ABSENT: Councilmembers McConnell and Scott

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

GUESTS: Shoreline Planning Commission: Chair Michelle Linders Wagner; Vice Chair Ben Perkowski; and Commissioners Janne Kaje, Donna Moss, Cynthia Esselman, John Behrens, and Michael Broili

At 5:54 p.m., Mayor McGlashan called the meeting to order and introduced Joe Tovar to lead a discussion about the Comprehensive Plan update and the Planning Commission Work Plan.

Mr. Tovar noted that Council discussed the guiding principles for the Comprehensive Plan (CP) update previously, and the main undertaking appears to be eliminating redundancies and simplifying the Plan. Responding to a question about whether 2012 was a realistic goal for completing the update, Mr. Tovar suggested that the goal is ambitious and it could possibly take longer if any element of the Plan requires a major analysis.

Mayor McGlashan invited attendees to proceed with discussion.

Councilmember Eggen noted that the Planning Director previously stated that the vision and framework goals that are relevant to development are not changing significantly, so any changes to the Development Code that precede the adoption of the updated CP could be appropriate. Councilmember Eggen suggested that it was his understanding that implementation of the Southeast Subarea Plan could still occur since implementation would result in changes to the development code, not the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Kaje commented that it would be helpful to have a simple way to show any amendments made to the CP, such as through the use of color codes, which would take the place of "track changes" and be easier to see at a glance.

Mr. Tovar noted that some CP language is very detailed and reads like a regulation. He encouraged having a distinction between code amendments and redundancies, adding that we should be careful that any proposal, whether it comes from staff or the public, is consistent with the established vision.

Deputy Mayor Hall agreed, noting that the high turnover rate on the City Council and Planning Commission necessitates such an approach. He said the City does not want to go back and do the whole thing over again.

Ms. Underwood said it might be helpful to hold another joint meeting between the Council and Planning Commission later for a status update on the Plan. She felt the more the two groups can collaborate, perhaps the list of outstanding items will be minimized. Mr. Tovar felt such a meeting should happen earlier in order to avoid the appearance that the Council is making decisions before the public process has begun.

Deputy Mayor Hall said the update should emphasize the “big picture” policy issues, and that he does not anticipate any brand-new issues to surface. He felt the decision-making process should distinguish between “wordsmithing” and policy decisions. In response, Ms. Underwood commented favorably on the success of the visioning process and felt the CP update could follow a similar approach.

Commissioner Behrens suggested an approach that would allow the Planning Commission to stay engaged in the process so they do not end up reviewing hundreds of pages at a time. He suggested a joint review effort in order to avoid resolving numerous conflicts at the end of the process. Mr. Tovar noted that adding one more check-in point in the process might have some benefit.

Vice Chair Perkowski agreed with the approach to remove redundancies in the CP but favored adding some type of cross-referencing in order to clarify how policies should be implemented. Mr. Tovar noted that perhaps each chapter could include some language about implementation. However, in some cases such language could be too prescriptive and inflexible. He suggested that the CP remain a generalized policy document. Deputy Mayor Hall felt the CP is a long-term policy statement that should be able to stand alone, without reference to other codes or laws. He said the length of the document is an important issue for him, and there will always be confusion between the City’s Vision and Framework Goals and the Development Code.

Chair Wagner said it appears that the average member of the public does not look to the CP for questions about development, so she wondered whom the CP is being changed for.

Deputy Mayor Hall noted that the CP I is a statement of where the City intends to take land use in the future. He clarified that the CP does not regulate development. Mr. Tovar added that developers only look at the Development Code when making decisions about land use. He said using the CP map is a way to be clear about the regulations, as opposed to including detailed text in the CP itself.

Commissioner Moss asked how the community outreach effort would unfold, and whether people would be limited in their ability to participate. Mr. Tovar and Mr. Cohn replied that the City must be clear that it is not talking about creating a new vision, but it is more about what the City can do. However, it is not a regulatory document, and because there is already significant detail included in the current CP, significant elimination of redundancies will likely be necessary.

Deputy Mayor Hall noted that the established Vision talks about various groups and elements such as seniors, children, pedestrians, housing stock, etc. However, most housing stock is not accessible to people in wheelchairs, which does not allow them to age in place. He used this example to illustrate that the Vision can influence the Development Code and capital plan so the needed changes can be implemented.

Commissioner Moss discussed mobility and accessibility issues, noting that being smart about how you build in the first place makes a big difference.

Councilmember Eggen added that there are many general policy statements that have implications for the regulations “down the line” that will ultimately implement the broader policies.

Commissioner Behrens expressed a need for more than the Planning and Development Services department’s involvement in the process. He said the Parks, Public Works, and transportation planning staff all need to be involved. Mr. Tovar said the review for concurrency could happen internally, or staff could present for Council on the Transportation Master Plan, Surface Water Master Plan, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Councilmember Roberts suggested that it might be worthwhile to adopt the Transportation Master Plan and Surface Water Master Plan in closer proximity to the final adoption of the CP update to ensure there is alignment and concurrency.

Mr. Tovar noted that Parks and Public Works staff could identify those items that may have policy implications, adding that the CP update is an iterative process where discussion and feedback is happening throughout the process.

Ms. Underwood noted that there is some urgency in getting the functional plans adopted because most of the City’s capital projects depend on grant funding, and grant funding is contingent upon whether there is an adopted plan.

Mr. Cohn assured the Council and Commission that the staff uses adopted growth targets in its modeling, and that the Transportation Master Plan reflects this.

Councilmember Roberts asked how the CP update process would proceed from this point. Mr. Tovar explained that the first phase would be to nominate sections for removal based on redundancy. The second phase will be to go back and add any necessary

elements. Responding to a question about map changes, Mr. Tovar noted that the easy ones would be the Special Study Area additions. He said he does not see many map changes occurring after the Town Center Subarea map addition.

Commissioner Broili then discussed the Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) assessment. He noted that while it is a good start, it was a low-budget review and the data is incomplete. He said the assessment is a general indicator of a trend; however, it falls far short of what is needed. He suggested conducting a second review using 2009 data at a 2-foot resolution. He noted that the City did not get a true baseline from the data, and impervious areas have increased by 10%, which equates to a net loss of UTC. He warned that the City is losing its functional environment and he urged the Council to take a closer look.

Commissioner Behrens noted a Washington State University study regarding the effects of water entering the Puget Sound. He said the study concluded that planting and/or decreasing impervious surface is the best way to remedy this situation. He said the City should encourage planting, despite the high costs. He said that the city could either invest now, or pay much more in the future for stormwater management.

Councilmember Roberts wondered if the Medical Marijuana Dispensaries (MMD) issue could affect the Commission's Work Plan. The Council and Commission then discussed the actions of the State legislature and whether MMDs may have bearing on the City's land use regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Scott Passey, City Clerk