

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Comprehensive Plan Update- Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Planning & Community Development
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner Rachael Markle, AICP, P&CD Director
<b>ACTION:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

**INTRODUCTION**

After a year of Planning Commission discussion and revision of the Draft 2012 Comprehensive Plan, Council had their first opportunity to review the entire document at their November 5 meeting. The Draft 2012 Comprehensive Plan is accessible at the following link: <http://shorelinewa.gov/index.aspx?page=409>. In the report for that meeting

<http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/council/staffreports/2012/staffreport110512-9b.pdf>, staff proposed a timeline for adoption that meets the Council's goal of updating the Plan by December 2012, while providing an opportunity for thorough consideration of this guiding document.

Staff will present the draft document to Council in three sections, which is scheduled as follows:

- November 5 – Overview of the process to date; discussion of the Land Use, Community Design, and Housing Elements (pages 1-44, 83-116)
- November 13 – Discussion of the Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements (pages 45-66, 117-156)
- November 19 – Discussion of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Capital Facilities; Utilities; and the docketed amendments related to the Point Wells Subarea Plan (pages 67-82, 157-192)
- November 26 – Discussion of any remaining questions or final revisions
- December 10, 2012 – Tentative date for Council adoption

**RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The City hired a consultant, BERK Consulting, for approximately \$40,000 to assess if the City's Comprehensive Plan, through proposed zoning code changes, can support consolidation of zoning categories, form based zoning regulations, reduction of parking standards, and removal of density limits in the commercial zones. There are no additional financial impacts associated with this project at this point.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff requests that Council discuss the Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements (pages 45-66, 117-156) of the draft Comprehensive Plan, and direct staff to make desired revisions in preparation for adoption on December 10.

Approved By:           City Manager ***JU***   City Attorney ***IS***

## **DISCUSSION**

The Planning Commission reviewed the Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements on the following dates (link to meeting materials are included):

- March 1- Transportation  
<http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4297>
- April 5- Natural Environment (proposed as a new element, formerly part of Land Use) <http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4295>
- May 3- Economic Development  
<http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4293>
- June 21- Economic Development  
<http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4290>
- July 9- Joint dinner meeting with City Council to discuss Big Picture Questions
- August 16- Natural Environment  
<http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4286>
- September 20- Full draft of entire Plan  
<http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=182&recordid=4284>
- October 18- Public Hearing on full draft Plan – The minutes for the public hearing are included with this staff report as Attachment A.

Four of the five Speaker's Series events focused on Transportation, Economic Development, or the Natural Environment. Videos of all presentations are available at <http://cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=850>.

- February 22, Transportation Element- Sara Schott Nikolic, Puget Sound Regional Council, *Equitable Transit Communities*
- April 12, Natural Environment Element- Jenny Pell, permaculture designer, *Beacon Food Forest*
- April 25, Economic Development Element- Rob Bennett, Portland Sustainability Institute, *EcoDistricts*
- September 12, Land Use Element- Matthew Kwatinetz, QBL Real Estate, *Sustainability, Culture, and Integrated Economic Development Strategies*

## **BIG PICTURE QUESTIONS**

Staff compiled a list of “big picture questions” to facilitate discussion at the July 9 joint City Council and Planning Commission dinner meeting. Most of those topics were not discussed that evening, but through Commission deliberation, have since been resolved. They are listed below with a staff response that includes policy references within the draft Comprehensive Plan for the elements under discussion this evening. The purpose of including the big picture questions and policy language here is to provide background and show resolution for topics that were included in the July staff report, rather than to request specific direction. If Council has concerns or recommendations, it is appropriate to suggest revisions or request more information. Because the Transportation Element was based on the 2011 Transportation Master Plan, no big picture questions were identified for the Comprehensive Plan Update.

## Economic Development

- Home based businesses: How does the City balance a desire to create more local economic development opportunities with neighborhood concerns like parking, signage, etc.? Although staff believes that the policy language is sufficient to address this issue at the Comprehensive Plan level, staff wanted to raise the question in case the Council had any specific concerns or recommendations to be added to the Comprehensive Plan. Another alternative is to address in future Development Code amendments which will not require any Comprehensive Plan amendments.
  - ED3: Encourage and support home-based businesses in the City, provided that signage, parking, storage, and noise levels are compatible with neighborhoods.
  - U16: Promote opportunities for distance learning and telecommuting to implement economic development and climate initiatives, such as encouraging more home-based businesses that provide jobs without increased traffic.
  
- Clean/Green Industries- How does the City encourage living wage, “clean tech” jobs while mitigating potential conflicts with adjacent uses? This is another area in which staff believes that the suggested policy language is comprehensive, but Council may have a desire to further address this issue during the Comprehensive Plan discussions.
  - LUX: Allow areas in the city where clean, green industry may be located.
  - LUIX: Minimize or mitigate potential health impacts of industrial activities on residential communities, schools, open space, and other public facilities.
  - CD4: Buffer the visual impact on residential areas of commercial, office, industrial, and institutional development.
  
- Food carts- Does the City want to promote these and other incubator initiatives?
  - This concept is not addressed in the draft Plan. It is also not specifically addressed in the Development Code, but food carts are currently permitted in the City, subject to the guidelines below. There are some administrative challenges with the existing regulations, such as a prohibition on outside storage and inability to group multiple “lunch wagons” on the same parcel, but revisions to remedy these issues could be accomplished without Comprehensive Plan justification. As with all changes proposed by Council, the City Attorney will need to determine whether they are significant enough to require an additional public hearing prior to adoption.
    1. They are permitted uses in the business and industrial zoning districts and do not require a permit from the City of Shoreline in these zones. In the residential zones, they are allowed only with a conditional use permit.
    2. Permission from the property owner is required.
    3. A right-of-way use permit is required to locate in the City right-of-way (street or sidewalk).

4. Cannot use or block required parking spaces for businesses or block pedestrian access to businesses.
5. A business license is required from the City.
6. A permit from the King County Health Department is required.

### Natural Environment

- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR): Does the City want to keep or refine language to consider developing or participating in a program? If so, state, regional, and/or local?
  - The TDR program is a voluntary, incentive-based, and market-driven approach to preserve land and steer development growth away from rural and resource lands into urban areas. The Program is based on free-market principles and prices that would motivate landowner and developer participation. Rural landowners realize economic return through the sale of development rights to private developers who are able to build more compactly in cities and designated unincorporated urban areas. More information regarding the King County TDR program can be found at <http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/stewardship/sustainable-building/transfer-development-rights.aspx>.
  - LU58: Support regional and state Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs throughout the city where infrastructure improvements are needed, and where additional density, height and bulk standards can be accommodated.
  - NE6: Provide incentives for site development that minimizes environmental impacts. Incentives may include density bonuses for cluster development and/or a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.
    - Transfer of Development Rights was discussed by the Commission at the April 5 meeting. There do not seem to be many examples of successful local programs, but the Commission recommended that the City consider participation in regional or state programs. The task force for the north corridor of the Growing Transit Communities program has discussed how TDR could be used with regard to light rail.

### NEXT STEPS

There will be a Public Hearing at the Planning Commission on November 15 to take comment on the docketed amendments regarding the Point Wells subarea. While changing the boundaries and name of the Potential Annexation Area were components of the adopted subarea plan, these changes were never implemented. Rationale for changing the boundary is explained thoroughly in the Subarea Plan, but as a brief reminder, the change in name from Potential Annexation Area (PAA) to Future Service Annexation Area (FSAA) was because PAA is a King County term. Snohomish County uses Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA), and objected to the use of a King County term to describe land entirely in Snohomish County. Likewise, staff did not feel it appropriate to use the MUGA Snohomish County terminology for an area that would

potentially be annexed into King County. Therefore, the term FSAA was coined to be acceptable to all interested parties.

The Comprehensive Plan Update is an appropriate mechanism to implement these changes. The maps in the draft Plan have been revised to show the boundaries established in the subarea plan, but there are 3 mentions of PAA in the text of the draft Plan that will be changed, assuming that is part of the Planning Commission recommendation following the public hearing. The entire amended subarea plan will be included in Council's November 19 packet.

The intent of breaking up review in this way is to provide ample discussion of all elements, but it is worth noting that the Transportation and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) elements are based entirely on the adopted 2011 Transportation and PROS Master Plans. Since Council spent significant time reviewing and crafting these policies, staff does not anticipate that they will require much time in the context of reviewing the draft Plan. This provides a cushion in case any of the study sessions run long. Likewise, the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) contained in Appendix A of the draft Plan is based on the SMP that Council adopted in May 2012.

The approved October 18 Planning Commission public hearing minutes are included as Attachment A Planning Comm. These will provide additional context for issues discussed, changes incorporated as part of Commission recommendation, and Commission deliberation on the criteria below. If you have questions or comments prior to the meeting, please contact Miranda Redinger at (206) 801-2513 or by email at [mredinger@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:mredinger@shorelinewa.gov).

The draft minutes from the November 15 Public Hearing (docketed items for Point Wells Subarea) will be ready for distribution at the November 19 meeting. These will provide additional context for issues discussed, changes incorporated as part of Commission recommendation, and Commission deliberation on the criteria below.

The Capital Facilities and Utilities elements are scheduled for Council discussion on November 19. This is purposefully after the November 6 election that will determine whether Shoreline voters approve Ordinance No. 644 adopted by the City Council authorizing Shoreline to acquire the Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) water system within the city without raising rates beyond those projected by SPU. If acquisition is not approved by the voters, staff has identified language to be removed from the current draft.

There is also time reserved on the November 26 agenda for remaining questions and revisions prior to potential adoption on December 10.

### **CRITERIA FOR ADOPTION**

Criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan are delineated in SMC 20.30.340-Amendment and review of the Comprehensive Plan (legislative action). The regulation is included below in *italics*, with staff response immediately following.

**A. Purpose.** *A Comprehensive Plan amendment or review is a mechanism by which the City may modify the text or map of the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the provisions of the Growth Management Act, in order to respond to changing circumstances or needs of the City, and to review the Comprehensive Plan on a regular basis.*

**B. Decision Criteria.** *The Planning Commission may recommend and the City Council may approve, or approve with modifications an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if:*

1. *The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, and the other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and City policies; or*
  - Staff reviewed the Plan for consistency with the Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies, and for internal consistency with other Plan elements and City policies, and determined that the draft document meets this requirement.
2. *The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a sub area plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan; or*
  - This update captures a snapshot of Shoreline in 2012, and will guide growth according to the vision established by the community and Council. Changing circumstances and values that are reflected in this update include an evolution of the city from a suburban fringe to a more self-sustaining urban environment, with a desire for more local jobs, services, and amenities, a multi-modal transportation system, and potential management of utilities. Another example of evolving values is the inclusion of economic and social equity considerations in addition to the focus on environmental sustainability.
3. *The amendment will benefit the community as a whole, will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety or general welfare.*
  - Policies included in the draft 2012 Comprehensive Plan are intended to benefit the community, and promote public health, safety, and general welfare. Examples include Community Design policies meant to direct development of design and transition standards, Natural Environment policies meant to protect natural resources and functions, Transportation policies meant to promote walkability and connectivity, and Housing policies meant to offer a variety of housing choices and levels of affordability appropriate for a diverse population.

The Commission based their recommendation for Council adoption on the belief that these criteria have been met.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff requests that Council discuss the Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements (pages 45-66, 117-156) of the draft Comprehensive Plan, and direct staff to make desired revisions in preparation for adoption on December 10.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Minutes from October 18 Planning Commission Public Hearing



These Minutes Approved  
November 1st

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

October 18, 2012  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Moss  
Vice Chair Esselman  
Commissioner Craft  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Montero  
Commissioner Scully  
Commissioner Wagner

### **Staff Present**

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development  
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Ronald Moore, Deputy City Clerk

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Moss called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Moss, Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Montero, Scully and Wagner.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

### **DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

Director Markle did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes to approve.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

No one in the audience indicated a desire to speak to the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE**

Mr. Moore explained the rules and procedures for the public hearing. Commissioner Wagner pointed out that the Commission amended their process so the public hearing is not closed until after a vote has been taken. This allows them to solicit additional questions as part of their deliberation. Mr. Moore expressed concern about allowing the public to engage in the Commission's deliberation process.

Chair Moss provided further explanation of the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the public hearing.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger explained the difference between the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies that provide general guidance and the Development Code regulations and zoning maps that implement the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. She explained that there are many ways to implement the policies in the Comprehensive Plan such as a functional master plans, zoning, capital improvement projects, and annual work plans. She emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan has no particular authority other than providing direction.

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that cities and counties update their comprehensive plans on a regular basis, and cities in King County were mandated to do so by June 30, 2015. The Shoreline City Council indicated their desire to complete the update by the end of 2012 before the framework goals became outdated and a vision for the City, which was created through an extensive public process, to be used as the basis for the major Comprehensive Plan Update.

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the current Comprehensive Plan was a 364-page, black and white text document with some maps. The goal of the update was to revise the document to be more succinct, user-friendly and graphically interesting. The 212-page document before the Commission for review includes sidebar explanations and large maps. She reviewed that the document was initially updated to remove unnecessary background information; restatements of policies found in other elements of the plan; policies that were outdated or had been accomplished; policies that were more detailed than is appropriate for a general guiding document; and policies that are already mandated by other local, state or federal regulations. She advised that policies and text were also added to the Comprehensive Plan to comply with GMA or other updated requirements; support the Vision 2029, Framework Goals, and other Council goals; and promote consistency with other guiding documents such as functional master plans, strategies, and subarea plans.

Ms. Redinger explained that after the initial staff review and proposed revisions, the update process included two major components: Planning Commission review and public participation. She noted that various elements of the Comprehensive Plan were reviewed by the Commission at 14 separate meetings. Public participation is not only a requirement of the GMA, but an important City value. The City hosted a 5-event speaker series to discuss various elements of the plan and created a Comprehensive Plan Update webpage that included the Vision 2029 video, as well as links to the current Comprehensive Plan, speaker series events, and all records from Commission meetings where the different elements

were discussed. The Comprehensive Plan Update was also featured in the May 2011 *Currents* newsletter, and the October 2012 edition announced the public hearing date. In addition to attending a Council of Neighborhood's meeting, staff actively solicited and received input from several organizations, citizens and one State Representative.

Ms. Redinger advised that tonight's meeting is scheduled as a public hearing on the proposed 2012 Comprehensive Plan Update. She noted that the comment period for the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review closed on October 18<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Redinger reminded the Commission that their high-priority discussion topics included identifying the study area boundaries for light rail station area planning, setting the stage for different levels of mixed-use zoning, cleaning up the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning designations that have the same name, preparing for upcoming projects to add design and transition standards to commercial zones, and consolidating redundant categories. The Commission discussed the need for a specific Development Code amendment package to address housing issues. They also discussed "mandates" versus "incentives," the possibility of eco-districts, special study areas, potential acquisition of utilities, home-based businesses, clean green industries, and transfer of development rights. In addition, rather than being a subheading under the Land Use element, a separate Natural Environment Element was created.

Ms. Redinger explained that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update was subject to environmental review under SEPA, and the City prepared an environmental checklist that was submitted to regional and state entities for review. She briefly reviewed the criteria outlined in the Shoreline Municipal Code that must be met in order for the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update:

- *The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP), and the other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan or City policies.* Ms. Redinger said staff reviewed the plan for consistency with the GMA and the CPPs and for internal consistency with other plan elements and City policies. Staff believes the draft document meets this requirement.
- *The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a subarea plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan.* Ms. Redinger noted that several amendments are meant to rectify issues where certain regulations are problematic to administer. The document was also updated to be consistent with new standards and technology. Staff believes the update captures a snapshot of Shoreline in 2012 and is meant to guide according to the vision established by the community and the City Council. Changing circumstances and values that are reflected in the update include an evolution of the City from a suburban fringe to a more self-sustaining urban environment, with a desire for more local jobs, services and amenities; a multi-modal transportation system; and potential management of utilities. She observed that another example of evolving values is the inclusion of economic and social equity considerations in addition to the focus on environmental sustainability.
- *The amendment will benefit the community as a whole and will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety or general welfare.* Ms. Redinger advised that policies included in the draft document are intended to benefit the community and promote public health, safety and general welfare. Examples include Community Design Policies meant to direct development of design and transition standards, Natural Environment Policies meant to protect natural resources and

functions, Transportation Policies meant to promote walkability and connectivity, and Housing Policies meant to offer a variety of housing choices and levels of affordability appropriate for a diverse population.

Ms. Redinger explained that following the public hearing, if the Commission believes the criteria have been met, they may make a recommendation to the City Council, including any proposed changes. Staff would then present the draft to the City Council at each meeting in November, with the goal of adoption on December 10<sup>th</sup>.

### **Questions by the Commission**

None of the Commissioners had questions during this portion of the meeting.

### **Public Testimony**

**Robin McClelland, Shoreline**, commented that the plan is lovely, and the color is a great addition. The document is well written and the maps are great. However, she expressed concern that the first goal in the Land Use element is about the future of the City's light rail station areas. She also expressed concern that the first three goals in the Land Use element are statements of fact and do not provide guidance. She said she is an advocate of transit and serves on the North Corridor Growing Transit Community Task Force, and she keeps a transit diary of what it is like to get around the region on a bus. She suggested the Commission consider the following language to replace Land Use Goal LU I:

*“Support Shoreline’s diverse community of residential neighborhoods, including all housing choices and continue to expand opportunities in the town center and other commercial centers. Implement mobility strategies, including the development of vibrant mixed use communities surrounding light rail transit stations. Enhance quality of life features with connections to ample open space, vital parks and recreation facilities, schools and other amenities. Grow the overall economy and boost activity in neighborhood commercial districts. Balance current needs with anticipated future opportunities.”*

Ms. McClelland reminded the Commission that the Comprehensive Plan is a combination of what the City has been doing, what the City is doing now and what the City plans to do in the future. It is not intended to be just a long-range plan; it must also address what the City needs now.

**Hiller West** said he and his wife own a home in Shoreline, but their current address is in Astoria, Oregon. He noted that the draft Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designates the block encompassed by Northeast 175<sup>th</sup> Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast, 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast, and Northeast 180<sup>th</sup> Street as Mixed-Use 2 (MU2). According to the definition, this designation may provide for retail, office, and services uses and greater residential densities than are allowed in purely residential zones. It also promotes pedestrian connections, transit and amenities. The adjacent areas are also designated as MU2. He noted that the current Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designates most of this area as North City Business District with some high-density residential. Mr. West observed that this square block is a neighborhood in transition. As a homeowner and resident, he has seen several single-family homes demolished and replaced by medium and higher-density residential development. The west side of 12<sup>th</sup>

Avenue Northeast remains single-family but is affected by the higher levels of traffic and parking associated with the uses across the street.

Mr. West stated that protection of this neighborhood is important to prevent loss of residential stability, high turnover, and deterioration of quality of life and property values. He said that reduction of impacts to single-family neighborhoods through the adoption of design standards and other development criteria is proposed under the text changes to the Comprehensive Plan. These design measures should reduce out-of-scale building massing, focus permitted uses on those that are of a residential nature or very limited commercial uses not involving retail, limit driveways to reduce turning movement and traffic impacts on single-family neighborhoods and require sufficient on-site parking for higher-density uses. He expressed his belief that adequate parking does not have to be land consumptive; it can be provided at the ground level of multi-story buildings, such as was required at the existing apartments on the corner of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and Northeast 185<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that design measures such as these will go a long way towards insuring a successful transition between businesses and institutional uses along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and single-family residential neighborhoods west of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast.

**Kelly Rider, Policy Director for the Housing Development Consortium of King County (HDC).** thanked the Commission for their hard work on the proposed update to the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element; for the commitments they are making to encourage, assist and support the development of affordable housing across Shoreline; and for their recognition of the need for services to support people who are homeless. She reminded the Commission that the HDC is a non-profit membership organization that represents private businesses, non-profit organizations, and government agencies who are working to develop affordable housing in King County and who are dedicated to the vision that all people should have a safe, healthy and affordable home. Toward that end, the HDC is excited to recommend the Commission approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan, which they believe takes the City another step towards achieving this vision.

Ms. Rider recalled that last May she, along with Shoreline residents and representatives from other organizations, presented the following recommendations for the updated Comprehensive Plan Housing Element.

- They asked for an explicit commitment to implement Shoreline's Comprehensive Housing Strategy, which is accomplished through **Goal H VIII and Policies H5, H19, H15 and H13.**
- They discussed the need to help educate and engage the community to better understand and support affordable housing choices. The City commits to these activities in **Policy H16.**
- They urged the City to establish a policy to explore the use of property tax exemptions in order to incentivize the development of housing affordable to lower-income households. This commitment is made in **Policy H13.**
- They requested a policy to provide incentives that encourage the development of affordable housing near job centers, good schools and strong access to transit. They also asked the City review and expand existing incentives. The City has made this commitment through **Policies H7, H8, H11 and H17.**
- They told stories about the many homeless individuals that HDC's stakeholders have worked with in Shoreline. They urged the City to recognize the needs of homeless individuals and families like these in its housing inventory to demonstrate that the housing needs of homeless individuals are just

as important as the needs of other segments of Shoreline's population. The HDC is overwhelmed with the commitment the Commission has made to address the needs of this population; not only through the draft Comprehensive Plan, but in the discussions the Commission has had in the months since the first public hearing. This commitment and recognition is now seen throughout the Housing Element, particularly in **Policy H29** and in the last page of the Housing Element's Supporting Analysis. This makes it very clear to the public that homelessness does exist in North King County and in Shoreline.

Ms. Rider acknowledged that serving homeless families and individuals will require additional public funding. They know it will not be an easy accomplishment, but they look forward to working with the City on the funding policy commitments they have made in **Policies H9, H10, H16 and H32**. For these reasons, and many more, the HDC encourages the Commission to recommend the proposed Comprehensive Plan to the City Council for adoption. She said the HDC is excited to begin working with the City Council to gain their support of the policies, as well. She summarized that adoption of the Comprehensive Plan is not an end to the work of providing more affordable housing choices in Shoreline. However, it does signal a new direction for the City's housing strategy. The HDC welcomes the opportunity to work with the Commission in the coming months on specific, detailed proposals to implement the policies recommended in the plan. They look forward to continuing a strong partnership with the City of Shoreline.

**Tom Jamieson, Shoreline**, said he attended a Planning Commission dinner meeting on September 29, 2011. At that meeting, then Planning and Community Development Director, Joe Tovar, discussed the Commission's long-range plan for 2011 to 2013. He particularly indicated that it was necessary to complete the Comprehensive Plan Update in 2012 to respond while the vision is still fresh. At the same time, he indicated it was an ambitious endeavor that would involve an accelerated schedule that taxed the City's resources that were in the process of being cut as part of the 2012 budget. He recalled that Mr. Tovar cautioned about flow restrictors such as time, resource availability and other agenda items. Mr. Tovar was worried there may not be enough time for the public to engage. Mr. Jamieson said he has only been able to attend a few Commission meetings this year because other City activities have consumed his attention. He said he attended more than 40 City Council meetings over the last year. Although he has tried hard to participate, he does not believe he had ample opportunity to adequately address the Comprehensive Plan Update. He summarized that while the City has complied with the requirements of GMA and followed the schedule published for the update, public attendance at Commission meetings has been low. He suggested that the significant amount of time the Commission spent wordsmithing the proposed update made the meetings unattractive for the public to attend. Despite the Commission's intention, he expressed his belief that they have not had adequate involvement and engagement with the public. He asked that they extend the public hearing to get additional input.

### **Final Questions and Deliberations**

**COMMISSIONER WAGNER MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE AS DRAFTED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. COMMISSIONER MONTERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Moss suggested that the word “element” should replace the word “section” in headings for each of the elements. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Wagner thanked staff for their excellent presentation, which clearly outlined how the proposed Comprehensive Plan Update is consistent with the criteria outlined in the Shoreline Municipal Code for Comprehensive Plan amendments: it is consistent with the GMA, it encompasses changing circumstances, and it is not adverse to the public’s health, safety and welfare.

Commissioner Wagner said she believes the public process for the Comprehensive Plan Update has been very thorough and numerous meetings have been held. She specifically referred to the Staff Report, which outlines the lengthy public process that has occurred. She is proud of the process, the work the Commission has done, and the discussions they have had. She explained that a significant amount of work took place before the Comprehensive Plan Update, and many of the policies were lifted from other adopted plans and strategies, such as the Economic Development Plan, Sustainability Strategy, Housing Strategy, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. The Commission was very sensitive and respectful of the work that went into these adopted documents, which all went through their own public processes.

Commissioner Scully noted that the Commission previously received one written comment, which Director Markle responded to; and they received another written comment just prior to the meeting. He acknowledged the Commission should always evaluate how they can do a better job of reaching out to the community and making it easier for citizens to comment. However, the City has more than met the requirements of GMA, and he sees no reason to hold up adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Chair Moss pointed out that all Commission meetings are recorded. Citizens who cannot attend meetings in person can listen to the audio via the City’s website. The Commission’s minutes and applicable documents are also available on the City’s website. She agreed that the Commission does get into a lot of detail during their study sessions, but this is necessary to prepare documents for public hearings. She also agreed that the Commission can always do more in the realm of public participation.

Chair Moss referred to a public comment that the Comprehensive Plan’s focus is no longer on the environment. She clarified that rather than abandoning the environment, they have created a new element (Natural Environment) that is devoted just to the environment.

Commissioner Wagner asked staff to respond to the recent letters from the Ronald Wastewater District and the Shoreline Water District suggesting that certain SEPA checklist criteria have not been adequately addressed. Director Markle responded that the points made in the two letters are very similar. She reviewed the comments as follows:

- *The checklist fails to mention the possibility of the City’s assumption of sewer and water utilities or the purchase of Seattle Public Utilities system.* Ms. Markle explained that the checklist is a general overview of what is contained in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan addresses the assumption and background. Should the vote be affirmative for the City to assume the Seattle Public Utilities system, the Comprehensive Plan would be updated in the future to account for the acquisition. However, she is not certain what environmental impact would result from changing ownership of the facility.

- *The checklist does not address how the City plans to address intense growth along the Aurora Corridor and other mixed-use development regarding levels of service from utilities, including water.* Ms. Markle explained that the City has a mandate from the state and the region to account for and plan for growth targets. The goals, policies and map in the proposed Land Use Element and the rest of the Comprehensive Plan account for this requirement. Historically, the water districts and sewer district update their plans according to the City's land use map. The water and sewer district plans are consistent with the current land use map, and they will have to catch up after the Comprehensive Plan Update is adopted. If the water or sewer district does not have the funding to fully accommodate where the City shows growth, SEPA and additional regulations would require a certificate of sewer and water availability to ensure that level of service can be met. If it is determined that level of service cannot be met, the proposed development would be denied unless the developer agrees extend the utility.
- *The City identifies future studies of light rail corridor, but the checklist does not identify any studies relating to water service along dense growth pockets identified.* Ms. Markle said the Comprehensive Plan identifies study areas, and the intent is to work with utility providers to talk about what happens in these areas. There have been no changes in zoning in regards to the study areas. The City hopes the utilities will be fully engaged with the City as it plans for these areas.
- *The checklist fails to analyze or plan for mitigation of impacts to utility services provided by special purpose districts.* Ms. Markle reiterated that the City plans for where the growth goes, and the utility providers update their plans accordingly. They also have the failsafe that any development must meet the required level of service for the Department of Health and for the provision of the International Fire Code.

Chair Moss invited the Commissioners to comment on the suggested language provided by Robin McClelland to replace **Goal LU I** (Page 20) in the Land Use Element. Commissioner Scully agreed that the proposed language is well written and provides an excellent summary. However, some of the points made in the suggested language are addressed in other policies and goals in the Land Use Element and replacing **Goal LU I** may result in conflicting language. Commissioner Maul agreed that all the sentiments contained in the proposed new language are covered in the existing language. However, he suggested that **Goals LU IV and LU V** (Page 21) could be placed before **Goal LU I** so the broader picture items in the Land Use Element are portrayed first. Vice Chair Esselman agreed that the order of the goals should be changed as proposed by Commissioner Maul.

**COMMISSIONER WAGNER MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE THE ORDER OF THE GOALS IN THE LAND USE ELEMENT (Pages 20 and 21) TO PLACE GOAL LU V FIRST FOLLOWED BY GOAL LU IV AND GOAL LU I. VICE CHAIR ESSELMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Ms. Redinger recommended that Ms. McClelland's suggested language could be placed in the sidebar. This would allow them to capture the text without changing the goals or becoming redundant.



**COMMISSIONER SCULLY MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE IN THE SIDEBAR OF THE LAND USE ELEMENT (PAGE 21):**

*“The intent is to support Shoreline’s diverse community of residential neighborhoods, including all housing choices and continue to expand opportunities in the town center and other commercial centers. Implement mobility strategies, including the development of vibrant mixed use communities surrounding light rail transit stations. Enhance quality of life features with connections to ample open space, vital parks and recreation facilities, schools and other amenities. Grow the overall economy and boost activity in neighborhood commercial districts. Balance current needs with anticipated future opportunities.”*

**COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Wagner pointed out that some of the protections suggested by Mr. West for single-family residential neighborhoods are addressed in the Land Use Element. She reminded the Commission that the intent is to incorporate the zoning regulations that were implemented in the Town Center Subarea Plan to encourage greater protection for single-family homes. While this may not be apparent on the Land Use Map, it is covered in the text of the Land Use Element.

Chair Moss referred to Ms. McClelland’s comments about **Policies LU1, LU2 and LU3** (Page 21) and recalled that the Commission has had lengthy discussions about this issue. Her understanding is that the Comprehensive Plan must provide a description of the low-density, medium-density and high-density residential designations. Ms. Redinger recalled that the three policies originally included a statement that identified appropriate zoning for each of the designations. The current language was recommended by the Planning Director and Planning Manager after carefully reviewing the requirements of the GMA. While the language was pared down to be less specific, staff believes it is necessary when making future zoning decisions.

Chair Moss recalled that Ms. McClelland commented that the three policies (**LU1, LU2, and LU3**) on Page 21 are statements of fact rather than policies. She suggested that this concern could be addressed by adding “ensure” at the beginning of each policy to identify a specific action the City should take. Vice Chair Esselman said she supports the language as currently written. While the policies do not start with action verbs, they do identify a certain action. If they start rearranging the language, they could lose some of the clarity. The majority of the Commission concurred.

Chair Moss suggested that **Policy LU12** (Page 22) may be redundant because the City has already adopted the Town Center designation. Commissioner Scully pointed out that **Policy LU12** is intended to provide a description of the Town Center designation and is similar to **Policies LU1, LU2, LU3, LU10 and LU11**. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Mr. Szafran pointed out an unintentional mistake on the coloring of one of the parcels on the Land Use Map (Page 31). The Aldercrest Subarea Plan contains a set of goals, policies and specific development regulations. On the map it is shown as Mixed Use 2, but it should be identified as a planned area. Chair Moss asked if it is the City’s intent to designate the North City Business District as Mixed-Use 2 on the proposed land use map. Mr. Szafran answered affirmatively. Ms. Redinger recalled the Commission’s

previous discussion about paring down the designations because many were redundant. To set the stage for the upcoming zoning consolidation, design standards, and transition work, staff wanted to remove the planned area designations except where there is a specific set of design standards based on a community process.

**COMMISSIONER WAGNER MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED TO ALTER THE LAND USE MAP (Page 31) BY CHANGING THE DESIGNATION FOR THE ALDERCREST ANNEX BACK TO THE PREVIOUS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE MAP DESIGNATION OF PLANNED AREA 3. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Vice Chair Esselman said it seemed odd that policies in the Community Design Element move from site and building design directly to signage. Mr. Szafran said the order was not intentional and could be changed. Commissioner Montero suggested the current order is appropriate since the first two sections deal with commercial sites and the remaining sections deal with public and residential sites. The Commission agreed not to change the order of the policies in the Community Design Element.

Vice Chair Esselman referred to **Policy H7** in the Housing Element (Page 41) and questioned whether the Comprehensive Plan should get into details about allowing an increase in the permitted density. She noted that there are other elements that say the same thing, but use broader language. For example, **Policies H8 and H11** speak to this same issue in a more general way.

**VICE CHAIR ESSELMAN MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED TO DELETE POLICY H7 (Page 41). COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vice Chair Esselman commented that there are numerous policies in the proposed document to support affordable housing in a more holistic way. Issues such as increased zoning can be addressed as a Development Code amendment. Commissioner Craft concurred.

Commissioner Wagner said she would oppose the motion because density has been such a contentious issue in the community. Unless the Comprehensive Plan specifically states increased density as a City policy, the concept may be stymied down the road. If the Commission wants additional density to be one option in the City's tool kit, it should be specifically stated as a policy in the Housing Element.

Ms. Redinger recalled that one of the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan policies is to provide justification for future Development Code amendments, and the affordable housing density bonus concept has been on the books for a long time. However, the first time staff tried to apply it, they discovered it does not function as written and does not provide the incentive for which it was intended. She emphasized that the policy would do nothing to change allowable development and the affordable housing density bonus or provide any exemptions in the development standards for lot coverage, etc. However, it would provide justification for a future development code amendment package specific to housing that would include a number of things.

Commissioner Scully agreed with Commissioner Wagner that the Comprehensive Plan should provide a policy for this specific tool for increasing affordable housing. Commissioners Maul and Montero concurred.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION FAILED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

The Commission did not discuss or propose changes to the Transportation, Economic Development, and Natural Environment Elements.

Chair Moss pointed out that the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element is the only element that includes a vision (Page 67). Ms. Redinger agreed and explained that is because they incorporated text directly from the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. She suggested that the vision could be moved to the sidebar to make this element consistent with remaining elements.

**COMMISSIONER CRAFT MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO MOVE THE LANGUAGE FOUND IN THE “VISION” SECTION IN THE PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT (Page 67) TO A SIDEBAR FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE OTHER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS. COMMISSIONER WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Montero pointed out that the Capital Facilities Element addresses most of the concerns raised by Mr. Jamison, particularly the coordination and public involvement component. He said he believes there was sufficient public involvement in the Comprehensive Plan Update process, and the proposed language provides the ability for both non-city and service providers to address deficiencies in the system and recommend further improvements.

Chair Moss reviewed that the Commission has had significant discussion about **Goal CF I** (Page 72). Staff has acknowledged that this goal is regarding acquisition of the Seattle Public Utility facility located in Shoreline, which will be the subject of a vote. Because the Commission does not yet know the outcome of the public vote, it would be up to the City Council to adjust the language accordingly.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED TO CHANGE THE SECOND BULLET POINT IN GOAL CF I (PAGE 72) TO READ, “. . . BY EVALUATING THE POSSIBILITY OF ASSUMPTION AND CONSOLIDATION WITH THE CITY’S WATER SYSTEM ACQUIRED FROM THE CITY OF SEATTLE (SPU), AMONG OTHER OPTIONS.” COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Scully pointed out that the franchise does not expire until 2027, which is a long time away. Some of the language in this sentence and other places seems to suggest that the City should assume and consolidate, but he does not believe there is sufficient analysis or information to even hint that this would be an appropriate course of action yet. The Comprehensive Plan language should remain neutral on whether the franchise should be extended, assumed, etc. Commissioner Craft concurred.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Moss pointed out that Page 165 of the Supporting Analysis for the Capital Facilities Element addresses a City of Shoreline Emergency Operations Center, but it is not identified in any of the policies in the Capital Facilities Element. Ms. Redinger said the center is currently housed at the fire station.

Ms. Redinger referred to the charts in **Policies CF31 and CF32** (Pages 76 and 77), which list the city and non-city managed facilities and services. She explained that the Emergency Operations Center was not included in either of the charts because it does not have a specific level of service. Chair Moss agreed that the center should not be included in **Policies CF 31 or CF32**, but she questioned if another policy should be added to address the issue. Ms. Redinger noted that the policy would be superseded by a state mandate that the City have an Emergency Operations Center. Chair Moss suggested staff consider whether this issue should be brought to the City Council's attention in the Commission's transmittal letter.

Commissioner Scully pointed out that the label on the lower picture in the sidebar (Aurora Pedestrian Bridge) on Page 77 is misspelled. Chair Moss reminded the Commission that typographical errors that do not change the content or intent of the language can be forwarded to staff by individual Commissioners.

Again, Chair Moss pointed out that **Utilities Goal U III** (Page 80) will be dependent on voter approval. She expressed concern that **Goal U III** is located on a different page than the remaining goals in the Utilities Element, which may be perceived as an attempt to hide the goal. She suggested that perhaps **Goal U II** could be moved to Page 80, too.

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding the Land Use Element Supporting Analysis.

Ms. Redinger pointed out the interesting walkability map (**Figure CDA-1**) located on Page 93 of the Community Design Element Supporting Analysis, which was designed by the City's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Specialist using Walk Square methodology.

Chair Moss noted that the names on the maps did not always match with the names provided in the list of maps in the Table of Contents.

Chair Moss asked why "vacancy" (Pages 104 and 105) was included in the same section as "housing tenure". While the language talks briefly about vacant units, it states that further information can be found on **Table HA-16**, which is pages away. She asked if the language would include links to the various tables. Ms. Redinger answered that staff is not planning to imbed hyperlinks for tables within the document at this time. However, they are looking at ways to break up the Comprehensive Plan so people can either view the entire plan or view the elements separately. Chair Moss suggested that the location of **Table HA-16** should be specifically identified on Page 105.

Chair Moss referred to **Figure HA-17** (Page 113) in the Housing Element Supporting Analysis, which identifies affordable housing units by income groups. She suggested it would be helpful to provide an annotation to explain how and why the areas were grouped. Ms. Redinger said the areas were divided based on the census tracts. She agreed this is a difficult map to decipher because it contains a lot of information. She noted that changes were made to the language in the legend to clarify that the data identifies the number of homes that are appraised at a certain value, which makes them affordable at a particular income level. The legend also clarifies that this is based on the appraised value and not necessarily how many homes are available in the area. She said that, if directed by the Commission, additional explanation could be provided by staff. The Commission agreed that would be appropriate.

Chair Moss noted that **Figure TA-2** (Page 121) identifies a portion of Linden Avenue near the Interurban Trail as a signed bicycle route. She clarified that this street is actually located in the City of Seattle, and they are making improvements at this time. Commissioner Montero added that the Interurban Trail is being extended to the Seattle side. Chair Moss asked staff to verify whether **Figure TA-1** is consistent with the City of Seattle's plans for this street.

Chair Moss said that **Figure EDA-5** (Page 128) identifies employment by sector from 1995 to 2010. **Figure EDA-6** (Page 129) identifies the change in employment by sector, but it does not include 2010 data. Commissioner Wagner recalled the Commission previously discussed this issue and learned that the figures were put together using two different sources of data. Ms. Redinger said she is not sure that 2010 data was available when **Figure EDA-6** was put together.

Commissioner Wagner referred to **Figure EDA-16** (Page 137) and noted that it does not accurately identify the Point Wells Potential Annexation Area as it is shown in the adopted Point Wells Subarea Plan. The Point Wells Subarea Plan does not include the upland area. Ms. Redinger agreed to check this issue and update not only **Figure EDA-16**, but other City maps, as well. Chair Moss suggested that another color should be used to identify the Point Wells Potential Annexation Area.

Chair Moss recalled that she previously recommended that the last sentence in the second paragraph under "Climate Change" (Page 142) should be deleted. She questioned the value of providing a potential scenario. Ms. Redinger said this section was changed to reflect the Commission's previous discussion. She said the scenario represents a common set of predictions, and she can see value in providing specifics about a potential scenario that could play out. The more they talk about climate change and what the City can do to mitigate and adapt, the better.

Chair Moss referred to **Figure PA-1** (Page 159) and questioned if the Aldercrest Annex should be shown on the map as a school. Mr. Szafran answered that the property is still owned by the Shoreline School District. Chair Moss noted that the map indicates that the North City Elementary School is closed. Mr. Szafran confirmed that is correct. Chair Moss advised that **Figure CFA-1** (Page 166) in the Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis identifies North City Elementary as an open school. Vice Chair Esselman pointed out that the North City Elementary facility is currently being used by the school district, but not as a school. Commissioner Wagner noted that **Figure CFA-2** (Page 177) may also need to be updated accordingly. Ms. Redinger agreed to check this issue and make the appropriate adjustments so that **Figures PA-1, CFA-1, and CFA-2** are consistent.

Commissioner Montero referenced **Figure CFA-3** (Page 179) and recalled that the police storefronts are being closed. Ms. Redinger said no decisions have been made yet, but the language contained in the Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis reflects a potential change.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED TO DELETE THE LAST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 168 AND THE FIRST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 169 AND REPLACE THEM WITH A SINGLE SENTENCE ADDED AT THE END OF THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPH TO READ, "THE CITY SHOULD STUDY AND SOLICIT INPUT REGARDING THE BEST COURSE OF ACTION AS THE SHORELINE WATER DISTRICT'S FRANCHISE NEARS EXPIRATION IN 2027." COMMISSIONER CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Scully explained that the purpose of the motion is to address the concerns he expressed earlier relating to the Shoreline Water District.

Commissioner Wagner expressed concern that the word “should” sounds more like a goal or policy rather than background information. While she does not disagree with the sentiment, perhaps it would be better to simply state that studying the best course of action as the Shoreline Water District’s franchise nears expiration in 2027 will be a priority. This would make it more factual and less directive.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY AMENDED HIS MOTION TO DELETE THE LAST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 168 AND THE FIRST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 169 AND REPLACE IT WITH A SINGLE SENTENCE ADDED AT THE END OF THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPH TO READ, “IT WILL BE IMPORTANT FOR THE CITY TO STUDY AND SOLICIT INPUT REGARDING THE BEST COURSE OF ACTION AS THE SHORELINE WATER DISTRICT’S FRANCHISE NEARS EXPIRATION IN 2027.”**

Commissioner Montero said he supports the language as presented in the current draft and would not support the motion to amend.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED 5-1-0, WITH COMMISSIONER MONTERO VOTING IN OPPOSITION AND COMMISSIONER MAUL ABSTAINING.**

Chair Moss referenced **Figure CFA-2** (Page 177) and suggested that different colors should be used to distinguish between public and private schools. She also suggested that Shoreline Community College could be a different color to identify it as an institution of higher learning. The Commission recommended not changing the colors on Figure CFA-2. In addition, the remainder of the Commission concurred that the colors could be changed in **Figure CFA-4** so they stand out better.

Chair Moss referred to **Figure UA-2** (Page 191) and said it appears that a small segment of the Lake Forest Park Wastewater District extends into the City near Northeast 195<sup>th</sup> Street on Ballinger Way. If so, she suggested that the Lake Forest Park Wastewater District should be included on the list of non-city managed facilities and utilities in the chart on Page 187. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this issue and make the appropriate adjustment. Chair Moss also questioned why the parks are all outlined in green on **Figure UA-2** (Page 191).

The Commissioners did not provide any comments related to the Shoreline Master Program (Appendix A).

Chair Moss pointed out that the Aldercrest Subarea should be listed in the Subarea Plan section (Appendix B) on Page 197. Mr. Szafran agreed that it should be added because it is an adopted subarea plan. Ms. Redinger noted that if the Aldercrest Subarea is added back into Appendix B as a subarea plan, then it must be put back into other elements of the Comprehensive Plan where it was previously deleted.

**COMMISSIONER SCULLY MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO ADD THE ALDERCREST SUBAREA TO APPENDIX B (SUBAREA PLAN SECTION) AND ALL OTHER**

**DISCUSSIONS AND MAPS ABOUT SUBAREAS THROUGHOUT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCUMENT. VICE CHAIR ESSELMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Commissioners did not comment regarding the glossary.

Chair Moss noted that, at the Commission's request, an acronyms section was added to the Comprehensive Plan (Page 212). Ms. Redinger explained that the list includes all of the acronyms contained in the draft language.

**Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification**

**THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE AS DRAFTED WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED.**

**Closure of Public Hearing**

The public hearing was closed.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Markle thanked the Commission for their hard work on the Comprehensive Plan and their recommendation to the City Council. The project is very important for the City, and one of the most important projects for the Planning and Community Development Department this year.

Director Markle reported that the North City, Meridian Park and Echo Lake Neighborhoods have recently formed a 185<sup>th</sup> Station Subcommittee. They are interested in coordinating their efforts with the Planning Commission's Light Rail Station Area Planning Subcommittee whenever possible. Because members of the 185<sup>th</sup> Station Subcommittee would like to attend Planning Commission meetings to hear updates from the Planning Commission's subcommittee, it would be helpful for the Commission to schedule their updates in advance.

Director Markle reported that on October 16<sup>th</sup> the Snohomish County Council voted on amendments to their Urban Village comprehensive plan designation and development regulations. She explained that Urban Village will be the new designation under the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and code for Point Wells should the application no longer be vested at the end of the Save Richmond Beach lawsuit or if the developer chooses to reapply. The City, Save Richmond Beach, and the Town of Woodway put forth joint amendments. Two amendments were approved by the Snohomish County Council having to do with local control over impacts to the City's infrastructure, specifically transportation, utilities and service. The amendments require the developer to have a binding agreement with the City and service providers to provide the infrastructure necessary to support the development prior to Snohomish County being able to issue a development permit at Point Wells. This amendment allows the City more local control should the developer reapply under the Urban Village designation.

Director Markle announced that the Town Center Subarea Plan received an award at the Washington American Planning Association Conference last week. She thanked the Commission and congratulated

them on their effort. Chair Moss advised that she attended the October 8<sup>th</sup> City Council Meeting to accept the Proclamation for Community Planning Month on behalf of the Planning Commission. She thanked the Commissioners for their dedication and service.

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

As recommended by staff, Chair Moss encouraged the Light Rail Station Area Planning Subcommittee to notify staff of when they would like to schedule their updates on the Commission's agenda. This would allow the City to notify not only the 185<sup>th</sup> Station Subcommittee, but the community, as well.

Chair Moss announced that on October 30<sup>th</sup>, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) will be conducting a session related to light rail. She agreed to forward information to the subcommittee members.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Economic Development Director is scheduled to speak to the Commission about the Community Renewal Area on November 1<sup>st</sup>. Future agendas in November and December would be scheduled as study sessions on the commercial design standards and the zoning consolidation project. Chair Moss said she requested that staff provide the Commissioners with a copy of the current zoning map.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

---

Donna Moss  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith  
Clerk, Planning Commission