

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING**

Monday, February 9, 2015  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue North

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

ABSENT: None

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Mayor Winstead, who presided.

2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL

Mayor Winstead led the flag salute. Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, provided reports and updates on various City meetings, projects and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Deputy Mayor Eggen stated he attended the SeaShore Transportation Forum Meeting. He shared that Kirk McKinley, Shoreline Transportation Manager, gave a 145<sup>th</sup> Traffic Analysis presentation, and stated that SeaShore members are proposing a larger scale review for east to west transportation options on the corridor. He reported attending a King County Youth Action Plan Meeting and discussing a levy proposal to help raise money for troubled youth.

Councilmember McConnell said she attended an event sponsored by the Shoreline Police Department supporting the implementation of the New Gun Confiscation Strategy in Washington (House Bill 1840), followed by the King County Domestic Violence Initiative Quarterly Meeting. She shared the Committee was pleased that the Shoreline Police Department volunteered to implement HB 1840.

Mayor Winstead reported on meeting with the Federal Legislative Delegation in Washington, D.C. regarding the need to renovate the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor in preparation for the Light Rail Station.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Councilmember McGlashan moved to extend public comment for one hour, followed by the staff presentation, Council deliberations, and then continuation of public comment. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hall, and passed 6-1, with Deputy Mayor Eggen voting no.**

Brian Derdowski, Sensible Growth Alliance Public Interest Associates, expressed concern about the planned action rezone and recommended that Council adopt potential zoning so it allows existing zoning to remain in place, and combine the 185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Environment Impact Statements (EIS). He suggested adopting Sound Transit's EIS as a reference document, defining Phase 1 as the area in the immediate vicinity of the station, and reducing form based zoning to the immediate area around the Stations. He commented on public opposition, potential political impacts, and asked Council to work with the community.

Peter Watter, Shoreline resident, commented on the rezone change from the perspective of an older population and the millennial population, and talked about families fitting in the new rezone.

Dan Jacoby, Shoreline resident, requested Council to slow down the rezoning process, rezone a smaller area next to station, and then step back to see what happens. He advocates for not making Shoreline North Seattle, and offered his support for Councilmember Roberts' Option One recommendation.

Karen Easterly Behrens, Shoreline resident, read a quote from Mayor Winstead, and then commented on selling, financing and buying a single family home in the Station Subarea.

John Kropf, Shoreline resident, submitted maps to resolve transportation problems in Shoreline.

Paul Goracke, Shoreline resident, commented on his preference of raising a family in the area in detached buildings, and not wanting to live in a high density area. He asked why there is a rush to start Phase 1, and that Council consider the people that could be displaced.

Rosalyn Lehner, Shoreline resident, commented on buying a house five years ago and selecting Shoreline as a good place to raise her children. She asked Council to reconsider rezoning.

Angela Henry, Shoreline resident, commented on buying a house a year and a half ago, and stated she is not sure how she would get a new home or a new loan with the proposed rezone. She asked Council to vote no.

Janet Way, Shoreline Preservation Society, asked Council to slow down the process due to numerous problems with the project. She referenced a map and shared that Sound Transit recommended building 700 units of housing around the Station within the first 20 years. She asked Council to wait for the FEIS from Sound Transit before making a decision. She then commented on having a legal memo from Dennis D. Reynolds Law Office, and read information from the document regarding SEPA and Planned Action Ordinances.

Elaine Phelps, Shoreline resident, expressed concern that the appropriate processes have not been followed to inform the entire community of the rezone changes, commented that neighbors are scared and upset, and gave her perception of how the process looks to her.

Ted Hikel, Lynnwood resident, commented on his awareness of rezones and their effects. He asked who will pay for the costs of additional city services and required open space, and asked Council to do a full cost benefit analysis.

Ruth Williams, Thornton Creek Alliance, spoke on how Thornton Creek has been harmed from commercial development and freeways. She read an excerpt from the Vision Statement in Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan, talked about the new Station changing the area, and commented on the need to keep and protect open spaces.

Meghan Peterka, Shoreline resident, commented on purchasing their home in a community, and not as a land investment. She commented on displacing people in adult family homes and expressed that she wants her community to be welcoming.

Tom Jamieson, Shoreline resident, commented he is happy to see so many people in the Chamber as a result of a rallying community, and asked Council to allow all the people to be heard.

David Higgins, Shoreline resident, requested that the urban density Council promised to Sound Transit happen at a slower rate. He expressed support for adoption of the zoning alternative recommended by the Planning Commission, retention of nonconforming use in MUR-35 and MUR-45 zones, and mitigation for those being asked to leave Shoreline. He discourages minimum density requirements.

Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline resident, asked how a decision can be made on the rezoning for the 185<sup>th</sup> Subarea Station before reviewing the FEIS from Sound Transit, and asked Council to consider Alternative I in the packet. She commented that too many residents still do not know what is going on.

Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline resident, asked that the rezones for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street and 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subareas be limited to properties immediately adjacent to the Station, to vet Councilmember Roberts' proposal with the community, and that no more rezoning take place until after Phase 1 is completely built out. She supports the Subarea Plan guiding development in the area and not a Planned Action, and waiting for Sound Transit's FEIS to be released so the public has an opportunity to review and comment on it.

Carol Ingraham, Shoreline resident, commented on the excellent schools in Shoreline. She is noticing high density proposals but not seeing information on how schools will accommodate the increased density. She asked Council to slowly phase in the Plan.

Jan Helde, Shoreline resident, commented that the rezone does not benefit homeowners and expressed concern about paying property tax for land without a lot of value. She asked if the Plan

could start with shorter buildings and a smaller footprint to see if the area can handle the added traffic.

Robin Lombard, Shoreline resident, asked Council to consider postponing rezone decisions until Sound Transit's FEIS is released.

Kathy Vaughn, Lynnwood resident, representing her mother-in-law who lives in the area, commented that they were unaware of the Station Subarea Planning until they received the Grizzly flyer. She shared that they and their neighbor have not received any mail from the City. She asked Council to make sure the community knows what is going on.

Jan Stewart, Shoreline resident, asked Council to slow down the process since people are just realizing the magnitude of the proposals. She commented that informational announcements focused on light rail and not the rezone, and that phased zoning has not been adequately studied or discussed in public meetings. She commented that the large scale rezones are not required by Sound Transit or the Growth Management Act, and asked Council to slow down and wait for Sound Transit's FEIS.

Julie Houff, Shoreline/Lake Forest Park resident, commented on recently becoming aware of the project and not seeing details on the maps. She perceives the process as a work in progress, and commented on Sound Transit's 700 unit recommendation for the area.

Christine Goetz, Shoreline resident, read a statement regarding data collected in her community regarding public awareness of the Light Rail Station Subarea Planning process, and asked if the planning supports Vision 2029.

Timothy Humphries, Shoreline resident, asked Council to wait to receive Sound Transit's FEIS before making a decision.

Dan Dale, Shoreline resident, asked Council to wait for Sound Transit's FEIS so that better decisions can be made. He commented on the Shoreline Stations being a neighborhood station to the Lynnwood Link Extension that would evolve over time. He expressed support for concentrated development closest to the stations.

## 6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**Councilmember Hall moved to amend the agenda to allow for additional Public Comment after item 8a. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan.**

**Councilmember Hall withdrew his motion.**

**Deputy Mayor Eggen moved to allow the seven remaining speakers signed up for Public Comment to address Council prior to Council deliberation of item 8a. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Salomon, and passed unanimously.**

**The agenda was approved by unanimous consent as amended.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT – CONTINUED**

Merissa Reed, Shoreline resident, asked Council to slow down the process until Sound Transit's FEIS is released. She asked if there can be strictly commercial zoning on a connector corridor on 180<sup>th</sup> Street between North City and the Subarea, and if MUR-65 can be including in the 185<sup>th</sup> rezone. She expressed support for the setback approach on taller buildings and requested more parking.

Boni Biery, Shoreline resident, commented on an increase in water on property, taxpayer funding for a new infrastructure to address flooding while developers are exempt from paying property taxes. She referred Council to Agenda Item 7c.

Will Sigman, Shoreline resident, commented on phased zoning, traffic, parking issues, and said he is not entirely sure what the plan is now since there have been so many changes.

Les Nelson, Shoreline resident, shared that he is an expert on RCW 36.80 and fighting development next to single-family residential neighborhoods. He commented that the City's original EIS states that Shoreline was incorporated to be a bedroom community with views and trees, and that we are losing the goal of the original EIS.

Jeff Eisenbrey, Shoreline resident, commented that Council needs to wait for the FEIS or the City might close off opportunity to make legitimate challenges provided by SEPA. He read excerpts from 2009 Rutgers Law Record regarding limiting eminent domain, notification of neighbors, and relocation assistance. He commented that the process is going too fast and urged Council to slow down.

Cathy Kennedy, Shoreline resident, urged Council to slow down, and commented that her neighborhood is a nice place where neighbors gather together, and fears this Plan will adversely impact the neighborhood.

Cheryl Anderson, Shoreline resident, provided background on volunteering in the community, and shared that she recently found out about the proposed rezone through the Grizzly Flyer. She expressed concern about traffic and school impacts, and referenced the Ballinger Commons project and stated that they did not consider impacts. She asked the Council to slow down the process.

**7. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Upon motion by Councilmember Hall, seconded by Councilmember McConnell and unanimously carried, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

- (a) Minutes of Workshop Dinner Meeting of January 12, 2015 and Minutes of Business Meeting of January 12, 2015**

**(b) Approval of expenses and payroll as of January 23, 2015 in the amount of \$2,122,556.48**

**\*Payroll and Benefits:**

<b>Payroll Period</b>	<b>Payment Date</b>	<b>EFT Numbers (EF)</b>	<b>Payroll Checks (PR)</b>	<b>Benefit Checks (AP)</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
12/21/14-1/3/15	1/9/2015	59151-59330	13629-13647	58987-58992	\$431,321.28
					<u>\$431,321.28</u>

**\*Accounts Payable Claims:**

<b>Expense Register Dated</b>	<b>Check Number (Begin)</b>	<b>Check Number (End)</b>	<b>Amount Paid</b>
1/13/2015	58918	58918	\$45,000.00
1/13/2015	58918	58918	(\$45,000.00)
1/13/2015	58919	58919	\$45,000.00
1/13/2015	58920	*	
1/15/2015	58921	58928	\$376,852.97
1/15/2015	58929	58945	\$96,935.89
1/15/2015	58946	58970	\$20,080.86
1/15/2015	58971	58986	\$4,711.08
1/20/2015	58993	58994	\$59,345.47
1/23/2015	58995	59011	\$924,517.80
1/23/2015	59012	59031	\$50,053.83
1/23/2015	59032	59035	\$6,397.53
1/23/2015	59036	59068	\$107,339.77
			<u>\$1,691,235.20</u>

\*Check #58920 will be submitted for approval by the Transportation Benefit District Board

**(c) Adoption of Ord. No. 694 - Amendments to the Shoreline Municipal Code for Property Tax Exemptions**

**(d) Adoption of Ord. No. 703 - Technical Corrections to the Shoreline Municipal Code Table 3.01 for the 2015 Budget**

**8. STUDY ITEMS**

**(a) Discussion of the 185th Station Subarea Plan and Planned Action Ordinance**

Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, provided history, background, and reviewed the 185<sup>th</sup> Station Subarea Plan Schedule and detailed the process. She explained Ordinance 702 Subarea Plan, 706 Development Regulations and Zoning Maps, and 707 Planned Action. She then outlined the big picture questions that Staff is seeking Council direction on.

Councilmembers asked what the benefits to waiting for the Sound Transit FEIS are, and if all the concerns brought forward by Council and the community have been addressed. Ms. Redinger responded that waiting for Sound Transit's FEIS does not change the impacts and what would need to be mitigated, but changes who pays for the mitigations. She explained if the City does not take on the mitigations as capital projects, then the cost would pass to the developers. She shared that the City has other negotiating powers outside of the FEIS, and noted there are other opportunities to work with Sound Transit exclusive of the FEIS. Ms. Markle added that Sound Transit and Shoreline have worked together on the environmental statements, and shared that all impacts and mitigations have been identified. Ms. Redinger pointed out that there are a number of implementation strategies that need to be worked on in the future which have been identified in the staff report.

Councilmembers discussed the Fee in Lieu Program proposal and agreed to have this discussion during Development Code Amendments discussion.

Councilmembers addressed the following Amendments to Proposed Ordinance No. 702 identified on the Station Area Planning Council Amendment Tracking Matrix:

- Amendment 4 – Councilmembers Roberts, Hall, and Deputy Mayor Eggen expressed support for completing the street grids within the City to support multi-modal transportation and access for all users, and asked about appropriate language. Councilmember McConnell asked about the cost to repurpose existing streets, and stated her funding priority preference is for 185<sup>th</sup> Street. Councilmember Salomon commented that it is not a priority. Ms. Markle shared that Transportation Staff is working on new language, and Ms. Redinger added in some cases the developer can create inter-block paths or they can be supported in capital projects.
- Amendment 5 – Councilmembers expressed support for the Planning Commission's recommendation of the installation of photovoltaic systems in all new government facilities, asked if it would apply to all government facilities, including schools, and if it should be included in the Climate Action Plan.
- Amendment 6 and 7 - Councilmembers commented on calling out history in the document that may lead to confusion, and stated they would like to strike the reference to R-48 and R-18 so a reference is not made to a document that no longer exist.

Ms. Redinger presented the zoning maps.

Councilmember Roberts spoke to his proposed maps and wanting to ensure that development is concentrated within a quarter mile or half mile radius of the station. He provided an example of Sacramento's Light Rail zoning overlay, and stated no development immediately adjacent to the station has happened in 20 years. He shared that the City of Portland had to scale back their rezone at their two stations on Interstate 84 due to lack of development. He recommended development in three phases which includes cleanup of North City, transition zoning on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a MUR-35 Corridor on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and transition zoning on 185<sup>th</sup> around the Shoreline Center. He asked Council to support his Option I recommendation.

Ms. Markle reviewed Councilmember Roberts' Option II proposal which connects Town Center and North City to the Station on 185<sup>th</sup> with MUR-45 zoning to support Transit Oriented Development and the creation of place.

Councilmember McGlashan pointed out that a huge area across from the station, from 180<sup>th</sup> to 185<sup>th</sup>, has been excluded from the Plan, and expressed concern with having an area within a quarter mile of the station not be included in Phase I of the rezone. Councilmember Hall agreed with Councilmember McGlashan and discussed it being contrary to adopted policy. He noted the absence of a corridor that links to Town Center, and commented that the maps presented by Councilmember Roberts depart too dramatically from the Planning Commission recommendations which include a lot of work performed by the public and staff. He stated support for a proposal closer to the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Councilmember Salomon offered support for Option I with minor modifications to support business development concentrated around the Station. He recommended a smaller Phase I, implementation of Phase II by early 2020s, and elimination of Phase III in the Staff recommendation. He commented that the area across from the Station at 180<sup>th</sup> would open up around the time of the Station opening.

Councilmember McConnell discussed addressing the concerns of community, and reducing the size of the area in Phase I. She recommended evaluating the results over ten years, and revisiting Phase II at that time.

Deputy Mayor Eggen offered general support for Councilmember Roberts proposal, expressed concern about extending zoning to 185<sup>th</sup>, and agrees that the little area south of the station and east of the freeway can be cut in half to mirror the Planning Commission's recommendation. He supports phasing in ten year intervals, and believes it is premature to consider zoning a second phase in 2021.

Councilmember McGlashan stated he will not support Option I due to the absence of a connection to Town Center, and the exclusion of the property directly across the street from the Station. He added he does not support eliminating Phase 3, and offered his support for the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Ms. Markle shared that Sound Transit will not mitigate all of 185<sup>th</sup> to Town Center, so part of the redevelopment plan is to have frontage improvements paid by redevelopments to address the corridor.

Mayor Winstead stated she is not in favor of Councilmember Roberts' options, and does not support leaving out the area closest to the station. She addressed the importance of connectivity to Town Center, and offered support for the Planning Commission's recommendations. She commented on her preference for phasing, starting with Phase 1, and then evaluating what happens.

Councilmember Hall discussed why there is a need for rezoning in Shoreline. He shared that from 2000 to 2010 there was no population growth in Shoreline and that people were aging and household sizes were shrinking. He recalled school closures due to declines in enrollments, and

explained that younger generations have been statistically moving out. He talked about Vision 2029's purpose to create a place where people of all ages could live. He explained that rezoning will provide an opportunity for more people of all ages and incomes to live in this area, closer to where they work, in a variety of housing stock, with the ability to take Light Rail. He cautioned against micromanaging the market, and expressed concern that if the area around the Station is not rezoned that it is in opposition to Vision 2029. He added that the process will take time, and addressed the environmental, economic, and quality of life benefits rezoning will have on the community.

Councilmember Roberts commented on seeing a plan that the Community can also support, and proposes a smaller rezone area in Phase 1. He offered support for the Planning Commission's recommendation in the southeast quadrant from the freeway to 10<sup>th</sup> as a base map to work from.

**Councilmember Hall moved to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Eggen, and passed unanimously.**

Councilmember Salomon agreed with Councilmember Roberts' Option I recommendation with the addition of the triangle area from 185<sup>th</sup> to 180<sup>th</sup> being MUR-85, and removing the area east of Cromwell Park from the rezone.

**At 10:09 p.m., Mayor Winstead called for a recess. At 10:19 p.m., Mayor Winstead reconvened the meeting.**

Councilmembers discussed how the rezone maps will be reviewed and addressed at the February 23, 2015 Council Meeting. There was a consensus to begin the discussion with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Councilmembers discussed Development Code Regulations. Councilmembers McGlashan, McConnell, Salomon, and Deputy Mayor Eggen expressed support for allowing single family residential in all three MUR zones, and do not support minimum density requirement for new construction in MUR zones. Councilmember Hall commented that he does not support allowing single family residential in all MUR zones. Councilmember Salomon commented that he does not support allowing an entire new single family house in MUR-45 and 85, but approves allowing larger additions to existing homes that can be addressed through non-conforming use code. He expressed support for minimum density in MUR-45 and 85. He discussed balancing the needs of the Light Rail Station with community needs. He talked about the need to prepare for the anticipated one million people moving to the Puget Sound Region, supporting transit oriented development, and providing housing around the Light Rail Station.

Councilmember Roberts recalled the Town Center discussion of not allowing single family detached residents at Town Center, and expressed that the goal is to encourage a certain type of development within the Station Area. He commented that the questions are different when considering MUR-35, MUR-45 and MUR-85.

Ms. Tarry recapped the discussion and commented that she is not hearing a Council recommendation to make changes to Amendment 23 on the Station Area Planning Council

Amendment Matrix regarding the addition of minimum densities, and shared that the Planning Commission's recommendation will remain in Ordinance 706. Councilmember Roberts added he would like frontage improvements required for new single family developing to R-6 standards. Councilmember Hall recommended allowing single detached homes in MUR-35 with no minimum density, requiring a minimum of 18 units in MUR-45, and not allowing single detached homes in MUR-85. Mayor Winstead agreed with Councilmember Hall. Ms. Redinger stated that she will prepare information for Council on nonconformance code or the use of a sunset cause.

Councilmember Salomon commented on being flexible with the nonconforming use regulations, making the conditional use permit less expensive, and providing the ability for a buyer to secure a mortgage in an up-zoned neighborhood. Councilmember Hall and Mayor Winstead concurred and support making it easier and cheaper for people to stay in their home as long as they want. They recommended allowing residents to have the ability to modify their home without a conditional use permit. Deputy Mayor Eggen supports allowing single family homes to be built in the up-zoned areas, and become a conforming use to serve the interest of the citizens living there now. Councilmember Salomon commented on data that projects a 5%-10% increase in property values in Shoreline in 15 years, and shared that it is a significant benefit to owners in this area.

Mayor Winstead recommended changing MUR-85 to MUR-65 or 70 for the 185<sup>th</sup> Station Area to be consistent with maximum height regulations at Town Center. She then asked for clarification that an 85 foot building would only be seven stories, which was confirmed by Ms. Markle. Ms. Redinger recalled the origin of the recommendation of MUR-85, and explained that it will allow for additional height to a seven story building accommodating green roof gazebos, a floor for heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment, or parking. Mr. Eernisse discussed the space needed to accommodate a six story office building, and explained that it would probably need to be about 85 feet.

**Councilmember Hall moved to extend the meeting to 12:00 a.m. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Salomon, and passed 6-1 with Councilmember Roberts voting no.**

**At 11:00 p.m., Mayor Winstead called for a recess. At 11:05 p.m., Mayor Winstead reconvened the meeting.**

Councilmembers continued reviewing the Station Area Planning Council Amendment Tracking Matrix and proposed Amendments to Ordinance 706. There was consensus to move forward with the following Amendments: 2, 5, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, and 20. Councilmembers discussed Amendment 4, and there was consensus not to delete the reference to the fee in lieu program in the Comprehensive Plan. Councilmembers agreed to withdraw Amendments 8 and 25. There was no consensus for Amendments 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31 and 32. Councilmembers agreed to propose individual amendments at the February 23 Council meeting to move forward any amendments that did not receive consensus.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:57 p.m., Mayor Winstead declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DRAFT