

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

Monday, December 2, 2019  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue North

**PRESENT:** Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor McConnell, Councilmembers McGlashan, Scully, Chang, Robertson, and Roberts

**ABSENT:** None.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL**

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

**(a) Proclaiming Edwin T. Pratt Day**

Mayor Hall read a proclamation declaring December 6, 2019 as Edwin T. Pratt Day in Shoreline. Sarah Haycox, Shoreline resident and student, accepted the proclamation on behalf of Mr. Pratt's family. Miss Haycox read a statement from Miriam Pratt, Edwin's daughter, expressing joy with the ways in which Shoreline has honored her father and sharing details of his life and accomplishments.

**3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER**

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

**4. COUNCIL REPORTS**

There were no Council reports.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Upon motion by Councilmember Roberts and seconded by Councilmember Chang, and unanimously carried, 7-0, the public comment period was extended to allow all 22 people signed up to speak.**

Lee Keim, Shoreline resident, spoke regarding Shoreline's Climate Action Plan. She shared climate reports and spoke in support of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2. She said the problem of climate change will not go away.

Bill Dwyer, Shoreline resident, spoke in support of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2. He said the world is in a climate crisis, and the City has the opportunity to create policies that will benefit future generations.

Jonah Volenti, Shoreline resident and Shorewood student, spoke in support of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2. He stated that its passage would mean that the environmental protections set in place by local government will be strengthened and expanded.

Liz Poitras, Shoreline resident, spoke in opposition of proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Nos. 1 and 3. She wondered if the approval of the amendments would set a precedent for zoning changes to be made through the Comprehensive Plan, which she believes is not the best use of Council, staff and Planning Commission time. She said changes like this should be done with careful analysis of the effects on the City at large.

Kristi Rettmann, Shoreline resident and member of Save Shoreline Neighborhoods, said she is opposed to Amendment Nos. 1 and 3, stating that the rezoning would permanently affect her neighborhood. She said traffic is already heavy on her street and the rezone would increase it more. She urged the Council to reject the proposed amendments.

John McCoy, Shoreline resident, said he believes the City staff and the Planning Commission both did a thorough job researching Comprehensive Plan proposed Amendment Nos. 1 and 3 and said he hopes the Council will protect Shoreline neighborhoods.

Annette Ademasu, Shoreline resident, said the greenhouse gas emissions are a global danger, and the City cannot wait for the Federal government to take action. She thanked the City for what has been done to decrease emissions, but asked the Council to do more, starting by voting in favor of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2.

Tom Poitras, Shoreline resident, said he is against proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Nos. 1 and 3. He pointed out that the properties in question have never been the residence of the current owners. He said if Council approves the amendments, it will normalize zoning violations, and he shared his perspective on what community perception and reaction would be.

Joseph Irons, Shoreline resident and owner of the parcels in question for Amendment Nos. 1 and 3, shared his experience with the application process for the amendment. He listed reasons the Council should support Amendment No. 1 and stated that effects of the change would be localized and promote transitional zones.

Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline resident, urged the Council to follow the Planning Commission's recommendations to deny adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendment Nos. 1 and 3. She stated that adopting the amendments might encourage others to disregard zoning regulations and then apply for Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Mark Rettmann, Shoreline resident, said he speaks on behalf of Save Shoreline Neighborhoods in opposition of Comprehensive Plan Amendments 1 and 3. He displayed a map of the residences of the members. He emphasized that the decision should be focused on whether it is appropriate to permanently rezone two residential lots to business zoning to fix code violations based on all applicable criteria, and the staff and Planning Commission recommendations should be accepted.

Pam Sager, Shoreline resident, spoke in support of Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2. She said what she has learned about environment impacts over the last few years is frightening for future generations. She said it is clear that Shoreline and the Council are paying attention and care about current, and future, residents and urged the Council to approve the Amendment.

Lois Harrison, Shoreline resident, said climate change is the most critical issue being faced today. She said it is crucial that the City go on record as facing the issue and doing something about global warming. She urged the Council to approve Amendment No. 2.

Melissa Irons, Shoreline resident, spoke regarding Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 3. She reminded the Council that this amendment does not make a significant change, stating that the properties in consideration are the transition from commercial to residential on the street. She recognized that there will never be a proposal that all neighbors will accept. She asked the City to be brave and flexible in planning, and said the amendments meet the 2029 vision and goals of the City.

Ginger Hayra Gunn, Shoreline resident, commended the Council for the work towards protecting the environment and said the passage of Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2 should be the highest priority. She asked the Council to consider bringing in more creative perspectives to encouraging bicycling in the City. She said the passage of I-976 has created challenges for the City, and that she is glad that Proposition 1 did not pass, since money is needed to do good for the future.

Ted Andrews, Shoreline resident, spoke on behalf of the arts in Shoreline. He said his neighborhood supports culture of many kinds. He asked the Council to ensure stable financing for the arts programming by expanding the Capital Projects to which the 1% for Art benefit applies.

Bruce Amundson, Shoreline resident, spoke in support of increasing the public arts funding. He praised the leadership of David Francis, the City's Public Arts Coordinator, and reviewed some of David's accomplishments. He said the Public Arts Plan adopted by Council has a visionary proposal to expand the amount of public art in the City. He encouraged the Council to adopt the staff recommendation to expand the 1% for Art program to include a broader array of projects that would contribute to the funding to help ensure the continuation of the program.

Roger Feldman, Seattle resident, described himself as a public artist whose work has been commissioned through 1% for Art funding and described the importance of art as a community builder.

Eric Swenson, Seattle resident, described his long term involvement in the Shoreline community. He implored the Council to expand the 1% for Art Program.

Elana Winsberg, Shoreline resident and artist, said her public art creates a way of living, thinking, and imagining. She emphasized the importance of art and urged Council to support it.

Megan McDonald, Edmonds resident, said she comes from a family of artists. She described art of the ‘umami of our lives’ and encouraged Council to support the arts.

Erik Ertsgaard, Shoreline resident and Shorewood student, described his involvement with City activities and voiced his support for the updated funding plan for public arts.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

**Upon motion by Councilmember Robertson and seconded by Deputy Mayor McConnell and unanimously carried, 7-0, the following Consent Calendar items were approved:**

- (a) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Interlocal Agreement Between the City of Shoreline and the State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services for the Respite in Community Settings Program**
- (b) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Interlocal Agreement Between the City of Shoreline and the State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services for the Recreational Opportunities Program**

8. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussing Ordinance No. 881 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan Annual Docket Amendments to the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, delivered the staff presentation. Mr. Szafran explained that the Growth Management Act limits the review of Comprehensive Plan amendments by directing cities to create an annual docket of amendments for consideration. He provided an overview of each proposed amendment:

- Amendment No. 1 would change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Mixed-Use 2 for two parcels of land. He displayed vicinity and zoning maps of the area and showed images of the properties. He concluded with a review of the pros and cons for Amendment No. 1.
- Amendment No. 2 would update the National Environmental Goal V to set local goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to limit global warming and described the benefits of the changes as well as the associated language changes and the impact of the effects of

implementing it. He said the Planning Commission determined it meets the decision criteria and described the current work plan efforts toward carbon emission.

- Amendment No. 3 would add professional offices to the allowed uses in the Medium Density Residential land use designation. He displayed a map of current R-8 and R-12 zones and indicated that a very small portion of the City falls within these designations. He listed the pros and cons of the Amendment. He said the Planning Commission's recommendations are based on the decision criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Mr. Szafran stated that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Amendment No. 2 and denial of Amendment Nos. 1 and 3.

Councilmember Chang recused herself from the discussion on Amendment Nos. 1 and 3 based on a previous professional relationship with a family member of one of the applicants.

Mayor Hall opened discussion on Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2.

Mayor Hall and Councilmembers Chang and Robertson expressed support for the Amendment.

Councilmember Chang thanked the Briarcrest community for initiating the proposed Amendment. She asked how implementing changes would affect policy in Shoreline. Mr. Szafran shared some of the changes that might take place but said an analysis would need to be done to have a better idea of how implementing the Amendment would translate into new goals and policies to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Robertson said that although the impact of this Amendment is not yet known, it is a change that needs to be made.

Mayor Hall said that Shoreline has been making good steps toward environmental goals both locally and regionally, including active partnership with the King County Cities Climate Coalition, but the sobering stories that are being released predict devastating impacts.

Councilmember Chang left at 8:04 p.m.

When asked for clarification on the impact of Amendment No. 3, if approved, Mr. Szafran confirmed that "professional office use" in Medium Density Residential areas would be a conditional, permitted, use. Councilmember Scully followed up asking if a conditional use permit could be revoked after granted. Mr. Szafran said that a conditional use permit, once granted, stays with the property. Margaret King, City Attorney, offered that there are nuances to this, and said she would prepare additional information for Council. Councilmember McGlashan asked under what scenarios would a conditional use permit expire. Ms. King said she would compare and contrast the regulations for Council.

In response to Councilmember Robertson's question of what types of businesses would be permitted in R-8 zones, Mr. Szafran confirmed that should the Amendment pass, the only type of additional businesses permitted in R-8 zones would be professional offices.

Councilmember McGlashan said he is leaning toward supporting Amendment No. 1, after confirming that the owners could have purchased the properties and requested a Comprehensive Plan Amendment prior to use.

Councilmember McGlashan said if No. 3 moves forward, Council could establish index criteria for development code conditions that must be met. He asked if specific conditions could be established for this particular property that would be different from what would currently be allowed in that zone. Mr. Szafran said no. Ms. King stated that there are ways in which index criteria for certain uses could be specified.

Councilmember Roberts asked if a business use changed from one specific type of business use to another, would it trigger another conditional use permit. Mr. Szafran said he would research and reply.

Councilmember Roberts said he supports Amendment No. 3 and listed different permitted conditional uses in R-8 and R-12 zones. He described the locations of the applicable zones in the City, and said businesses already exist in these zones. He said he wants home based businesses to be successful, so including expanding professional offices is an appropriate step. If Amendment No. 2 passes, he said there will be even more reason to think about how far people have to travel to do business, so it is a small step that fits within the Council goals.

Mayor Hall confirmed that the City allows some form of residential use in all commercial zones.

Mayor Hall said he agrees that integrating a mix of uses is an inclusionary, modern approach to City development. He reflected on the shift in recent decades to Mixed-Use zones, which Shoreline has intentionally cultivated in the Light Rail Station areas. He said that compatibility is very important, and that he agrees that the conditional use permit process would be an appropriate way to handle these situations. He said Vision 2029 depicts a shift from Shoreline being a bedroom community to integrating businesses into the community. He said he could support either Amendment No. 1 or Amendment No. 3.

The Council unanimously voiced support for Amendment No. 2, agreeing that there is no need for there to be amendment language prepared to remove Amendment No. 2 from the docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Mayor Hall reviewed the process for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket and Ms. Tarry clarified the steps for amending the associated ordinance.

Deputy Mayor McConnell and Councilmembers Robertson and Scully said they do not support Amendment No. 1.

Councilmember Robertson emphasized that her decision regarding Amendment No. 1 is not at all connected to the quality of the current business, its owners, or contribution to the community, but is solely based on the location of this zone and the future impacts to the area. She said she would like to see the City maximize the zoning that is currently in place before encroaching on residential neighborhoods. She said she looks forward to additional discussion and information on Amendment No. 3 before she makes her decision.

Councilmember Scully said that he has never agreed that land use changes should be made through Comprehensive Plan amendments. He said that adding commercial businesses in the middle of a residential area will rarely make sense to him. Regarding Amendment No. 3, he said he agrees with Councilmember Roberts but would like to know more about the process for revoking a conditional use permit. He added that businesses have to be good neighbors, otherwise conflict will always exist. He said he is inclined to support Amendment No. 3 because home based businesses have a broad range of purposes, so including professional offices makes sense, as long as they do not impact adjacent residences and requirements can be enforced.

Councilmember McGlashan said he looks forward to the discussion and observed that in the future there may be a lot of change on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Councilmember Roberts offered that there has been movement towards a desire for statewide zoning codes, removing control from local jurisdictions. He said it is important to make it clear to our representatives that cities want to retain control over these decisions. He said zoning and the budget are the two biggest decisions the Council makes, and he does not want to see the State intervening, so Shoreline should be cognizant that all decisions set precedents. Mayor Hall agreed that the more Shoreline can demonstrate it is accommodating growth, the less pressure there will be from the legislature to remove local control over decision-making.

Deputy Mayor McConnell asked for specifics on the impact to the two properties in consideration, should Amendment No. 3 pass. Mr. Szafran explained that its passage would allow amendments to the Development Code in R-8 and R-12 zones. Ms. King clarified the difference between home occupancy permits and conditional, or special, use permits. She said site specific details are usually set through the special use permitting process, and the Council would have the opportunity to review the separate uses. Ms. Tarry said that if Council were to approve Amendment No. 3, it amends the Comprehensive Plan to allow professional offices in R-8 and R-12 zones. She added that once development regulations would be put in place, conditions and criteria would be established.

Mayor Hall thanked the staff for the work on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:45 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk