

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

Monday, September 21, 2020  
7:00 p.m.

Held Remotely via Zoom

PRESENT: Mayor Hall, Deputy Mayor Scully, Councilmembers McConnell, McGlashan, 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. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present.

(a) Proclaiming Welcoming Week

Mayor Hall recognized September 12-19, 2020 as Welcoming Week in Shoreline and shared statistics on the diversity of the City.

3. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, provided updates on COVID-19, and reports and information on various City meetings, projects and events.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

There were no Council reports.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

*Speaking in opposition of the proposed Enhanced Shelter at 16357 Aurora Avenue N:*

Vinay Venkatesh, Shoreline resident, shared data on the petition opposing the Shelter. He asked for more information on the Shelter to properly prepare for the upcoming community meeting.

Ed Jirsa, Shoreline resident, said, from his experience as a firefighter, low-barrier shelters lead to an increase in area homeless populations and call volumes for emergency services. He expressed concern for the effect the Shelter would have on the community.

Joanne Godmintz, Shoreline resident, shared concerns for the impact on budget and emergency services for low-barrier shelters. She opposed the potential zoning change.

Barbara Twaddell, Shoreline resident, said she felt her concerns were being dismissed after a Councilmember's comments at the last Council meeting. She asked for clarification on what level of drug use will be permitted.

Margaret Willson, Shoreline resident, said providing a place to stay with no sobriety requirement is not going to help a drug addict get clean, and she asked the Council to use the shelter for law-abiding needy people.

Larry Pfeil, Shoreline resident, shared information in a letter from the Shoreline Place developer and recommended that the Council read the Washington State Department of Commerce Shelter Program Overview.

Nancy Morris, Shoreline resident, said many legitimate concerns have not been answered about the proposed Shelter and she shared comparisons with the guidelines for hosted encampments. She said shelter policies need to help homeless people get better.

Guruprasad TG, Shoreline resident, asked for information documenting successes of low-barrier shelters and commented that the public process for naming parks is more comprehensive than for considering a low-barrier shelter.

Chris Chalcraft, Shoreline resident, described the Shelter as an irresponsible plan, specifically geared toward a subset of homeless people who have had problems in traditional shelters.

Nancy Pfeil, Shoreline resident, said the Shoreline Municipal Code gives direction that shelters not be cited in residential neighborhoods and said regulations are being rewritten to accommodate the facility. Additionally, she urged preservation of mature trees.

*Speaking in support of the proposed Enhanced Shelter at 16357 Aurora Avenue N:*

Jason Metcalf-Lindenburger, Lake Forest Park resident, said he was involved heavily with the shelter at Ronald United Methodist Church and shared the community connection that those that the Shelter housed. He said there is public support for the Shelter, and he does not think it will increase the homeless population.

Stephanie Henry, Shoreline resident, shared her positive experiences at the Ronald United Methodist Church Shelter. She said a 24/7 shelter would provide basic necessities for unhoused members of the community.

Pastor Kelly Dahlman-Oeth, resident of Kirkland and Pastor of Ronald United Methodist Church, recognized that homelessness is increasing dramatically but it is not a result of providing shelters for people to live in. He shared positive experiences from running a shelter at the Church.

*Offering general Public Comment:*

Rebecca Jones, Shoreline resident and Save Shoreline Trees representative, spoke to the value of landmark trees scheduled for removal as part of the pending Washington State Department of Transportation office project.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- (a) Approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of July 27, 2020**
- (b) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Change Order #2 to Contract No. 9155 with Trinity Contractors, Inc. for Annual Stormwater Catch Basin Repair and Replacement**
- (c) Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Amendment 1 to the King County Flood Control District Flood Reduction Grant Funding for the Storm Creek Erosion Management Project**

8. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Approving Preliminary Formal Unit Lot Subdivision No. PLN19-0133, Dividing Three Existing Parcels into Nineteen (19) Unit Lots at 18002, 18008 and 18016 12th Avenue NE

Mayor Hall reviewed the Appearance of Fairness Checklist with Council and no one reported any ex parte communications on the subdivision proposal before them.

Cate Lee, Associate Planner, delivered the Staff presentation. Ms. Lee explained that this quasi-judicial decision before Council is a formal subdivision because ten or more lots are proposed for creation. She reviewed the requirements for this Type-C decision. Ms. Lee shared property information including location and zoning and displayed a vicinity map. She reviewed the proposal to subdivide the site into 19 lots and described the proposed structures and the requirements for subdivision. She outlined the process to date and shared highlights and stated that all construction permits have been approved but their issuance is pending Council approval of the preliminary subdivision and lot merger. She stated that City staff and the Hearing Examiner have concluded that the proposed subdivision meets applicable requirements of the Shoreline Municipal Code and after conducting a public hearing, the Hearing Examiner recommends approval subject to listed conditions. City staff concur with the recommendation.

**Councilmember McGlashan moved to approve Preliminary Formal Subdivision No. PLN19-0133 subject to the conditions included in the Hearing Examiner recommendation. The motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Scully.**

Councilmember McGlashan said this proposal represents the Council's decision to approve fee simple townhouse lots and said it will be a great addition to North City.

Mayor Hall commented on the road and sidewalk improvements that are part of this project and noted this corner will be a major connection between North City and the Light Rail Station. He said the project brings revenue to fund services and amenities.

Deputy Mayor Scully said the City is changing, and it is important to ensure people can afford to get a start here. Projects like this are more affordable than most of what is being built.

**The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.**

(b) Adoption of Ordinance No. 896 - Amending Certain Sections of Shoreline Municipal Code Title 20 to Permit Professional Offices in the R-8 and R-12 Zoning Districts

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, delivered the staff presentation. He reminded Council of the origins of the development code amendments to permit professional offices in R-8 and R-12 zones, stating that it began as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The amendments before Council tonight will implement the policy established by Council in Ordinance No. 881. He explained the purpose of the amendments, displayed the amendatory motion language requested by Council, and asked a clarifying policy question regarding parking spaces. He said the Planning Commission recommended the amendments shown in the staff report and that Staff recommends adoption of Ordinance No. 896.

**Councilmember Roberts moved adoption of Ordinance No. 896. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan.**

Councilmember Roberts said that as more people work from home, expanding the areas zoned for professional office makes sense.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to amend the main motion to modify the Planning Commission's recommendation to remove indexed criteria #1 from the proposed Development Code Amendments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Robertson.**

Councilmember Roberts said this amendment makes it clear that all properties in all areas zoned R-8 and R-12 would be eligible to have a professional office on their property.

Deputy Mayor Scully and Councilmembers Chang and McConnell spoke in opposition of the amendment. Councilmember Chang stated the original language would limit the professional office areas to locations that are already on the edge of busier areas, but the broader range of areas that this amendment would include are scattered throughout the City. Not all the areas make sense to increase busyness. Deputy Mayor Scully said when this first came up he thought

that this would benefit neighborhoods, but since you cannot ensure that each business is a good neighbor, he would like to proceed cautiously to begin with, and expand after having the opportunity to track the impacts. Councilmember McConnell agreed that slowly expanding the area once given the opportunity to observe the success of a smaller section would be a more thoughtful approach.

Mayor Hall said he will support the amendment because in the future people will be working from home more and the closer people can live to where they work, the better it is for the environment, the community, and the local businesses. He said the change affects a small portion of the potential parcels in the City, and he sees it as an opportunity to address the outdated notion in urban planning that people could only live in some neighborhoods and work in others.

**The motion to amend passed, 4-3, with Deputy Mayor Scully and Councilmembers Chang and McConnell voting against.**

**Councilmember Roberts moved to modify the Planning Commission's recommendation to amend indexed criteria #9 to read "one sign complying with Table 20.50.540(G) is allowed." The motion was seconded by Deputy Mayor Scully.**

Councilmember Roberts said that businesses operating in the R-8 or R-12 zones should be treated the same way businesses in an R-6 zone are, and this amendment does that.

Mayor Hall and Councilmembers Chang, McGlashan, and McConnell opposed adding internally lit signs to professional office areas. Councilmember Chang said internally illuminated signs make an area look commercial and add light pollution, and she would rather they not be used in home occupation business or professional office areas. Councilmember McConnell said she would prefer to keep neighborhoods looking less commercial. Mayor Hall said he agrees with the principle of allowing professional office and home occupation businesses to have the same types of signage, however, he concurs with Councilmember Chang on this issue, and added that daytime businesses do not have the same need for illuminated signs.

Deputy Mayor Scully observed that while the Council seems united in minimizing the impact of this change will have on neighborhoods, there are differing opinions about what creates a negative impact. He said he does not see a giant difference between internally and externally illuminated signs, and since there have not been complaints about internally illuminated signs in home occupation business areas, he supports the amendment.

**The motion to amend failed, 2-5, with Deputy Mayor Scully and Councilmember Roberts voting in favor.**

Councilmember Roberts asked if the current definition for 'storage of vehicles' means overnight parking. Mr. Szafran responded that the intent is meant to be any parking, day or night.

Councilmember McGlashan asked for clarification on the parking restrictions and definition of commercial vehicles, stating that they seem to be more restrictive than those for home occupation businesses. Mr. Szafran said, impact wise, there may not be much of a difference

between vehicles used for personal and business uses. Councilmember McGlashan suggested defining “commercial vehicles” in the Municipal Code, and Mr. Szafran defined commercial vehicles and said the same limitations that exist in the home occupation code were incorporated into these proposed regulations.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to modify the Planning Commission’s recommendation to amend the indexed criteria #5 to read “the office may use or store two vehicles for pickup of materials used by the office or the distribution of products from the site, provided such vehicles shall not exceed a gross weight of 14,000 pounds, a height of nine feet, and a length of 22 feet.” The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGlashan.**

Councilmember Roberts said this amendment will allow a professional office the same vehicle permissions that home occupation businesses are allowed, since no negative impact should be created if a business transitions from home occupation to professional office designation.

Mayor Hall said he is inclined to support this because of the rationale presented. Councilmember McGlashan confirmed that this amendment is focused on the number of commercial vehicles that may be kept on site. Councilmember McConnell confirmed that professional office spaces would have parking restrictions based on property size.

Mayor Hall pointed out that the same definition and code enforcement issues exist whether or not this amendment passes and urged Council to focus their decision on the vehicle count they feel should be permitted.

**The motion to amend passed, 6-1, with Deputy Mayor Scully voting against.**

**The main motion to approve Ordinance No. 896 as recommended by the Planning Commission and as further amended by Council passed unanimously, 7-0.**

Mayor Hall expressed gratitude for the Council’s attention to the details of this Ordinance.

9. STUDY ITEMS

- (a) Discussing Ordinance No. 901 - Amending Certain Sections of the Shoreline Development Code to Provide for Commercial Space on the Ground Floor of Multifamily Buildings

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, and Cate Lee, Associate Planner, delivered the staff presentation. Mr. Szafran reviewed the background on the proposed amendments, which stem from a privately initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment that was rejected from the Docket. He said in rejecting the amendment, Council recognized that Comprehensive Plan policy already exists to support ground floor commercial, and they directed staff to start work on Development Code amendments. He described the research process, which included an online community survey.

Mr. Szafran said that based on Council’s direction, staff initially identified areas in Ridgecrest and North City where ground floor commercial could be required, and he displayed vicinity

maps. He stated that the survey results indicated both preferred business uses and ones the community did not support, and he listed examples of each. He described the Planning Commission's recommendations on business uses to be prohibited, and he added that staff recommends incentives to encourage construction that accommodates restaurant-ready spaces.

Ms. Lee reviewed the specific incentives of height bonus and hardscape increase included in the proposal and described the rationale for them. She shared the public comments received prior to the Public Hearing and outlined the Planning Commission's recommendations. In addition to the amendments proposed in Ordinance No. 901, the Planning Commission recommended creating a vacant commercial space registry, considering future code amendments to encourage redevelopment of commercial spaces in existing buildings and to activate rooftop spaces for commercial use, and developing a grant program for the owners of restaurants to incentivize new development.

Councilmember Chang said she is excited about this commercial requirement and expressed appreciation for the public survey. She recounted an experience eating in a dining area shared by multiple restaurants and asked if a similar situation would meet the City's dimensional requirements. Ms. Lee said flexible approaches could be considered and elaborated on the specifics. Mayor Hall asked if the proposed code would prohibit multiple vendors from sharing a dining space, and Ms. Lee said the requirements would be at the shell construction phase, prior to finished walls, and improvements could be broken into small storefronts.

Councilmember Robertson shared her appreciation for innovative thinking. She said she supports this step toward making spaces happen for the population that will benefit from it. She praised the work of the Planning Commission and said she would like to pursue the idea of a vacant commercial registry.

Deputy Mayor Scully observed that the question before them is complex, because commercial rent must be low to avoid vacancies. He said he is okay if the sacrifice, in order to get lower rents, is to increase building heights because the current market will tolerate it. He said he is excited to see how the change is made. He asked what benefit a vacant business registry would offer versus pursuing traditional routes to identifying available properties. Ms. Lee said that it would allow the City to take a more proactive approach to ensuring commercial spaces are being filled. Mayor Hall suggested the City's Economic Development Program Manager do some research on a registry for future discussion.

Councilmember Roberts said he supports the end goal of this proposal but has several concerns over what is being called an incentive because these 'incentives' are already granted to any business in the particular zone. Ms. Lee explained that the 8 foot height bonus is only available to new construction multifamily buildings in the displayed areas, and the reason for the incentive is to offset the height being sacrificed to add commercial on the ground floor, thereby not penalizing developers to build something that they are now required to build. She added that the incentive for restaurant-ready is offered because it is more cost effective to install at the shell stage, rather than as a retrofit. Councilmember Roberts said it feels like a new zone is being created with new requirements, not incentives, and he suggested that the city's system of incentives is backwards.

Commenting on the remainder of recommendations, Councilmember Roberts said he is not sure where the idea of ‘family friendly’ uses comes from in the development code, but he is concerned that within these two areas certain businesses that are currently allowed will no longer be allowed. He encouraged the Planning Commission to see if there are any barriers to rooftop dining, and he thinks it is a failure to not address reducing parking requirements because developers are concerned about this when building structures. He said he questions requiring developers to build to the minimum lot line and asked whether construction means initial construction or includes remodeling.

Mayor Hall asked clarifying questions on how the proposed code language would work in certain scenarios. He said if it is the community’s desire and Council’s policy decision to prohibit certain uses in certain areas of the City because they are undesirable in that neighborhood, he would rather prohibit the use in the zone than through these amendments. He recalled that Council asked for a code amendment proposal to be brought forward to them promptly, so in this context, even though he would have preferred to separate the allowed use and ground floor requirement issues, he is willing to look at this approach as a pilot project. Mayor Hall agreed that reducing the parking requirements is one of the best ways to generate affordable housing and lower costs for businesses, and he asked for clarification on the proposed parking requirements in the staff report. Ms. Lee said the proposed code sets a standard parking ratio for commercial space that is much lower than it would be for some specific uses. She said it is not a parking incentive, but it does help even the playing field if the type of business going into the commercial space has not been identified at the time of construction.

Councilmember McGlashan reflected on how retail is changing, so while he supports a commercial use ground floor requirement, the City should not limit what kind of businesses they can rent to because he believes they will struggle to secure tenants.

Based on Council interest, Mayor Hall directed staff to prepare an amendment for Council’s consideration to remove the restriction on what types of businesses are permitted.

Councilmember Chang said she supports limiting the types of businesses that can operate in the area and she would like to incentivize restaurants, since they are the kind of business that the community wants.

Mayor Hall encouraged Council to get questions and amendment requests to staff and noted the Ordinance is scheduled for adoption on October 19, 2020.

(b) Discussing the Resident Satisfaction Survey Results

Eric Bratton, Communications Program Manager; announced this is the 10<sup>th</sup> community survey and he introduced Chris Tatham, Chief Executive Officer of ETC Institute, who delivered the presentation. Mr. Tatham described the purpose of the survey, stating that it is an important tool to assess resident satisfaction, compare performance with previous survey results and against national and regional benchmarks, and to identify areas for improvement. He reviewed the



methodology of the survey description, method of administration, sample size, confidence level, and margin of error. He displayed a map identifying the location of survey respondents.

Mr. Tatham shared specifics on the major findings and comparisons with previous years' data, highlights of which include:

- ***Residents continue to have a very positive perception of the City and city leaders*** despite the challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, and most residents rate the city as an excellent or good place to live and raise children. He observed that there is a high level of concern about homelessness, but the data does not indicate the cause for dissatisfaction.
- ***Dissatisfaction with City services has not increased during the COVID-19 pandemic.*** The leadership ratings remain strong, with very few residents dissatisfied with City leadership. He noted that most residents continue to feel safe in Shoreline, adding that satisfaction with police services has decreased nationally since March 2020.
- ***Satisfaction with City services is significantly higher in Shoreline than most other U.S. cities,*** with more than a ten to one ratio of residents satisfied versus dissatisfied with the overall quality of services provided by the City.
- ***Residents identify homelessness, quality of human services, and quality of police services as the priority issues for the next two years.***
- ***Streets, Sidewalks, and Housing.*** The majority of respondents prefer finding new funding sources for road and sidewalk maintenance programs and support the City's efforts to develop policies to encourage construction of more housing types.
- ***Effects of COVID-19.*** Reporting indicates that Shoreline has been impacted very similarly to the nation as a whole, with 14% of residents expressing concern with being able to pay for necessities as a result of the pandemic. He said 84% of respondents stated they are confident or very confident the City will bounce back from the pandemic.

Councilmember Robertson asked if there were more details available about the expressed concern about homelessness and Mr. Tatham said the survey does not indicate if respondents want the City to do more, or less. Mayor Hall confirmed that the survey results were completed before the recent discussions on a potential Enhanced Shelter began.

Deputy Mayor Scully recognized the City's need to do better when it comes to policing. He asked for additional information on the results that nationwide there was a decline in satisfaction with policing and Mr. Tatham said he thinks that respondents can be influenced by the media and can be a little less positive.

Councilmember McConnell said she learned that the neutral responses have more power than she thought in influencing results. She said she thinks the City recognizes the areas for improvement and has a leadership that cares about the community.

Councilmember McGlashan said as the Council is discussing a potential shelter in Shoreline, it is meaningful to hear that diversity and inclusiveness, response to homelessness, and human services were all identified as high priority issues by residents.

Councilmember Chang added that she has spoken to a lot of people who are concerned about the Enhanced Shelter, and the dissatisfaction is with the location, not the idea of helping the homeless. In light of the recent actions around the Shelter, if residents were to take the survey at this moment in time, she thinks the City would get very different survey results on the topics of communication and satisfaction.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:51 p.m., Mayor Hall declared the meeting adjourned.

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DRAFT