

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

*The purpose of these minutes is to capture a high-level summary of Council's discussion and action. This is not a verbatim transcript. Meeting video and audio is available on the [City's website](#).*

Monday, June 6, 2022  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Avenue North

**PRESENT:** Mayor Scully, Deputy Mayor Robertson, Councilmembers McConnell, Mork, Roberts, Pobe, and Ramsdell

**ABSENT:** None.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the City Clerk, all Councilmembers were present except for Councilmember McConnell, who joined the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

(a) Proclamation of Pride Month

Mayor Scully announced Pride Month, Ride Transit Month, and National Gun Violence Awareness Day in Shoreline.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

4. REPORT OF CITY MANAGER

Debbie Tarry, City Manager, reported on various City meetings, projects, and events.

5. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Ramsdell said he attended a meeting with the Stay Housed, Stay Healthy Coalition. He will be communicating with City staff about an analysis on renter protections in Kenmore.

Councilmember Pobe reported his attendance at a SeaShore Transportation Forum meeting with Councilmember McConnell. They spoke about Lynnwood Link opening in 2024 and concerns with the E-Line route to downtown.

Councilmember Mork stated she attended a meeting of the Regional Water Quality Committee where they worked on a set of guiding principles for the Public Issues Committee Board.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

*The Council heard comments from the public from approximately 7:10 p.m. to 7:41 p.m. Written comments were also submitted to Council prior to the meeting and are available on the [City's website](#).*

Richard Kink, Shoreline resident and Vice President of the Richmond Beach Preservation Association, spoke about Ordinance No. 967 raising concerns over the cost to comply with public access regulations.

Julia Scarpa, Shoreline resident and volunteer for Moms Demand Action, thanked Council for recognizing National Gun Violence Awareness Day and shared details on the history of the movement.

Joyce Taibleson, Shoreline resident, expressed support for Ordinance No. 967 and advocated for safe entry and exit points for the beach and specific access times.

Susanne Tsoming, Shoreline resident, commented on the 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northwest sidewalk design and encouraged a continuous 8-foot-wide sidewalk to preserve trees.

Nancy Morris, Shoreline resident, opposed a 10-foot-wide sidewalk along 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northwest and asked to have staff consider an alternate stormwater plan.

Nancy Malek, Shoreline resident, requested funding on behalf of ShoreLake Arts to obtain a permanent location.

Jack Malek, Shoreline resident, spoke regarding Ordinance No. 966 stating that clarification is needed on building operations with the temporary power. He expressed support for Ordinance No. 967 but pointed out issues in need of attention.

Jonelle Kemmerling, Shoreline resident and member of Save Shoreline Trees, asked that tree protection regulations, Engineering Development Manual standards, and arborist recommendations be adhered to regarding the 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northwest sidewalk.

Bryan Chow, Shoreline resident, stated opposition to Ordinance No. 967 and advised that more discussion is needed on the outcome of the action.

Janet Way, Shoreline resident and representative of the Shoreline Preservation Society, suggested making Seattle Naval Hospital a museum to preserve the site and forest.

Kathleen Russell, Shoreline resident and representative of Save Shoreline Trees, shared concern with tree loss and asked that a 10% tree retention be included in Ordinance No. 968.

Peter Vitaliano, Shoreline resident, shared issues with the condemnation process for Ordinance No. 967. He suggested the funds for purchase go to another cause.

Tom McCormick, Shoreline resident, clarified details related to Ordinance No. 967 and reasoned that it will preserve safe beach access.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- (a) Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of May 9, 2022  
Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of May 9, 2022**
- (b) Approving the Multi-Family Tax Exemption Program Contract with WZL Enterprises LLC for the Paramount Apartments Phase 1 Project Located at 304 NE 152nd Street**
- (c) Adoption of Ordinance No. 965 - Extension of Interim Regulations for Outdoor Seating**
- (d) Authorize the City Manager to Execute Contract No.10320 with Osborn Consulting, Inc. in the Amount of \$290,000 for Stormwater Pipe Condition Assessment**
- (e) Acceptance of Assignment of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Franchises for Wastewater Facilities**

8. ACTION ITEMS

- (a) Action on Ordinance No. 967 - Authorizing Acquisition of Certain Real Property Located in the Richmond Beach Neighborhood at the South End of 27th Avenue NW, Tax Parcel 727810-0905**

Councilmember McConnell stated that she will continue to recuse herself from the topic and then excused herself from the discussion.

Assistant City Attorney, Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, reviewed a summary of Ordinance No. 967 which authorizes the use of eminent domain. If acquired, parcel 727810-0905 would add 2.6 acres of City-owned park and tidelands. Staff will negotiate for a voluntary settlement of the property appraised at \$110,000 and have provided legal notice as required. A license from Burlington Northern will be required for a pathway from the north via 27th Avenue NW.

**Deputy Mayor Robertson moved to adopt Ordinance No. 967.**

Councilmembers expressed support for Ordinance No. 967. Concerns were raised over parking issues in the neighborhood and the adequacy of notice about the acquisition. Councilmember Mork advised staff to look into improving noticing procedures. Councilmember Ramsdell suggested that a public easement be created if a willing sale could not be achieved to ensure safe public access. He and Councilmember Roberts agreed that there are higher priorities than this acquisition that the City could address.

**The motion passed 6-0, with Councilmember McConnell abstaining.**

- (b) Adoption of Ordinance No. 966 - Amending Shoreline Municipal Code Chapter 13.20 to Add a New Section SMC 13.20.060 - Deferred Underground Facilities

Assistance City Manager, John Norris, discussed the role of Ordinance No. 966 to require developers in the first 10 blocks of the Seattle City Light (SCL) 5th Ave Duct Bank Project to install underground infrastructure and eventually connect to the underground power facility. Ordinance No. 966 would ask SCL to ensure interim power is setup and removed following the Duct Bank Project scheduled to be completed in five years. Feedback from the public and involved agencies was incorporated into the proposed code including a recent revision to the timeline for pole removal.

**Councilmember Roberts moved to adopt Ordinance No. 966.**

A question was raised about the timeline for completion of the Bank Project. Mr. Norris responded that staff have been working closely with SCL to confirm that the project will be completed within the scheduled timeframe. He added that an agreement is being developed to outline undergrounding projects and define the partnership between the City and SCL. Addressing a comment from the public, Mr. Norris clarified that both Ordinance Nos. 958 and 966 allow for the construction and operation of the interim overhead power.

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

9. STUDY ITEMS

(a) Presentation by ShoreLake Arts - Facility Market Study Request

Mayor Scully disclosed that his wife is on the ShoreLake Arts Board, and Deputy Mayor Robertson disclosed that her husband is also on the Board.

Ms. Tarry introduced the presenters from ShoreLake Arts, Executive Director, Quinn Elliott, and President of the Board, Tracy Thorleifson. She stated the point of tonight's presentation is to ask the City to contribute funds towards their market analysis for an Artspace-type project in Shoreline.

Ms. Thorleifson shared their goal to create a community arts center in Shoreline with a component that offers affordable housing for artists. Ms. Elliot discussed the needs behind their goal including:

- Classroom space for youth visual arts camp and adult classes.
- Community performance space.
- An area for art installations.
- Affordable housing for artists.

She stated ShoreLake Arts is working with Artspace, an experienced developer of arts facilities, who conducted a preliminary feasibility study. The study found that the project is feasible and the goals to address racial disparities and support creative businesses are shared by many stakeholders. Artspace sees the appetite and opportunity to invest in the creative sector but identified funding as the biggest challenge. The company recommended moving forward as quickly as possible due to rising market costs. An Artspace project costs between \$20 million and \$25 million and takes five to seven years to complete. The next step for ShoreLake Arts is an arts market study which will cost \$35,000 and a Project Concept Refinement workshop that will cost \$12,500 for a total of \$47,500. On behalf of ShoreLake Arts, Ms. Thorleifson asked Council for \$20,000 to \$25,000 to move forward with the study.

It was asked why ShoreLake is only requesting \$25,000. Ms. Elliott answered that they have requests out to several potential donors and will be applying for grant funding. She stated that ShoreLake Arts will move forward once the first \$35,000 has been identified and will be able to begin the study in September with Shoreline's contribution. Councilmember Roberts advised that Council wait to consider this funding until the normal budget cycle. Mayor Scully expressed support for the funding and clarified that the request would draw money from the general fund. There was a question about the gifting of public funds to which Ms. Ainsworth-Taylor explained that grants for public purposes are common and funding this project would align with gifting obligations if defined as a public purpose. Deputy Mayor Robertson expressed support for granting the fund.

Ms. Tarry said she will take the information gathered tonight and develop a budget ordinance for Council discussion and action in July.

- (b) Discussion of Ordinance No. 968 - Amending Chapters 20.30, 20.40, and 20.50 of the Shoreline Municipal Code to Modify Regulations for Development Within the MUR-70' Zoning District

Planning Manager, Andrew Bauer, presented on Ordinance No. 968 to modify regulations for development within the MUR 70 zoning district. The first main component of the proposed code is a parking reduction of up to 50% of the minimum off street parking requirement. This would apply to developments with 100 or more dwelling units or 10,000 or more square feet of commercial space. A Transportation Demand Management Plan would be a required condition of the reduction. The second component is an amendment to the process to achieving the maximum development height of 140 feet. The amendment would remove the requirement for a development agreement and replace it with an Administrative Design Review and neighborhood meeting. The review would analyze compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and confirm adequate infrastructure is provided. Development standards that would be a condition of attaining the 140-foot maximum height include:

- The current affordable housing requirement.
- Either 10,000 sq ft of commercial space or 30% ground floor for neighborhood amenities.
- A park, plaza, or open space.
- Art or placemaking amenities amounting to 1% of the building.
- Subarea improvements.

He stated staff proposes that several requirements be removed. The development agreement will become optional. MUR-70 buildings will no longer be required to be LEED Gold as the 4-Star Green requirement is comparable to Gold. The requirements for structured parking and the purchase of transferring development right credits will be removed.

A question was asked about the impact to funding for parks and art. Mr. Bauer pointed out that the provision is only for developments looking to achieve maximum height. There was no park impact fee at the time the code was developed, and now that there is a park impact fee to fund parks, the current 2% contribution requirement is duplicative. He said he will return with real numbers on the impact to park funding.

Some Councilmembers had concerns about the effectiveness of public comment on development projects. They asked if developers are required to make changes based on feedback received. Mr. Bauer explained the intent and process to obtain community feedback based on code requirements. In a development agreement, it is up to Council whether to approve the agreement. Councilmember McConnell commented that her understanding is that there is enough in the codes to protect neighborhoods from something outside of their expectation.

Following clarification on the climate impact regulation on developments of various heights, Councilmember Mork stated objection to the removal of environmental components. She opposed the Ordinance as written in the interest that something more environmentally significant can be done. But she suggested it may be appropriate to require these buildings to follow the Clean Building Act. This would require buildings over 20,000 square feet to be 15% below the energy code requirement. Mayor Scully disagreed with the idea of maintaining the current environmental code. He believes it would be better to mandate significant environmental provisions only in order to maximize housing near the light rail.

Mr. Bauer explained the administrative design review process and shared that the review time could fluctuate between eight and twelve weeks. He also noted there is an expedited permit review through the Deep Green Incentive program. Councilmember Roberts shared concern over the undefined time frame the review would take to be completed. He brought up the fact that section 11e requires subarea improvements but does not detail expectations or limitations. This vague condition is also found in section 11c which requires public open space. He asked why the 50% parking reduction is not standard for all MUR-70 developments. Addressing Councilmember Roberts' questions, Mr. Bauer explained that the ambiguity in the code aims to offer flexibility to negotiate development agreement requirements. The parking reduction focused on large developments as the impact to smaller spaces would be greater. Councilmember Roberts expressed interest in building courtyards and addressing vehicle loading zones.

Responding to questions about the Transportation Demand Management Plans, Mr. Bauer explained that the plan is meant to be flexible to fit the scope of a development. It is written in the proposed language that the City may request utilization data from the development to check on the plan's performance. With utilization data from Public Works, the City may also track and respond to parking issues. He gave examples of ground floor amenities such as a restaurant, office space, or community space for the neighborhood to access.

Mayor Scully raised concern over the Transfer of Development Rights program. He spoke about the benefits of the program to the community and environment, and stated that if it is removed, he believes it will not get done. Councilmember Mork agreed that she would like to see the City set up the program.

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:21 p.m., Mayor Scully declared the meeting adjourned.