

**DRAFT**

**CITY OF SHORELINE**  
**SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL JOINT MEETING WITH THE**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

Tuesday, November 29, 2005  
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline Fire Department Headquarters  
17525 Aurora Ave. N

*Shoreline City Council*

**PRESENT:** Mayor Hansen, Deputy Mayor Jepsen, Councilmembers Fimia, Gustafson and Ransom

**STAFF:** Bob Olander, Deputy City Manager; Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager; Paul Cohen, Planning & Development Services; Scott Passey, City Clerk

*Shoreline Planning Commission*

**PRESENT:** David Harris, Chair; Commissioners Michael Broili, Sid Kuboi, Robin McClelland, and Chakorn Phisuthikul

**I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, PURPOSE AND GROUND RULES**

Mayor Hansen convened the meeting at 7:03 p.m. with introductions around the table. He explained the purpose of the meeting, which is to conduct a civil discussion about specific concerns people have about cottage housing and whether cottage housing is a useful housing option in the City of Shoreline.

**II. BACKGROUND AND CHRONOLOGY OF COTTAGE HOUSING IN SHORELINE**

Paul Cohen, Planning and Development Services, provided a brief background of the issues surrounding cottage housing in Shoreline. He outlined the amendments to the cottage housing ordinance as recommended by the Planning Commission, which include the following:

- a. Burden developers for high quality projects
- b. Limit of 8 cottages within 1,000 feet from any point in the City
- c. Minimum of 700 square feet on main floor
- d. Reduce potential density bonus to 1.75
- e. Maximum of 8 units per development
- f. Limit parking and community buildings to 18 feet in height

- g. Cottage entry toward streets and minimum 40 feet width of common open space
- h. Borders of private open space not to exceed 2 feet in height
- i. Increase parking to 2 per unit plus guest parking; 50% of parking to be in garages
- j. Use of architectural screens rather than solid board fences

He concluded that the Greenwood Cottages would be the only development in Shoreline that would meet the requirements under the proposed amendments.

### III. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING COTTAGE HOUSING

David Harris, Planning Commission Chair, also provided some background on the evolution of cottage housing issues in Shoreline. He pointed out that a Commission vote to repeal the cottage housing ordinance failed by a vote of 4-4, although this should not be interpreted that there is significant opposition to cottage housing. Most Commissioners agree with the cottage housing concept and believe the amendments will help cottages fit into the communities. He said the strategy should be to address all forms of housing, and cottages are considered one element. He said while the Commission doubts the proposed amendments will resolve all concerns, it concurred that the City should adopt an overall housing strategy. He noted that the Planning Commission does not feel these amendments are necessarily urgent, since cottages are not critical to the Growth Management Act (GMA) housing target numbers. Mr. Harris affirmed Councilmember Fimia's clarification that some people oppose cottage housing in single-family residential areas.

### IV. ROUNDTABLE DIALOGUE WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Mayor Hansen invited community members to the table in groups to comment on cottage housing.

Councilmember Fimia noted that newly elected Council members Cindy Ryu, Janet Way, and Keith McGlashan were in attendance in the audience.

(a) David Fagerstrom, Shoreline, noted there have been discussions in the past about funding trusts for achieving affordable ownership of housing. However, cottage housing is not affordable housing. He urged the Council to consider making affordable housing a part of the overall housing strategy.

Commissioner McClelland noted that while cottage housing is an opportunity to provide a choice of smaller houses, it was never intended to meet the definition of affordable housing. She felt there has been a general misunderstanding of this issue. The City has been trying to meet its GMA housing targets, which are separate from affordable housing goals. She agreed there should be an overall housing strategy and an inventory of housing so the City can get a better understanding of the housing supply.

Mr. Fagerstrom discussed the potential of achieving GMA goals and affordable housing through purchasing density compliance credits from other jurisdictions that exceed their infill requirements. He said a strategy to create low-income housing would be “great,” but it would require a community commitment to build trust funds so people could afford the down payment. He reiterated the need to make affordability an element of the overall financial plan.

Mr. Kuboi suggested that each member of the community have an opportunity to speak before engaging in dialogue with individual citizens.

(b) David Matthews, Shoreline, neighbor of the Greenwood Avenue Cottages, urged the Council to support the proposed amendments. He quoted that “the only thing people hate worse than urban sprawl is density.” He asked the Council not to “trash” the whole idea but to encourage developers to build like the Greenwood Cottages, which are well-designed and fit the neighborhood.

(c) Jim Soules, Seattle, developer of the Greenwood Avenue Cottages, said building smaller homes on smaller lots is an idea dating back to the 1920’s and 1930’s. He said the changing demographics have increased the demand for cottage housing, since 60% of U.S. households today have only one or two persons. Cottage housing customers are typically people looking for a smaller home that is more environmentally sensitive and more befitting their lifestyle. He commented on the smaller lot sizes in the Seattle neighborhoods of Queen Anne, Ravenna, and Capitol Hill. He noted that Redmond, Kirkland, and Olympia have made cottage housing work and Mercer Island, Spokane, and Normandy Park are in the process of adopting a cottage code. He acknowledged that other projects in Shoreline have not been successful but the Council should try to improve its code and make it work. Mr. Soules provided a copy of his recommendations to the Councilmembers and Commissioners at the beginning of the meeting.

(d) Mike Nelson, Shoreline, resident of the Greenwood Cottages, felt the City should be more concerned with the texture and diversity of housing, noting that the community is not a “monolith.” Cottage housing intermixes with other buildings and structures and adds to that community texture. He said Shoreline residents want more pedestrian-friendly opportunities, and the only way to achieve it is to have a little more density “here and there.” He said he was attracted to the cottages because they fit his lifestyle and they create a sense of community. He said the neighbors gather for weekly events and watch each other’s homes while on vacation. He said the community that is created by well-designed cottage housing is so powerful that it has attracted people from across the nation.

(e) Darlene Feikema, Shoreline, resident of the Greenwood Cottages, said the cottages appealed to her because of the close community feeling they create. She said it is a special type of housing that addresses the needs of single women, and she does not want others to lose this important housing choice. She said cottage housing is not for everyone, but neither is any other kind of housing. She felt there should be a continuum

of housing where people can make a choice and select what fits their lifestyle. She noted that cottages fit in much better than some other options, noting that four large mansions could have been built in place of the Greenwood Cottages. Referring to a newspaper article, she contended that the special characteristics of cottage housing meet the community and security needs of women. She urged the Council to adopt the proposed amendments and maintain cottage housing in Shoreline.

(f) Brian Ducey, Shoreline, resident of the Greenwood Cottages, felt the City should address the housing needs of the older demographic, who desire housing choices that differ from the type of homes in which they were raised. He urged the Council to consider the proposed changes and make affordable living still available in a context the community can accept. He said despite the anger over poorly-designed cottage housing units, the community needs to “get over what has been done” and do what is needed to lift the moratorium.

Mayor Hansen stated that although cottage housing is not considered affordable housing in the traditional sense, it is more affordable than what it is competing against.

(g) John Bulman, Shoreline, commented that the Reserves cottage housing development does not fit that neighborhood, which is surrounded with more expensive homes. He described the poor design and lack of sidewalks and parking, noting that cars will park outside the development due to the lack of space. He expressed disappointment with the overall development, noting that it is not “high-quality infill.” He said only one out of 11 developments in Shoreline has been successful, so he would give cottage housing in Shoreline “a failing grade.” He felt the burden should be placed on the City to ensure quality rather than having developers “come in and see what they can get away with.” He said developers negotiate for the least amount in order to make it as highly profitable as they can. He said the Planning Commission must consider how to make houses fit into the neighborhoods.

(h) Mark Deutsch, Shoreline, expressed support for the proposed amendments and for cottage housing in general. He said the recent changes to the Comprehensive Plan have addressed the issue related to the zones in which cottage housing should be located. He felt the Planning Commission made its best effort to amend the ordinance so that future cottage developments meet high standards. He said it is probably not possible to identify all the needed amendments, so the best approach is to take the best guess and move forward. He advised that before making a final decision, the City should compare its ordinance with other cities that seem to have had more success with cottage housing. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan is a policy statement for housing, if not a strategy, and that the Council has expressed interest in considering affordable housing next year. Since Shoreline is an infill City and not a developing city like Kent or others, cottage housing will not make a significant difference in the overall housing makeup. He commented on the mix of new development going on in the City, noting that cottage housing is only one of many types. He said it makes sense for cottage housing to be a choice in Shoreline, so the City should figure out what provides the kind of quality development we know is possible.

Commissioner Kuboi wondered if people were attracted to cottage housing because they are actively seeking a sense of community, or if it results from living in a cottage housing setting.

Mr. Soules responded that cottage home buyers are a socially and environmentally conscious group looking for this type of product. They are often people who think about sustainability and energy conservation.

Councilmember Fimia said the real “sticking point” for most people seems to be the issue of allowing more houses on a plat than the underlying zoning. She asked Mr. Soules how other cities are addressing this issue and if it is economically feasible to build cottage homes without providing a bonus density.

Mr. Soules said other cities think of cottage housing in terms of “equivalent density,” meaning that the number of units increases but the number of people remain about the same. He suggested that Shoreline conduct a survey to find out how many people live in its cottage housing developments, noting that 11 permanent residents live in the 8 cottages on Greenwood Avenue. He did not consider people density to be the primary objection to cottage housing. He explained that other cities treat cottage zoning in the same way that Shoreline does – as an overlay or bonus density. He noted that Redmond has identified three different alternatives for cottage housing, and it is adopting cottage housing by neighborhood plan, not on a citywide basis. He said Redmond and Kirkland have a stronger sense of design review at the staff level, and perhaps this is what should be done in Shoreline.

Continuing, Mr. Soules explained that cottage housing provides a detached housing choice for those who still want the single-family neighborhood experience. He explained the economics of the cottage housing industry and the value of land versus home ratio. He said cottage housing costs more per square foot because of the cost of land. He noted that that undeveloped lot in the City of Kirkland cost around \$300,000, and Shoreline’s land values could be similar. With a 2.0 cottage housing bonus density ratio, the land component alone for a cottage home on a \$300,000 parcel could be \$150,000. With offsite development costs, the cost per unit could reach \$300,000. He said the goal is to achieve high quality in a smaller space, but some developments have not achieved this goal.

(i) Tim Carroll, Shoreline, said the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue development is a stark contrast to surrounding residences, and he was shocked at what these developments would mean every 1,000 feet in Shoreline. He said in new neighborhoods cottage housing might work, but Shoreline residents are “set in their ways” and everybody has built their economic futures around zoning. While a compatibility test might control some problems, he felt that Shoreline is not the right place for cottage housing. He urged the Council to carefully consider the proposed amendments and the issue of compatibility.

Ms. Feikema addressed the issue of demand, noting that some people decided to buy cottage homes before even coming to Shoreline to see them.

Councilmember Gustafson asked for the rationale behind Mr. Soules' written recommendations.

Mayor Hansen reminded the group that there may be other citizens who wish to speak.

(j) Christina Spencer, Shoreline, asked for clarification of Amendment B, the limitation on building 8 cottages within 1,000 feet from any point. She wondered if this would allow building 8 cottages for every ten lots (the lots having approximately 100 linear feet on one side). She felt cottage homes thus far have not been compatible with existing neighborhoods, and this 1,000 foot rule would create a lot more density.

Commissioner Broili said he understood Amendment B would actually provide for a distance of 2,000 feet separating different cottage housing developments.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen pointed out that one would have to have over two contiguous 7,200 square-foot, single-family lots in order to build the minimum required number of four cottage houses under the proposed 1.75 bonus density.

Ms. Spencer said the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue cottages are "a travesty and an eyesore" and the parking garages are inadequate. She said she never received notification of a land use action for that site. She said her property lies between the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue cottages and the other site that was proposed for 16 cottages, so if not for the moratorium, she could have been surrounded by 21 cottages. She said Shoreline does not have a good record of proving compatibility, and these homes are far from compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen noted that another property on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue with very small lots sizes was developed early in the City's history. He wondered how people responded to this development in terms of design, setbacks, massing, and parking issues.

Mr. Carroll said that development had a fair amount of resistance, but in the end it was accepted. He emphasized that this development is very different from the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue cottages, since one is infill under R-4 or R-6 zoning and the other is a conditional use permit that changes the character of a community.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen pointed out that minimum lot sizes have increased; first from 2,500 square feet, then to 5,000 square feet, and then to the current 7,200 square feet. He wondered how people were responding to the change in lot size. He felt that although design review can cause a lot of "headaches" and added expenditures, it might be a way to address the issues of quality and compatibility and allow cottage housing to move forward. He said he has always had difficulty resolving the issue of setbacks and the relationship of front yards to side and backyards, but he felt this is an important factor in the debate on cottage housing. He said he appreciates Mr. Soules' recommendation on

the reduction in base height to 15 feet, but he would also like some discussion about what constitutes reasonable setbacks.

There was brief discussion about subjectivity and the difficulty of determining compatibility since everyone has different preferences and opinions.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said it would be preferable for people to know what types of development are allowed in a given zone.

Mr. Soules said one of his recommendations is that a cottage housing developer must submit a plan for what types of conventional development could take place, in addition to a cottage housing plan. He noted that the Meridian Cottages are so dense because it was built in an R-8 zone when the bonus density was doubled. Traditional development would allow for up to eight homes on the same parcel.

(k) Randy Hughes, Shoreline, asked for clarification of the proposal to limit development of 8 cottages within 1,000 feet from any point. He said many people have understood the proposal to mean that cottage housing developments could be within 1,000 feet of each other. He asked staff to clarify for the Council, Commission, and audience if the distance is actually 2,000 feet between cottage housing developments.

Mayor Hansen clarified that the recommendation is to limit cottage housing developments to 8 cottages within 1,000 feet from any point. The Planning Commission's intent was that there would be 1,000-foot radius circles, and circles would not be allowed to intersect. This means that there would effectively be 2,000 linear feet between any two developments.

Mr. Hughes felt this should be clarified in writing so people have a chance to study and consider it. He said this clarification might make a difference in the outcome on cottage housing.

Commissioner Broili said it sounds as if Mr. Hughes would be amenable to cottage housing if the City can come up with a solution to meet his needs. He said he would like to find a way to meet the community's needs and the needs of cottage housing.

Mr. Hughes said the Council and Planning Commission have a duty to clarify to the public, since there has been so much confusion surrounding the 1,000-foot rule. He said people wouldn't be fighting it so hard if the City had clarified its position earlier.

Mayor Hansen clarified that there is no 1,000-foot rule, only a recommendation at this point.

Mr. Fagerstrom said he likes the idea of addressing quality through design review, but he fears it means different things to different people. He favored a design review process that includes the public, City staff, and professionals in determining what compatibility means.

(l) Peter Agnos, Shoreline, concurred with the previous speaker, noting that the public has not had much opportunity to provide input. He questioned whether Planning Commission members were Shoreline residents, and suggested that cottage housing would fail if put to a public vote. He said the City is asking citizens to accept amendments for something it doesn't want in the first place. He said if the City wants cottage housing to be compatible, then it should "have an open meeting and let us participate." He felt the public should be directly involved in the design review. He also felt the City should be more proactive, noting that people are frustrated because they feel they have no voice. He said they would likely accept some type of cottage housing if they had a voice in the matter.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen clarified that residing in Shoreline is a prerequisite for serving on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner McClelland pointed out that hundreds of hours have been spent in open public meetings and public hearings debating the issue of cottage housing. She said there have been many opportunities for the public to get involved and voice their opinions. She said this is evidenced by the fact that the people present tonight already know each other.

Mr. Agnos noted that there is a great deal of misinformation in the public because people get their information secondhand. He said people generally do not get involved directly, pointing out that only a few of the 55,000 Shoreline residents have attended this meeting tonight.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that citizens share the burden of disseminating accurate information by correcting misstatements and encouraging people to attend public meetings.

Mr. Agnos advised that the people most directly impacted by cottage housing would be the best candidates for getting the community involved in the discussion.

(m) Jean King, Shoreline, said she never knew anything about cottage homes until she got a letter asking that she sell her home so they could build a new cottage housing development. She said this request offended her, adding that cottage housing does not fit into single family neighborhoods. She said she does not want cottages next to her or on busy streets with traffic and school children.

Mayor Hansen noted that people seeking property make offers on homes from time to time, but people do not have to sell to them.

(n) Paul Tychsen, Shoreline, said he has never received a good answer to the question of why the underlying zoning in single-family neighborhoods can be doubled under the cottage housing provision. He said it is not fair that a builder can come into Shoreline, fill out a simple checklist, and automatically double the density from the standard listed zoning. He said there is also not a good answer to the question of why cottage housing can't be done in higher density zones where it's more appropriate and



feasible. He said some cottage housing projects represent a stark contrast to the character of well-established neighborhoods, and many people oppose them on this basis. He said the projects have not even come close to meeting the standard that they be compatible with the existing neighborhood.

Chair Harris said the cottage housing bonus density does not change the underlying zoning; it is an allowance for increasing the density if it meets the design requirements in the code.

Mayor Hansen left the meeting at 8:34 p.m.

(o) Martin Kral, Shoreline, said he lives in close proximity to the Meridian Park Cottages and the Ashworth Avenue Cottages. He said he argued strenuously against having two lots joined which eventually formed the Meridian Park Cottages because he felt it would not fit the aims of the cottage housing ordinance. He said both developments have many inadequacies that still need to be corrected, pointing out that three of the Ashworth Avenue homes are still for sale. He said he argued that cottage housing should be removed from possible R-6 zoning uses because it impacts single-family neighborhoods. He felt the Council and Commission should consider locating cottage housing exclusively in higher density neighborhoods. He clarified for Chair Harris that he is in favor of restricting cottage housing to multi-family residential zones.

Mr. Nelson felt the debate was not so much about density but about “ugliness moving in next door.” He said there is poorly designed housing everywhere, whether it’s cottage housing or conventional development, so the focus should be put on how to execute quality developments. He said focusing only on cottage housing and trying to force density into multi-family housing zones will impact the diversity of housing. He said the community would lose texture and diversity and become “ghettoized” if cottage housing is forced into small parts of the City. He concluded that Shoreline residents want to see good housing developments no matter what the type.

There was a question of whether the current proposal allows cottage housing in R-8 zones. Chair Harris clarified that it did, but the open space and separation requirements would probably nullify the ability to make cottages feasible in R-8 zones.

Councilmember Fimia said the issue would likely come down to design review and neighborhood planning, since it seems neighborhood planning made the difference in other cities. She felt the discussion should hereafter be in the context of neighborhood plans. She asked if it is economically feasible to build 8 cottage homes in an R-8 zone.

Mr. Soules explained that under such a scenario, the property would have a higher cost-per-square-foot value. So it is not economical because the cost per unit of land and improvements would be higher.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen said the generally accepted rule for land-to-home value is 1:2; so on a \$300,000 parcel, the value of the house should be \$600,000 for a total

land/improvement of \$900,000. If the lot can be divided, it brings the individual lot price down to \$150,000. He said this is why it becomes economically feasible to build more smaller houses versus fewer large houses.

Councilmember Fimia wondered if cities subsidize land and if tax incentives are feasible way to move forward.

Mr. Soules replied that cities do not generally subsidize the land unless they are pursuing some kind of affordable housing goal. He added that tax incentives are too complicated to administer. He pointed out that Kirkland and Mercer Island's restrictions on how much area a home can occupy on a lot was the result of the neighborhood planning process. In those cases, there was backlash against building larger homes on smaller lots. He affirmed that these have not been challenged in court.

Councilmember Ransom pointed out that cottage housing has not only been a major issue for the past two years but also in the recent election. He expressed the point that cottage housing is multi-family housing and should be considered like apartments or condominiums, which really means restricting them to an R-12 zone. He disagreed with the estimate that Shoreline lots cost upwards of \$300,000, noting that lots on the east side of I-5 can range from \$100,000-\$120,000. He noted that people would have the right to appeal cottage housing if it were restricted to higher density zones. He felt the Planning Commission should consider the fact that the last election was very clear there are not four votes on the City Council to keep the cottage housing code.

Deputy Mayor Jepsen emphasized the importance of discussing the issues and gathering information rather than projecting what future Councils might do.

Commissioner Broili said the role of the Planning Commission is to consider testimony, look at evidence and the City code and make recommendations to the City Council without thinking about Council's directives. He went on to explain the environmental and sociological reasons he supports the cottage housing concept. He said over the past 50 years the average household size has decreased while house size has increased, all while cities struggle to accommodate more density. He said it makes sense to consider ways to reduce the size of homes so they are more in line with the available land mass that serves a given population. He alluded to a number of newspaper articles commenting on the lack of housing choices for senior citizens and other demographics. He concluded that the objection is not cottage housing itself, but the way it's being done. He felt the community's needs could be met through design review and the proposed amendments.

Commissioner McClelland pointed out that many people have large enough parcels to add density through accessory dwellings and other means without the cottage housing ordinance. She said the opportunity to create equivalent density by having a couple more people living in the same space without greater environmental impact seems like a reasonable concept, but perhaps Shoreline is not ready for it yet. She agreed that the design of the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue development has been a "travesty," but focusing entirely on

compatibility does not address the housing needs of Shoreline's changing demographics. She said when we overlook the social impact of providing a housing alternative such as this simply for the sake of appearance, then we're losing something in the process. She encouraged everyone to think about their personal and social values and how they feel about their neighbors and community.

Commissioner Kuboi said the 1,000 square-foot size restriction on cottages has been a recurring theme in Planning Commission meetings, which he felt to be the biggest single element of the compatibility question. He asked if building 1,200-1,500 square-foot cottages would be feasible, or if there would be a size between 1,000-2,000 square feet that people would find more amenable.

Mr. Soules explained that single adults and couples have always been the target market for cottage housing, and good designs can be achieved in a 1,000 square-foot plan. He said this target market starts to get lost as cottages get bigger. He said other cities such as Kirkland have built a variety of sizes of cottage housing simply because they were looking for more diversity in housing types. He said Kirkland plans to do a mail survey of all residents within 1,000 feet of cottage housing developments to gauge public opinion.

Commissioner Phisuthikul expressed the view that cottage housing provides a needed housing choice for Shoreline. He felt the proposed 1.75 density bonus would make cottage housing more acceptable, noting that the bonus density is a privilege for developers who demonstrate that additional density can be achieved without adverse impacts. He said this privilege must be earned through quality and design, which is what the proposed amendments try to achieve.

Councilmember Gustafson thanked everyone who participated in the forum, particularly members of the Planning Commission, who have spent so much time and effort on cottage housing. He thanked Mr. Soules for providing specific recommendations. He said he continues to have an open mind and still has to study the issues.

Chair Harris said he has enjoyed talking to different people about this issue. He pointed out that every neighborhood has unattractive and dilapidated housing, yet people are quick to criticize a few houses because they do not fit their definition of "compatible." Since Shoreline is an infill community, he advised that the City think about how it wants to guide neighborhood redevelopment in the future. He said Shoreline needs a variety of small, medium, and large houses, so he is an advocate of housing for everyone.

(p) Janet Way, Shoreline, thanked everyone for their efforts on what has been a difficult issue. She said while she views cottage housing as a good concept in general, she wondered how cottage housing would help the City achieve its GMA targets of accommodating more population density. She noted that Mr. Soules mentioned that some cottage housing developments actually result in less density than would have otherwise resulted from conventional development.

Mr. Soules said the density could either be more people or more dwelling units. He said cottage housing aims to provide more dwelling units without any greater impacts.

Commissioner McClelland clarified that the GMA goal is number of households, not necessarily number of people.

V. SUMMING UP-NEXT STEPS

Mr. Cohen outlined the next steps for the cottage housing debate. On January 23 the City Council will hold a public hearing, with possible action planned for the following weeks. He noted that the current moratorium expires February 19, 2006. He encouraged citizens to review the packet of materials they received and provide input.

Mr. Olander encouraged the community to provide any additional written comments or voicemail messages to the City Council and City Manager's office prior to January 23.

On behalf of the Council and Planning Commission, Deputy Mayor Jepsen thanked all participants and members of the audience for donating their time and effort to this issue.

Councilmember Fimia said she intends to propose the formation of a smaller workgroup to refine any proposals to see if some consensus can be reached before a package is forwarded to the Council.

VI. ADJOURN

Deputy Mayor Jepsen declared the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

---

Scott Passey, City Clerk