

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Adoption of Ordinance No. 482, Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan Amendment and repeal elements of the Central Shoreline Plan Report in the Comprehensive Plan
DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services
PRESENTED BY: Joe Tovar, PADS Director
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner

ISSUE STATEMENT:

By State law, an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan can only be made once a year unless it is a subarea plan. Subarea plans may be used to respond to changing conditions or needs of the City and should never be out of conformity with the Comprehensive Plan.

Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan is a small, initial step to establish a study area boundary, adopt five framework policies to guide work on Phase 2, and repeal Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report elements of the Comprehensive Plan in view of the Council's recently adopted preference for the "Flexible Alternative" for the Aurora Project.

The study area map does not establish or change zoning boundaries. It is to identify an area where nearby residents and property owners might have a greater interest in being involved in the discussion of future land use rules governing projects along Aurora or Midvale Ave N.

The Central Shoreline Subarea Plan elements adopted by the Comprehensive Plan includes the future right-of-way alignment for the Aurora Corridor. It is in conflict with the Council adopted preference for the "Flexible Alternative" (Attachment A) within the Town Center study area.

Phase 2 of the Town Center Subarea Plan will include actions consistent with the framework policies, establish specific standards addressing building height and land uses, and identify appropriate improvements for a "heritage park", Midvale Ave N., and area walkways. A public process for Phase 2 will begin in late 2007.

An public hearing was conducted before the Planning Commission September 1, 2007. The Planning Commission completed its Findings and Determination (Attachment B) to Council on the proposed amendment September 19th, 2007.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

The following options are within Council's discretion and have been analyzed by staff:

- 1) Adopt the Planning Commission's and Staff's recommendation for Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Modify the Planning Commission's and Staff's recommendation for Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan in the Comprehensive Plan.
- 3) Remand the amendment and repeal back to the Planning Commission for additional review.
- 4) Repeal Appendix 5 and remand the Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan amendment.
- 4) Deny the amendment and repeal recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:


If repeal of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan elements is delayed then the Aurora Corridor improvement project will be slowed (construction and Right-of-way costs continue to go up) and potentially jeopardize grant funds. The amendment of Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan will not have direct financial impacts to the City.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt Ordinance No.482, approving the Town Center Subarea Plan and repealing elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report in the Comprehensive Plan.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



INTRODUCTION

The recommendation before Council is a request to include Phase 1 amendment to the Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal adopted elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report.

A public hearing before the Planning Commission occurred on September 19, 2007. The Planning Commission Findings and Determination are included in Attachment B.

The Planning Commission recommended that the amendment be approved with an added policy to development a vision for the Town Center and to extend the study area north to N.192nd St. The draft minutes of the public hearing are included in Attachment D.

BACKGROUND

In 1998 the City of Shoreline adopted its first Comprehensive Plan. In 2005 the City Council amended the plan with the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report Appendix and the Central Shoreline Right-of-Way maps (Appendix 5) that delineate the improved Aurora's alignment and future, maximum right-of-way. That alignment conflicts with the Council's recently approved "Flexible Alternative" plan as it passes through the Town Center Subarea Plan (Attachment A).

The Council also adopted strategic principles for the Town Center Subarea Plan in Resolution 263 to be used in advance of projects that are already occurring in the study area to ensure consistency and guidance for interim development.

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are processed as legislative decisions. Legislative decisions are non-project decisions made by the City Council under its authority to establish policies and regulations. The Planning Commission is the review authority for legislative decisions and is responsible for holding a public hearing on the official docket of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and making a recommendation to the City Council on each amendment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The City received six public comments at the Planning Commission hearing on September 19, 2007. The Planning Commission addressed the comments in its Findings and Determination (Attachment B).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City issued a SEPA Determination of Non-significance October 4, 2007 for Phase 1. City staff anticipates a more extensive environmental review during the Phase 2 amendment process if land use, development standards, traffic, neighborhoods, etc. are significantly changed.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

Amend the Comprehensive Plan to add Phase 1-Town Center Subarea Plan.

Planning Commission in its Findings and Determination found that the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan has been evaluated and found to be consistent with the amendment criteria, listed below, provided in Section 20.30.340(B) of the Development Code.

1. The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, and the other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and City policies; or
2. The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a sub area plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan; or
3. The amendment will benefit the community as a whole, will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety or general welfare.

OPTIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL

The options available to the City Council are:

- 1) Adopt the Planning Commission's and Staff's recommendation for Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Modify the Planning Commission's and Staff's recommendation for Phase 1 – Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Remand the amendment and repeal back to the Planning Commission for additional review.
- 3) Deny the amendment and repeal recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt Ordinance No.482, approving the Town Center Subarea Plan and repealing of elements of the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report of the Comprehensive Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: Resolution No. 263 adopting Aurora Corridor Flexible Alternative
Attachment B: Planning Commission Findings and Determination
Attachment C: Ordinance No. 482
Attachment D: Planning Commission Minutes- September 19, 2007

RESOLUTION NO. 263

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, ADOPTING THE DRAFT RECOMMENDED FLEXIBLE ALTERNATIVE AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE AURORA CORRIDOR PROJECT N 165TH – 205TH, ADOPTING IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES FOR THE AURORA CORRIDOR PROJECT N 165TH – 205TH AND DIRECTING STAFF TO PROCEED WITH COMPLETION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

WHEREAS on August 23, 1999 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 156 which provided for 32 specific points to guide the design and implementation of the Aurora Corridor Project; and

WHEREAS staff and the Aurora Business and Community Team have reviewed these 32 points (hereafter "Implementation Strategies") and identified needed updates to the Implementation Strategies; and

WHEREAS three build alternatives and one do nothing alternative have been developed for the Aurora Corridor Project 165TH – 205TH and preliminary environmental analysis and mitigation measures have been developed for these alternatives; and

WHEREAS public open house meetings were held on November 30, 2006 and December 6, 2006 to review the three build alternatives and a public open house was held June 20, 2007 to review the three build alternatives, the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative and the Implementation Strategies; and

WHEREAS the Aurora Business and Community Team evaluated and provided input on the three build alternatives, the do nothing alternative, the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative, and the Implementation Strategies; and

WHEREAS the City conducted a public hearing on July 16, 2007 on the three build alternatives, the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative, and the updated Implementation Strategies; and

WHEREAS public involvement and review of the project, alternatives, and Strategies has been extensive and adequate to ensure a substantial relationship to the public interest, health, safety and welfare; and

WHEREAS the preliminary environmental analysis addressed a reasonable range of alternatives including a no action alternative that accomplishes the purpose and need for the project; and

WHEREAS in order to implement this project environmental analysis must be completed; and

WHEREAS the updated Implementation Strategies will provide project flexibility; and direction through the design, right of way acquisition and construction phases of the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON, HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

- A. Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative Adopted. The Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative, filed with the City Clerk's Office under Clerk's Receiving No. 4393, is adopted as the Preferred Alternative to carry through the environmental process.
- B. Implementation Strategies Updated. The Implementation Strategies, filed with the City Clerk's Office under Clerk's Receiving No. 4394, are updated to guide the design and implementation of the project.
- C. Environmental Review. Council hereby directs staff to proceed with completion of the environmental analysis.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THIS 23rd DAY OF JULY, 2007.

Robert L. Ransom, Mayor

ATTEST:

Scott Passey
City Clerk

**CITY OF SHORELINE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

PROJECT INFORMATION SUMMARY

Project Description: Amend the Comprehensive Plan to include Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal Central Shoreline Right-of-Way maps.

Project Area: Between N.170th St. and N.192nd St. and between Ashworth Ave. N. and Fremont Ave. N.

SEPA Threshold: Determination of Non-Significance (DNS)

Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval to the Comprehensive Plan amendment of Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Proposal

1. Phase 1 is a small, initial step to establish a study area boundary (Attachment 1), adopt several framework policies (Attachment 2) to guide work on Phase 2, and repeal outdated policies in view of the Council's recently adopted preference for the "Flexible Alternative" for the Aurora Project.
2. The study area map does not establish or change zoning boundaries. It is to identify an area where nearby residents and property owners might have a greater interest in being involved in the discussion of future land use.
3. Appendix 5 is the future right-of-way alignment for the Central Shoreline Subarea of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in conflict with the Council adopted preference for the "Flexible Alternative" within the Town Center study area.
4. Phase 2 of the Town Center Subarea Plan will include actions consistent with the framework policies, establish specific standards addressing building height and lands uses, and identify appropriate improvements for heritage park, Midvale Ave N., and area walkways. A public process for Phase 2 will begin in late 2007.
5. Notice of an open record hearing was publicized September 4, 2007. An open record public hearing was held by the Planning Commission for the City of Shoreline on September 19, 2007.

6. The City's Director, Joe Tovar and Senior Planner, Paul Cohen have reviewed the proposal and recommend approval of the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations

Land use designations in Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan remain unchanged.

Current Zoning

Zoning designations remain unchanged in Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Criteria

1. The amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and not inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, and the other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and City policies.

The amendment of Phase 1 does not propose changes that will affect the Growth Management Act or inconsistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, and the other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and City policies because it only establishes a study area and 5 framework policies to guide the development a Phase 2.

2. Consistency with these documents will be evaluated during the development of Phase 2.
2. The amendment addresses changing circumstances, changing community values, incorporates a subarea plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision or corrects information contained in the Comprehensive Plan.

The amendment addresses the changing circumstances and values of the community to develop a complete Town Center Subarea Plan and corrects the Aurora Corridor Plan - Appendix 5 because of its inconsistency with the Council's preferred "flexible alternative" for the Aurora Corridor.

3. The amendment will benefit the community as a whole, will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety, and general welfare.

The amendment does not establish land use, program, or regulatory changes that would adversely affect the community.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Planning Commission recommended the following changes to the staff proposal:

- Add a Framework Policy 1 to develop a vision for Town Center prior to the development of the Phase 2.
 - Clarify Framework Policy 3 to distinguish “heritage park” and Midvale Avenue N. designs.
 - Extend the Study Area boundary north to N. 192nd St.
2. The notice and meeting requirements set out in SMC 20.30 for a Type L action have all been met in this case.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the amendment of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan with Phase 1 of the Town Center Subarea Plan and repeal Appendix 5 – Central Shoreline Right-of-Way maps.

Date: _____

By: _____
Planning Commission Chair

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1- Study Area Map
Attachment 2- Framework Policies

ORDINANCE NO. 482**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON AMENDING THE CENTRAL SUBAREA PLAN PROVISIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; AND AMENDING ORDINANCE 326, EXHIBIT A AND REPEALING APPENDICES 1 AND 3 OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

WHEREAS, the City Council passed elements of the Central Subarea Plan in Ordinance No. 326 in July, 2003 adding a northern and southern boundary of the Central Subarea and Policy T5.1 and Figure T-8 identifying the Central Subarea Future Right-of-Way Needs Maps, consisting of a folio of maps designate the Official Central Subarea Future Right of Way Needs Map, Clerk's Receiving No. 2243; and

WHEREAS, City of Shoreline passed Resolution 263 in July 2007 adopting a Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative, Clerks Receiving No. 4393, as a preferred alternative for environmental review of the Aurora Avenue Project; and

WHEREAS, the Flexible Alternative is inconsistent with the Central Subarea Right of Way Needs Map and the map should be repealed to reflect the adopted change in preferred right-of-way design for Aurora Ave. N; and

WHEREAS, the Central Subarea Plan should be redesignated the Town Center Subarea Plan to reflect the recent acquisition of a Civic Center development site at N 175th St. and Midvale Ave. N., and a study area for the subarea should be delineated with east and west boundaries and extended south to N. 170th St.; and

WHEREAS, the new Town Center Subarea Plan should be developed following certain framework policies; now therefore

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Town Center Subarea Plan Adopted. A new Town Center Subarea Plan is adopted as Appendix 5 to the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan to read as follows:

FRAMEWORK POLICIES FOR THE TOWN CENTER SUBAREA PLAN

The following policies establish the framework for development of the land use, capital facility and programmatic aspects of the Town Center Subarea Plan.

FW-1 Articulate a community vision for the town center as an early step in the development of detailed provisions for the subarea.

FW-2 Establish a study area boundary (Figure 1) to provide context for evaluating the opportunities and potential impacts from future development of commercial and mixed uses along Aurora Ave. N.


FW-3 Engage Shoreline residents and businesses in detailed design processes for a) a park site on both sides of the Interurban Trail and b) Midvale Ave N.

FW-4 Design roadway, transit and pedestrian facilities consistent with the City's preferred "Flexible alternative" for Aurora Avenue between N. 165th St. and N. 205th St.

FW-5 Prepare a program of civic directional or 'way finding' signage and evaluate refinements to city sign regulations to reflect the emerging function and visual character of Aurora Avenue.

FIG. 1 STUDY AREA

Phase 1 – STUDY AREA



Section 3. Repeal. Ordinance 326 Exhibit A is repealed in its entirety.

Section 4. Repeal. City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan Appendix 1, *Central Shoreline Subarea Plan Report* and Appendix 5 *Aurora Corridor Right-of-way Plan* are each repealed in their entirety.

Section 5 Publication, Effective Date . A summary of this ordinance consisting of the title shall be published in the official newspaper and the ordinance shall take effect five days after passage and publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON October 22, 2007.

Mayor Robert Ransom

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Scott Passey
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of publication: , 2007
Effective date: , 2007

DRAFT

These Minutes Subject to
October 18th Approval

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

September 19, 2007
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Spartan Room

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Chair Piro
Vice Chair Kuboi
Commissioner Wagner
Commissioner Phisuthikul
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Hall

STAFF PRESENT

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Kirk McKinley, Aurora And Interurban Project Manager
Alicia Sherman, Senior Planner
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Commissioner Pyle
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner McClelland

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Piro called the special meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Piro, Vice Chair Kuboi, Commissioners Wagner, Phisuthikul, Harris, and Hall. Commissioners Pyle, McClelland and Broili were excused.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Commission accepted the agenda as proposed.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tovar reported that the Hearing Examiner rejected an appeal by residents in the Richmond Beach Neighborhood regarding a short plat the City approved in their area. The appellants expressed their concern that the short plat would allow buildings that were too large for the neighborhood. Much

information was submitted by the appellants to support their contention that the floor ratio of the new homes would be greater than the homes that have historically been built in the neighborhood. The short plat can now move forward. He suggested that rather than asking staff to use their limited or non-existent authority to limit the size of buildings in residential zones as part of the short plat process, the issue could be more appropriately be addressed by requesting the City conduct an exclusive review of the regulations that apply in residential zones.

Mr. Tovar further reported that neighbors of a proposal for a development of seven homes in the Highland Terrace Neighborhood recently attended a City Council meeting to voice their concerns. He noted that the applicant conducted a pre-application neighborhood meeting to describe the proposed project. During the meeting, he used the term "air condo," which created some concern amongst the neighbors. Staff has been asked to research the concept further in an effort to address some of the concerns that have been raised.

Mr. Tovar emphasized that both topics on the agenda relate to properties that are zoned either commercial or mixed-use, and not properties that are zoned single-family. However, they are adjacent to lands that are zoned single-family so the relationship between the commercial, multi-family and mixed use components of those neighborhoods to the single-family neighborhoods that lie adjacent to them is an issue that must be considered. Mr. Tovar cautioned that when looking for opportunities for accommodating growth and housing in the future, the City should primarily focus on properties other than those zoned single-family residential.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 6, 2007 minutes were approved as corrected.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Virginia Paulsen, Shoreline, noted that numerous multi-family residential units are being constructed in the City, particularly on 15th Avenue Northeast between Northeast 170th to 205th Streets. She urged the Commission to carefully review the Transportation Master Plan, which includes plans to extend Northeast 165th from 15th Avenue Northeast to 25th Avenue Northeast. It was originally hoped that this proposed new extension would be a means of getting people from the Sheridan Heights and Lake Forest Park areas into the proposed commercial development on 5th Avenue North and Northeast 165th Street. She said her house is four houses from 165th, and she would be opposed to an arterial in this location. She referred to the Ridgcrest Neighborhood Master Plan, which would be considered later on the agenda, and summarized that Shoreline residents are concerned that zoning changes designed to increase density would spoil the single-family neighborhoods.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PHASE 1 – TOWN CENTER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Chair Piro reviewed the rules for the legislative public hearing and briefly explained the process that would be utilized. He opened the public hearing and invited the staff to provide their report.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Tovar recalled that several years ago, the Commission reviewed and recommended approval of a proposal to create a Central Shoreline Subarea Plan. However, the City Council specifically chose not to adopt the plan as part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Instead, it was included in the plan as an unadopted appendix report, but no development regulations were adopted to implement the plan. He referred to recent developments that have occurred along Aurora Avenue North and noted that a number of people correctly expressed concern that these development proposals were not consistent with the concepts discussed in the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan. However, the proposals were consistent with the existing Regional Business zoning, which has been in place since the City incorporated. He advised that if the City wishes to have development occur in a different form, different use mix, or different design standards, etc., they must adopt new regulations to control future development.

Mr. Tovar said the subject of the Town Center Plan would proceed in two phases. Tonight's Phase 1 hearing would be related to the four framework policies for the study area. Phase 2, which would not occur until the end of 2007 or beginning of 2008, would include a more detailed discussion of land use, zoning, design standards, etc. He explained a number of things have happened since the original Central Shoreline Subarea Plan was first discussed. Two commercial projects have been constructed and the final section of the Interurban Trail has been completed, including identification of a potential location and preliminary ideas for a heritage park. In addition, the City Council has adopted Phase 1 of the Aurora Project and given direction to move forward with the flexible alternative for Phases 2 and 3. The City Hall Project is moving along, as well, with a public meeting scheduled for October 2nd; and the City Council adopted 13 Strategic Points to guide future projects in the Town Center area. There is also a greater interest in applying a mixed-use concept in certain areas of the City.

Chair Piro explained that Phase I of the Town Center Subarea Planning Process would include a review of the framework policies, the proposed boundaries, and the right-of-way plan. Mr. Tovar pointed out that while the map provided in the Staff Report identifies all properties within the study area, staff is not proposing to change land use in all areas. Staff's intent was to capture a large enough area to include all lands that are currently zoned commercial and might be appropriate for changes in uses and zoning, as well as the residential neighborhoods that are close enough to be impacted by the changes. It is important for the City to provide adequate notice to all residential property owners who might be impacted by the proposed changes. Mr. Tovar advised that Appendix 5 is a Right-of-Way Map for the Aurora Avenue North Project. He explained that the City Council adopted a preferred alternative for Aurora Avenue North, which is inconsistent with Appendix 5. Staff recommends the map be repealed and that a new map be adopted.

Mr. Cohen introduced himself as the project manager for the Town Center Subarea Plan. He explained that the intent of Phase 1 is to establish the Central Shoreline Subarea Plan in the Comprehensive Plan by developing skeletal framework policies. Most of the specific details would be addressed as part of Phase 2. Mr. Cohen described the study area as a large rectangle, bounded by Fremont Avenue on the west, Ashworth Avenue on the east, North 188th Street on the north, and North 170th Street on the south. He cautioned that the boundaries are very general at this point, and staff is very interesting in hearing from the community about their ideas for the area. They are particularly concerned about the single-family residential neighborhoods and are interested in hearing ideas for how they could interface appropriately with the town center concept.

Mr. Cohen referred to the Framework Policies, which were extracted from the strategic principles identified by the City Council. They represent the minimum of what would be needed to stay ahead of actions the City has already taken for properties near Aurora Avenue and the Interurban Trail. He reviewed each of the policies as follows:

1. *Establish a study area boundary to provide context for evaluating the opportunities and potential impacts from future development of commercial and mixed uses along Aurora Avenue North and Midvale Avenue North.*
2. *Engage Shoreline residents and businesses in detailed design processes for two facilities between North 175th Street and North 185th Street: the “heritage park” site on both sides to the Interurban Trail and Midvale Avenue North.*
3. *Design roadway, transit and pedestrian facilities consistent with the City’s preferred “flexible alternative” for Aurora Avenue between North 165th Street and North 205th Street.*
4. *Prepare a program of civic directional or “wayfinding” signage and evaluate refinements to city sign regulations to reflect the emerging functions and visual character of Aurora Avenue.*

Questions by the Commission to Staff

Commissioner Hall asked staff to share their rationale for cutting off the study area at North 188th Street when there are commercial properties that appear close to redevelopment between there and North 192nd Street. Mr. Cohen explained that the north boundary of the study area was established to include commercial areas that front on the north side of North 185th Street and have some influence with the intersection at North 185th Street and Aurora Avenue North. While the boundary may be greater than it needs to be, staff’s intent was to include all possible areas. However, the Commission should keep in mind that the boundary would likely be refined and changed. He also noted that at the bottom of North 188th Street, the town center area drops off topographically.

Commissioner Phisuthikul referred to Framework Policy 2, which calls for engaging Shoreline residents in detailed design processes. Mr. Cohen clarified that this policy refers to the heritage park site on both sides of the Interurban Trail and Midvale Avenue North. Chair Piro suggested it would be helpful to change the language to make it clear the policy refers only to those two projects. Commissioner Phisuthikul added that the term “facilities” should be changed to “projects.”

Public Testimony or Comment

LaNita Wacker, Shoreline, said she didn’t realize the discussion would be limited to Phase 1 of the project. She indicated her support of the subarea planning concept for the Town Center area. She suggested it would be appropriate for the plan to identify Fremont and Ashworth Avenues one-way southbound and Stone and Lyndon Avenues one-way northbound. Each of these streets could provide rear angle diagonal parking on one side. She pointed out that underdevelopment has recently occurred on Aurora Avenue North, and she suggested it would be appropriate to require a minimum of two or

three stories for all development on Aurora Avenue North. In addition, she said she would like to see some type of taller building on the vacant lot near Spiro's, which could become an anchor retail and commercial tenant. Another tall building could be constructed south of the Aurora Rents property to also serve as another anchor for the subarea plan.

John Behrens, Shoreline, inquired if the City has completed a traffic impact study to determine the impact the proposal would have to the surrounding neighborhoods. He particularly expressed an interest in learning more about the amount of traffic that would be generated on Midvale Avenue and Aurora Avenue North. He recalled that at the first meeting, the City discussed the need to come up with a plan that would allow Midvale Avenue to run through the City Center. He asked if any progress has been made to implement this concept. He also asked if the City has studied the impact Midvale Avenue has had on the Gateway Project. Are people using the street to access the businesses, or just to bypass Aurora Avenue? He also asked if the City has studied the impact the City Hall Project would have on traffic at the intersections of North 175th and Midvale Avenues and North 175th Avenue and Aurora Avenue North.

Mr. Cohen answered that the Environmental Impact Statement that was adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan for this area included a traffic study. However, the study would have to be updated at some point. Chair Piro advised that he served on the Aurora Corridor team. He reported that traffic studies are currently taking place, and the reports should be issued sometime in the fall.

Mr. Behrens asked who would be responsible for paying for the new traffic lights that would be required as additional development occurs in the area. He noted that three new traffic lights have recently been or will be installed in the study area. Mr. McKinley answered that the three traffic signals have been funded by three different sources. The light at Midvale Avenue and North 175th Avenue was paid for by the developer of the TOP Foods Project. The new light that is currently being installed at the intersection of North 185th Street and Midvale Avenue is being funded by the Interurban Trail Project in order to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access. The light that is proposed at North 182nd Street and Aurora Avenue North would be funded as part of the Aurora Project, which gains funding from the State, Federal, County, and City governments.

Kevin Grossman, Shoreline, said the framework policies sound very solid and reasonable. However, he suggested an additional policy be added related to developing a vision for the study area. The established framework policies grew out of the vision of the community for the subarea, but there are other pieces. He suggested the study area be extended to North 192nd Street. He expressed concern that there are tremendous opportunities for redevelopment on properties currently occupied by the park-and-ride, the mattress store, and other large parcels in this area. Chair Piro summarized that Mr. Grossman would like to see the City articulate their vision for the study area as a framework policy.

Mr. Tovar suggested that rather than stating the City's vision for the study area as a framework policy, it might be better to add a framework policy related to developing a vision early in the process. Mr. Grossman agreed that would be helpful so the public could have a clear understanding of what the end product would be.

Boni Biery, Shoreline, said she lives on the northern border of the subarea plan, and she would like it to be extended to North 195th Street. As development has occurred over the past 42 years she has lived in her home, the City has promised traffic changes to address problems. However, nothing has been done to date to limit or reduce the traffic impacts on Firlands Way. She requested information about who the City would notify regarding the proposed changes. Mr. Tovar noted that all of the amendments being considered to date are legislative in nature, which would not require the City to mail out notices. Instead, notices would be published in the local newspaper, CURRENTS, etc. In addition, they would consider the option of using notice board signs and posters throughout the geographic area of the subarea plan. Mr. Cohen encouraged interested citizens to sign up on the City's mailing list. Ms. Biery recommended that notice be provided to all properties within a half mile of the proposed study area.

Bobby Lee Williams, Shoreline, asked if real estate professionals and contractors know that the zoning in the study area might change. He also requested more information about the impacts the proposed changes would have to traffic on Stone Avenue, which is already a busy street. He addition, he inquired regarding the proposed timeline for the project. Mr. Tovar answered that staff would like to study Stone and Lyndon Avenues and their side streets as part of their effort; not because they want to change the land uses on these streets, but because the impacts must be considered if more intense development is allowed on Aurora and Midvale Avenues. Staff intends to discuss these concerns with property owners along the two streets in order to come up with traffic mitigation or changes that could soften the impacts. Chair Piro noted that real estate professionals and developers would be invited to participate in the next phase of the project.

Loren Lango, Shoreline, said he has complained to the City for the past several years regarding the traffic problems on Stone Avenue. Over the past few months, there has been a more than three-fold increase in traffic on the street, including the dump trucks from Sky Nursery and the construction site. The problem is especially bad between 6 and 9 a.m. and 4 and 6 p.m. when everyone is going or coming home from work. He noted that placing the boundary of the study area at North 183rd Street would cut the Sky Nursery property in half. The building area would be inside the study area, and the parking lot and traffic would be on the outside. He agreed with the previous recommendation that the boundary be extended to North 192nd Street. This would allow the City to consider connecting Midvale Avenue to North 192nd Street, which would allow traffic from Sky Nursery to access onto Aurora Avenue North. Including these additional properties could help resolve traffic problems that already exist on Stone and Ashworth Avenues.

Presentation of Final Staff Recommendation

Mr. Tovar said staff would support an extension of the study area boundary to North 192nd Street as recommended by several members of the public. He also reiterated his suggestion that a new framework policy be added calling for the creation of a vision as the logical first step in Phase 2 of the project.

Final Questions by the Commission and Commission Deliberation

Vice Chair Kuboi asked if extending the boundary to North 192nd Street would include the parcels immediately north of that street. While he would not be inclined to support a boundary extension all the way to North 195th Street, he is concerned that the properties on the north side of North 192nd Street also

be included in the study area. Mr. Tovar said staff would be agreeable to including the north side of the street in the study area, as well. However, he cautioned that this would not necessarily result in a zoning change for the properties on the street.

Commissioner Wagner agreed that the boundary could be extended to the north to include critical properties on Aurora Avenue North if there is no other vehicle for addressing concerns. However, she cautioned that the intent of the study is to consider the Town Center area and the impact of very specific projects to the surrounding neighborhoods. She suggested that perhaps the properties that are currently outside of the boundary could be better addressed as part of another study so the City Center Subarea Plan boundaries could remain small and focused.

Commissioner Hall agreed that keeping the study area small would allow the City to focus more clearly on their mission for the Town Center area. If the area were expanded, the vision could become somewhat diffused and it could take the City substantially longer to complete the project. However, he would support an extension to North 192nd Street to include properties that are prime candidates for redevelopment in the near future. Chair Piro said he, too, would support an expansion of the boundary to North 192nd Street. He said he would also be willing to support Mr. Lango's recommendation that the boundary be extended to North 195th Street to allow the City to consider the concept of connecting Midvale Avenue to North 195th Street.

Chair Piro referenced the suggestion that another framework policy be added related to creating a vision for the Town Center Subarea Plan. Commissioner Phisuthikul said he would support an additional policy since it would provide an opportunity for the citizens to express their ideas for the area. Mr. Tovar recommended a new framework policy be added to read: "Articulate a community vision for the town center as an early step in the development of detailed provisions for the subarea." The Commission indicated their support for the proposed new policy language.

Commissioner Harris cautioned that the Town Center area should be defined as a special place and not extend all the way up and down Aurora Avenue. The Commission agreed it would be appropriate to extend the boundary to North 192nd Street only.

The Commission discussed possible changes to Framework Policy 2 to make it clearer as to what projects are being referenced. They agreed to change the policy to read: "Engage Shoreline residents and businesses in detailed design processes for a.) the "heritage park" site on both sides of the Interurban Trail and b.) Midvale Avenue North."

If the boundary were adjusted to include North 192nd Street, Vice Chair Kuboi inquired if the traffic generated by the Echo Lake Project would be addressed as part of the traffic study that is done for the project. Mr. Tovar said traffic from all land uses along Aurora Avenue were studied in a general way as part of the SEPA review that was required for the Aurora Project. It might be possible to refine or provide more detailed information about the Echo Lake Project as part of the study, but the analysis of this traffic would still be fairly general in nature.

Closure of Public Hearing

COMMISSIONER HALL MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER HARRIS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Vote by Commission to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification

COMMISSIONER HALL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE STAFF'S PROPOSAL WITH TWO COMMISSION AMENDMENTS. SPECIFICALLY:

- **ADD A NEW FRAMEWORK POLICY 1 TO READ: "ARTICULATE A COMMUNITY VISION FOR THE TOWN CENTER AS AN EARLY STEP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED PROVISIONS FOR THE SUBAREA."**
- **CORRECT FRAMEWORK POLICY 2 TO READ: "ENGAGE SHORELINE RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES IN DETAILED DESIGN PROCESSES FOR A.) THE "HERITAGE PARK" SITE ON BOTH SIDES TO THE INTERURBAN TRAIL AND B.) MIDVALE AVENUE NORTH.**
- **EXTEND TOWN CENTER STUDY AREA TO NORTH 192ND STREET.**
- **REPEAL APPENDIX 5 (CENTRAL SHORELINE RIGHT-OF-WAY MAPS).**

COMMISSIONER PHISUTHIKUL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

None of the Commissioners provided reports during this portion of the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Study Session: Ridgecrest Commercial Area Zoning

Chair Piro explained that tonight's discussion would be a study session, but the public would be invited to provide comments to the Commission. He emphasized that a more formal public hearing on the Ridgecrest Commercial Area Zoning would be conducted at a later date.

Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said people are not so concerned about possible land use changes as they are about the traffic impacts associated with the changes. As part of the City's discussion related to the Ridgecrest Commercial Area, they must address how they will protect the neighborhoods from cut through traffic. This might require the businesses to be open from the back so that people living in the neighborhood could walk.

Mr. Lee noted that there has been a significant escalation in the demand for housing, and the Aurora Corridor and North City have accommodated more density than was anticipated in the original Comprehensive Plan. He agreed the plan needs to be updated. He urged the City to involve the public early in the process; and right now, they don't really understand the process. He also suggested the project be renamed the Ridgecrest Neighborhood zone. They should avoid quick rezones, with the developers promising to be good the neighbors. If the commercial properties are zoned as Neighborhood

Business, the commercial uses should be for the neighborhood residents. The goal should not be to attract customers from other areas. Chair Piro noted that a public hearing for the Ridgecrest Commercial Area Zoning Proposal has been scheduled for October 18, 2007.

Pam Mieth, Shoreline, said she understands that the Commission is at the beginning stages of their review, so she would submit her questions and concerns in writing. She said she is primarily concerned about the traffic impacts, as well as the significant density that would be allowed on North 163rd Street. Allowing five or six floors of development so close to the single-family residential neighborhoods seems out of scale.

Cathie Schleh, Shoreline, suggested that notice of the upcoming public hearing date be posted on the reader board at the Ridgecrest Elementary School.

Mr. Tovar reviewed that a public workshop was conducted on September 12th, and approximately 70 people attended. Many of them also participated in the process that occurred last winter with the University of Washington students. He explained that the staff's proposal is intended to establish regulations that would enable the uses, building form, and other amenities the neighborhood indicated as desirable for the Cascade Bingo Property that is currently zoned commercial. The proposed new regulations would allow property owners to develop properties as the market demands, but protect the neighborhoods from projects that are too large or have too many impacts. He cautioned that if the regulations that are ultimately adopted by the City Council are not more attractive than the existing zoning, property owners would develop under what the existing zoning would permit, which is three stories of town houses on the entire property.

Mr. Tovar distributed copies of a zoning map from the City of Kirkland, which has utilized the planned area concept effectively since 1976. He explained that much of the City of Kirkland is zoned single-family residential, but they also have 22 planned areas. In each planned area zone, the zoning code identifies a maximum building height, the floor ratio, design standards, access conditions, and other details that control what projects can occur in the individual planned zones. The intent behind the planned area concept is to recognize that not all of the properties in a community fit well into the five or six zoning designations available. A better method is to write a zone to suit the needs of a particular area.

Mr. Tovar provided copies of the City's Comprehensive Plan Map, upon which staff identified where potential planned area zones might be designated in the City. He specifically noted that the Ridgecrest Commercial Area is designated on the map as Planned Area 4 (PA4). The intent of the concept is to better regulate land use to implement the Comprehensive Plan in more detail for a particular zone. He noted that the Shoreline Community College Property, the Christa Property, the South Aurora Triangle Property and the Fircrest Property are also identified on the map as being potential locations for planned area zones. He cautioned that just because an area is zoned as a planned area doesn't mean that the uses allowed in one planned area would be the same as those allowed in another planned area or any other zone in the City. He said the form-based code concept is another method of achieving the objectives of City and neighborhoods with more precision. He concluded by emphasizing that the proposal is simply a zoning text and zoning map change and not a Comprehensive Plan amendment. All of the proposed changes would be consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Szafran referred to the proposed text for Planned Area 4. He reviewed the proposed purpose and scope language (Section 20.98.010), which states that the new standards are designed to:

- Be a form-based code that provides flexibility, yet ensure that the character of a project's building and site design is supportive of the adjacent public spaces and uses.
- Create a lively mixed use and retail frontage in a safe, walkable and transit-oriented neighborhood environment.
- Provide for a human scale building design.
- Ensure that building and site design is presented to the neighborhood for comment.

Next, Mr. Szafran referred to the permitted and prohibited uses section (20.90.020), which specifically lists the uses that would not be allowed in the PA4 zone. He reviewed the density and dimensional standards section (20.98.030), explaining that for the purpose of building setbacks, the mass of the building was divided into three sections: the building base (ground floor), the middle (2nd and 3rd stories), and the top (anything above the 3rd story). He noted that maximum building height would be 3 stories, with an additional 3 stories if certain conditions are met. The proposed basic density for the PA4 zone would be 24 dwelling units per acre, which is allowed by the existing zoning. The maximum density would be limited by the height of the building, floor area ratio, and parking requirements.

Mr. Szafran noted Section 20.98.040 explains the administrative design review concept, which is a new element of the Shoreline Development Code. Administrative design review would ensure that any building plan for the site meets the goals and intent of the PA4 zone. Chair Piro noted that the proposed administrative design review would be carried out by staff. Mr. Tovar said the concept would require an administrative permit, but there would still be a neighborhood meeting requirement.

Mr. Szafran referenced Section 20.98.050, which identifies the proposed design standards. He said one key point of site design is the requirement that new development accommodate street level retail, particularly on 5th Avenue Northeast. If ground level retail is not planned for buildings fronting on 5th Avenue Northeast, the buildings must still be available for retail uses at a future date. This section also requires that building design soften the visual impact of multi-use buildings face Northeast 163rd Street and the west property line so they are more compatible with the single-family homes. This could be done by providing decorative features or planting trees or shrubs in the setback area along the western property line.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the language proposed in Section 20.90.050, which states that driveway access should be limited to minimize automobile conflict and light glare on adjacent properties. In addition, development on parcels that front on 5th Avenue Northeast would have to be designed and furnished to support, complement and accommodate and promote transit stops.

Mr. Szafran explained that building design review would consider things such as pedestrian enhancements, blank wall treatments, façade articulation, weather protection for buildings along the street fronts, vertical differentiation, street frontage standards, roofline design, service areas and mechanical equipment, parking structures, and the accommodation of live/work units.

Mr. Szafran referenced Section 20.98.060, which describes the public bonus feature program. The zone would outright allow a 3-story building. Any development above 3 stories would be required to accommodate a certain number of the public bonus features listed in the section. The parking section (20.98.070) proposes that the minimum residential parking requirement be one space for studio and 1-bedroom units and 1.5 spaces for 2-bedroom units. However, provisions would allow for car sharing programs.

Mr. Szafran said that Section 20.90.080 outlines the proposed sign standards for the PA4 zone. It would basically allow for the same type of signs allowed in the existing zones. It requires that a master sign plan be submitted and approved by the City in conjunction with the building permit. He said the last section (20.98.090) is related to outside lighting, and the intent is to make sure the outside lighting does not impact the residential properties that surround the site.

Commissioner Hall expressed his belief that proposing zoning changes for just one very small area of the City appears to make the code extremely complicated. He understands the advantage of creating planned area zones, but writing a 20-page development code for every individual parcel would be too complex. Mr. Tovar agreed it would not be appropriate to apply this concept to every parcel in the City, but they are only talking about a finite number of parcels. The PA4a parcel is very unique for many reasons, and the proposed language is staff's best attempt to write a regulation that achieves what the community seems to want and provides as much certainty to the applicant as possible. He agreed that implementing a planned area concept would result in more zoning code text, but the question that must be asked is whether it's worth it. Staff believes it is for certain parts of the City that are ripe for redevelopment.

Commissioner Phisuthikul suggested that providing a percentage of affordable housing should be included on the list of public bonus feature options, since this would provide a direct benefit to the public. Mr. Cohn noted that Section 20.98.030.B states that based on a specific formula, the number of permitted units could be increased if affordable housing was provided on the site. Commissioner Phisuthikul pointed out that this section only applies to density increases in buildings up to 3 stories. Providing affordable housing would not be one of the options for obtaining additional height. Mr. Szafran agreed. In order to obtain the additional height, the developer could be asked to give something back to the neighborhood. The public bonus feature options are intended to have a direct impact on the adjacent property owners, and that is why affordable housing was not listed as one of the options.

Mr. Szafran referred to Section 20.98.050.D.1, which would require that the first floor adjacent to the street be constructed to accommodate retail. He noted that the language would not require a retail use. This would be determined by the market, but staff believes there is some market for retail space in this particular corner. Mr. Tovar expressed his belief that this would be particularly true if there were four or five stories of residential development above the retail space.

Vice Chair Kuboi pointed out that the proposal would introduce the concepts of planned areas, form-based codes and administrative design review all at the same time to a potentially skeptical public. He asked if staff has anticipated how the proposal could be changed if the public expresses objection. Mr. Tovar advised that there are several design review processes that could be utilized such as an administrative review, a hearing examiner hearing with a recommendation to the City Council, or a

hearing examiner hearing and decision. Another option would be for the Planning Commission to serve as a design review board that would make recommendations to the City Council. While it could be argued that a public hearing process would allow more opportunity for the public to participate, staff also believes it is important to make the process more predictable by having a more prescriptive and detailed set of zoning standards and regulations.

Chair Piro said he supports the idea of addressing design issues as part of the zoning regulations. He recalled that with the more complicated projects, the Commission has found that whether or not a proposal would be viable and contribute to the quality of life in the City comes down to design. Having a design review function would ensure that design gets the attention it needs when projects are proposed.

Vice Chair Kuboi questioned the process the City used to identify a balance between the impacts to the neighborhood and the needs of the developers. Mr. Tovar said staff reviewed what design review processes have and have not worked in other jurisdictions. He advised that some jurisdictions have had design review boards for years, and they usually consist of three to five board members with a background in architecture or engineering. Typically, the policies that design review boards consider are broader than just design issues. If the City were to create a design review board, they would still have to provide very clear design standards for them to use when reviewing projects. Design review boards cannot base their decisions on subjective and/or arbitrary standards.

Vice Chair Kuboi expressed his concern that allowing a development to go from three stories to six stories would significantly change the profit potential from a developer's standpoint. However, the list of public bonus feature options appear to be rather token in nature. Mr. Szafran explained that any proposal for additional stories would be reviewed by staff to make sure it meets the intent of the code. Vice Chair Kuboi suggested that before this concept is implemented, staff should provide more information from other jurisdictions to illustrate how public benefits could be traded for additional developer privileges. He felt this would be particularly important for this subject property since additional height could impact some property owners' view of the Olympic Mountains. It is important that the neighborhoods receive a reasonable return on the additional height allowance.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the proposed language is draft only. Staff intends to incorporate feedback they have received to date from the public and the Commission into the draft that is presented at the public hearing. He noted that the public bonus feature options identify things the City would like developers to incorporate into the design of buildings, but more detailed discussion needs to take place to determine the quantity of each option that a developer would have to provide in order to gain the extra height. In addition, the Commission could have a discussion about how to tie increases in building mass and height to provisions for moderate-income housing. While they can't quantify the developer's cost of providing this housing, it is important to keep in mind that moderate-income housing would provide a public benefit. He agreed the City should be able to obtain more tradeoff from developers than what has been described in the draft language. He agreed to update the document to address this concern.

Commissioner Wagner asked if the proposed zone would identify a minimum height limit. She cautioned that the language should prohibit single-story strip development. Staff agreed to make that change. Secondly, Commissioner Wagner suggested the language should also carefully address the issue

of impervious surfaces. She recalled the City Council's goal to create a green, sustainable Shoreline and noted that requiring green building standards could have some potential public benefit, as well. Mr. Szafran agreed the draft language does not explain any kind of green building requirements. Mr. Tovar advised that the citizens also made this comment. Staff would consider ways to articulate this concern, either as a bonus option or possibly as a requirement. However, because green roofs are very costly, the City must consider how to keep the public benefit options proportionate or commensurate with the return to developers.

Commissioner Harris said it must be understood that if a 6-story structure is built on the subject property, all of the surrounding property owners would lose the privacy of their backyard. Secondly, Commissioner Harris asked if terms such as façade articulation, vertical differentiation, etc. are common terms in the development community. Mr. Szafran answered that these terms came right out of the City's current code. Commissioner Harris expressed his belief that these types of design techniques are becoming so common place, that the new buildings are almost becoming boring. Lastly, Commissioner Harris asked if the façade details would be similar to the apartment building that was recently constructed on 15th Avenue and Northeast 183rd Street. Mr. Szafran said the intent of the proposed language was to require better architecture. Commissioner Harris suggested that the types of building materials used are just as important as the design elements. Mr. Szafran noted that Section 20.98.050.F.4.a briefly states that different materials and/or colors should be used. Commissioner Harris expressed his belief that quality and appearance would play a significant role in neighborhood acceptance of the proposed changes.

Commissioner Phisuthikul noted that while the proposed language would require building articulation, it does not make it clear exactly how much articulation would be required. Mr. Tovar agreed the proposed language should spell out these types of dimensions.

Commissioner Hall asked staff to give further consideration to options for encouraging affordable housing. He asked staff to at least consider changing the requirement to low-income housing instead of moderate income housing. Secondly, Commissioner Hall encouraged staff to keep in mind the good information that was shared by presenters at the recent speaker series events, such as what makes a plaza a public gathering place, becoming a Cascade City and utilizing the transfer of development rights concept, etc. Thirdly, Commissioner Hall suggested it would be appropriate for the City Attorney to be present at the October 18th public hearing to provide legal advice to the Commission as the hearing proceeds. Mr. Tovar agreed it would be appropriate for staff to review the speaker series presentations and determine which concepts might have application in the proposed amendments the Commission would consider over the next several months.

Mr. Tovar advised that, as part of their work on the South Aurora Triangle, staff has developed some language regarding the concept of transferring development rights from the rural area into the urban area. This project is currently on hold while the staff, Commission and City Council deal with more pressing matters. While there is no program in place in King County right now, they could create a place keeper in the proposed language that would allow a developer to avail themselves to this type of program if and when it is established by King County and accepted by the City of Shoreline.

Chair Piro pointed out that much of the public concern with both of the items on the Commission's agenda was related to traffic impacts. He suggested the parking requirements be more clearly delineated in the proposed language to address not only on-street and off-street parking requirements, but also require a parking management plan to address the impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.

Commissioner Phisuthikul referred to the proposed setback requirements in Section 20.90.030. He suggested the language be changed to make it clear that the setback for the upper stories would be greater than the setback for the middle stories.

Mr. Tovar advised that staff would create an updated draft of the proposed changes, utilizing the comments received thus far from the public and the Commission. Once it is ready, the draft would be posted to the City's website for the Commission and public to review. Staff would accept additional recommendations related to the draft, but they must distribute the final draft to the Commission by October 10th in preparation for the October 18th hearing. He noted that the public would also be invited to provide additional written comments regarding the draft language. Mr. Szafran added that citizens on the email list would receive a reminder notice about the upcoming hearing.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Transit Resolution

Chair Piro reviewed the typographical corrections that were discussed and agreed to at the Commission's earlier dinner meeting.

COMMISSIONER HALL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION TRANSMIT THE TRANSIT RESOLUTION TO THE CITY COUNCIL. COMMISSIONER WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Piro recalled that, at the earlier dinner meeting, staff offered a thought that the Commission may want to consider options for developing policy language to implement the concept when they review the Comprehensive Plan amendments again in 2008. The Commission agreed this would be appropriate if the document is adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Tovar reported that staff would prepare an updated version of the Commission's work program for the upcoming joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting. The new document would provide more details about their 2008 agenda.

Based on the Commission's final action related to the resolution, Chair Piro said staff recommends the City provide a courtesy copy of the document to the various transit agencies to start the communication process. The Commission agreed that would be appropriate. Commissioner Hall suggested that a courtesy copy of the document could also be forwarded to the planning commissions of the other jurisdictions identified in the resolution.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No additional announcements were provided during this portion of the meeting.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Piro reminded the Commission of their joint meeting with the Hearing Examiner on September 20th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 P.M.

Rocky Piro
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission