

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, September 6, 2012
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber
17500 Midvale Ave N.

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL	7:01 p.m.
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02 p.m.
4. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS	7:03 p.m.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:08 p.m.
A. August 2 Regular Meeting	
B. August 16 Regular Meeting	

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes.

6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:15 p.m.
7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	7:20 p.m.
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	7:25 p.m.
A. Establishing a Subcommittee for Light Rail Station Area Planning	
9. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	8:30 p.m.
10. AGENDA FOR September 20	8:35 p.m.
11. ADJOURNMENT	8:40 p.m.

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236.

This page intentionally blank

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 2, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Moss
Vice Chair Esselman
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Scully

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Planning & Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning & Community Development
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Wagner

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moss called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Moss, Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioners Maul, Montero, and Scully. Commissioners Craft and Wagner were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Markle announced that the City Council would be holding a public hearing on the Floodplain Management Ordinance on August 6th.

Ms. Markle reported that on July 17, the City of Shoreline and Sound Transit staff provided a briefing to Shoreline School District staff. Sound Transit gave an overview of the Lynnwood Link Project, decisions made to-date by the Sound Transit Board and next steps. City of Shoreline staff provided an update on the City Council's recent actions including adoption of the Framework Policies for Light Rail Station Area Planning, direction to draft amendments to the future land use map to show future study areas around light rail stations and direction to begin light rail station area planning in 2013.

On July 25, City of Shoreline and Sound Transit staff provided the same briefing to the Shoreline School Board. The City's main message was that the Council is planning on rezoning the property located within a 1/4 mile of the 185th light rail station from R-6 to at least R-48 and the property within a 1/2 mile of the light rail station to at least R-18 during the station area planning process. The Shoreline Center and North City Elementary School are located within these areas.

On August 3, City of Shoreline staff will meet with Sound Transit staff to discuss opportunities and lessons learned from other station area planning processes, scheduling for station area planning and potential resources available to Shoreline to support station area planning.

Ms. Markle shared that the City has applied for a Department of Commerce GMA Competitive Planning Grant for 2012-2013 to assist with station area planning. The request is for \$50,000 and grants will be awarded by August 15, 2012.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes for the Commission to approve.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

STUDY ITEM – 2012 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger recalled that to date the Planning Commission has discussed all 10 Elements of the Comprehensive Plan and this evening staff was bringing back the Community Design, Housing and Land Use Elements for a second review. She invited the Commission to discuss the new revisions that were incorporated since the last review.

Chair Moss reminded the Commission of the big picture questions that still needed to be addressed and stated the Commission would work through each Element page by page.

Community Design Element

The Commission discussed the Community Design Element and Supporting Analysis and provided staff with the following feedback:

- Change the ending of the first paragraph in the introduction to refer to place-making attributes.
- The Comprehensive Plan should use the term “Transit-Oriented Development” to be consistent with the Transportation Master Plan. The term should be added to the definitions section and include reference to other names that are used to describe the same type of development.
- Change wording of Goal CD III to say “Expand on the concept that people using places and facilities draws more people.”
- In Goal CD VI change the word “zoning” to “zones”.
- Policy CD1 should say: “Encourage building design that create distinctive places in the community.”
- Policy CD2 should say: “Refine design standards so new projects enhance the livability and the aesthetic appeal of the community.”
- Policies regarding signs should be reordered based on community priorities.
- Policies CD12 and CD17, which encourage native plantings and discourage invasive species, should be combined and perhaps moved to the Natural Environments Element.
- Revert Policy CD18 back to original wording of “significant” properties: “Preserve, encourage, and enhance open space as a ~~significant~~ key element of the community’s character through parks, trails, water features, and other significant ~~large~~ properties (~~such as cemeteries~~) that provide public benefit.”
- Policy CD22 should be worded “Design public spaces to provide amenities and facilities such as seating, landscaping, kiosks, connections to surrounding uses and activities, lighting, that contribute to a sense of security”, or even broken up into two goals. The Commission also suggested moving Policy LU15 here: “Consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles when developing mixed use, commercial and high density residential uses.”
- Policy CD26, which encourages private donations of art to the City, should also encourage gifts of money to spend on the arts. Staff agreed to research policy regarding acceptance of money for a dedicated fund.

Community Design Supporting Analysis

- A portion of the Background and Context text should be revised to say: “Transition buffers between ~~neighborhood residential~~ residential and commercial land uses;”
- A portion of the Design Quality text should be revised to say: “Design quality is important to Shoreline because citizens want ~~the anticipated~~ the anticipated new development ~~that is anticipated in the next 20 years~~ to enhance the community.”
- A portion of the Gateways text should say: “At the beginning of the City’s planning process a vision to create a civic identity by having special treatments signaling entry into Shoreline was ~~identified~~ crafted.”
- The Commission recommended reordering examples under Design Quality so the important items come first.
- The Commission requested site specific examples of neighborhoods where “cache” has been created (Fremont, Ballard, Capitol Hill).

- Consult with the Shoreline Historical Museum for further refinement of language added regarding historic inventory, specifically the part about “inclusion facilitates researching the historic significance of a structure before it is modified or demolished.”

Housing Element

The Commission discussed the Housing Element and Supporting Analysis and provided staff with the following feedback:

- In Goal H II say “land use” instead of “use of land”.
- Add a Goal that focuses on facilitating housing development throughout the city that addresses the needs of households making less than 30% of Area Median Income.
- Goal H VI should be reworded to say: “Encourage and support a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs, particularly older adults, people with disabilities, or language barriers related to age, health or disability.”
- In Goal H VII replace the word “Cooperate” with “Collaborate”.
- Add a Goal that supports housing for people with children.
- Change term “cottage housing” to “clustered housing”.
- In Policy H27 replace the words “senior and disabled citizens” with “older adults and people with disabilities”.
- Add new Policy that says: “Support the development of both public and private, short-term and long-term housing for Shoreline’s population of people who are homeless.”
- In Policy H29 replace the word “Cooperate” with “Collaborate”.
- In Policy H30 replace the word “Cooperate” with “Partner”.

Housing Supporting Analysis

- Include timeframe on King County Housing Authority vouchers.
- Use People First Language when referring to people who are homeless.
- In the language under “A Changing Community”, make the following text edits: “The increase in the number of singles and older adults in the community suggests that there is a need for inexpensive homes with a variety of price points designed for smaller households, including accessory dwelling units or manufactured housing.”
- Add numbers of housing units in Table H-1.
- The Commission requested a map showing West, West Central, East Central, and East Shoreline.

Land Use Element

The Commission discussed the Land Use Element and Supporting Analysis and provided staff with the following feedback:

- Remove the word “etc.” from the Comprehensive Plan as it has many different meanings and is vague at the same time.
- The Commission wanted more supporting analysis for Ecodistricts.

- Mention considering a bikeshed and corridor improvements within 2 miles of Light Rail Station Areas in the Supporting Analysis section.
- Goal LU V should be rephrased to: “If annexed, implement the City of Shoreline Subarea Plan for Point Wells.”
- Clarify that light industrial uses may be appropriate with some level of review.
- Goal LU XIII, regarding “Ecodistricts”, should be moved out of the goals section or the wording should be revised from “Consider Ecodistricts as a potential means of neighborhood empowerment...” to say “Explore whether Ecodistricts could be used as a potential means...”.
- Add R-4 Zoning back into the list of appropriate zones for the Low Density Residential Land Use Designation.
- Create a new policy or goal that directs staff to do a parcel-level analysis for properties zoned R-12 as part of a future Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket.
- The Commission requested that R-12 remain listed as a compatible zone in the High Density Residential Comprehensive Land Use Designation category.
- Reword Policy LU6 to read: “Protect existing stands of trees and vegetation and encourage additional plantings that serve as buffers.”
- Move LU15 to Community Design Element.
- Policy LU26 should state “Develop and implement an integrated wayfinding system using signage.” Add a definition for wayfinding.
- Remove level of detail in Policy LU30 describing community involvement.
- Delete Policy LU33 “Identify long-rang development tools and mechanisms to assist people that live in areas adjacent to light rail stations during transitions from their present use to a planned use.” It is similar to LU31.
- Strike the words “minimum and maximum” from Policy LU35.
- Reword Policy LU40 to say: “Develop station areas as inclusive neighborhoods in Shoreline with connections to other transit systems, commercial nodes, and neighborhoods.”
- Include standards for bike facilities in to Policy LU59.
- Add safe routes to school in to Policy LU48.

Land Use Supporting Analysis

There were no suggested changes to the Land Use Supporting Analysis.

Staff agreed to research all the requested changes for each Element and Supporting Analysis and incorporate them into the next draft.

Mr. Szafran displayed two maps that illustrate two different boundaries for light rail station study areas (Attachments N and O). Attachment N delineates a ½ mile radius around stations presumed to be located at 145th and 185th. Attachment O delineates two different radii, one at ¼ mile and one at ½ mile. He asked for the Commission’s feedback on which map should be used. Commissioners concurred that Attachment N should be used.

Public Comment

Kelly Rider, Policy Director for King County Housing Development Consortium, commended the Planning Commission for their work on the Housing Element. She especially appreciated the consideration the Commission took in incorporating feedback from the public into the goal and policy language.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle did not have any items to report to the Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Moss recalled that at their July 9th Joint Meeting with City Council, Council indicated station area planning was a high priority. Since the Commission's plate is full with the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Update, she asked if the Commission should form a subcommittee to begin working the light rail station area planning now. The Commission agreed that it was a good idea. Chair Moss asked for the topic to be put on the August 16th agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None of the Commissioners provided reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the Commission will continue to review the Capital Facilities, Natural Environment and Utilities Elements of the Comprehensive Plan at their August 16th meeting. They will also discuss the station area planning subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 16, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Moss
Vice Chair Esselman
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Scully

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Community and Development Services
Steve Szafran, Associate Planner, Community & Development Services
Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Community & Development Services
Jeff Forry, Permit Services Manager, Community & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Wagner

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moss called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Moss, Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Montero and Scully. Commissioner Wagner was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Markle recalled that the City has discussed the need to complete their station area planning effort by the end of 2013 in order to meet Sound Transit's deadline for applying for federal funds. However, at a recent meeting with Sound Transit representatives, she learned that applications do not need to be

submitted until mid 2015. At the meeting, Sound Transit representatives encouraged the City to postpone the station area planning process to coincide with their draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which will be issued in June of 2013. This will give the City time to complete the necessary in-house planning and preparation for the associated public process. Staff will present this option to the City Council on September 17th. She distributed a copy of the Draft High-Level Coordination Schedule, which outlines how the City's proposed schedule for station area planning would match up with Sound Transit's schedule.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commissioners that he sent out information regarding the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association Conference in Olympia on October 11th and 12th. The current budget is sufficient for most of the Commissioners to attend the event. He invited interested Commissioners to contact him so necessary arrangements can be made before September 8th.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 19, 2012 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Laethen Wene, Shoreline, suggested that Sound Transit consider a loop route through Shoreline so that everyone can have access to light rail.

Diane Pottinger, District Manager, Shoreline Water District, said she has over 25 years experience consulting and working for the federal government, and she was a consultant for the Ronald Wastewater District for 12½, prior to coming to the Shoreline Water District six years ago. She also worked several years for the Highland Sewer District so she knows the pipelines in the City of Shoreline well. In addition, she is an 8-year veteran of the Bellevue Environmental Services Commission, which oversees the water, sewer, stormwater and solid waste utilities for that City. She said the Shoreline Water District would like to propose the following changes to the City's Comprehensive Plan:

- The City's Comprehensive Plan goal relating to utilities should be to provide effective and efficient utility services to the citizens of Shoreline in the most cost-effective fashion. Effective planning should be considered part of the process. It appears that the plan already has a preconceived conclusion and the document is only looking at one option. The Shoreline Water District recommends the City look at other options whenever possible.
- Goal CF-1 on Page 62 of Attachment E will be substantially different if the vote to acquire the Seattle Public Utility water system does not pass in November 2012. The Shoreline Water District suggests there be a reference to the vote and an option considered should the vote not pass.
- Regarding the last paragraph on Page 8 of Attachment G, the Shoreline Water District disagrees that the City can reinvest back into the water utility at a higher rate than what a special purpose district can do. Who is going to be doing the reinvestment and would the water rates be higher? Would the City have higher property tax rates that would be dedicated to doing water infrastructure? The City has never once asked Shoreline Water District to reinvest at a greater rate to our water system than what we are currently doing, even when they review the capital

facilities projects on the District's Comprehensive Water System Plan. They would like the City to delete this statement from the Comprehensive Plan or provide additional clarification as to why the statement is necessary.

- The Shoreline Water District disagrees with the last sentence in the first paragraph on Page 86 of Attachment G, which states that “controlling the water utility will help streamline the permitting process for investors.” There is no proof or evidence that the City controlling all water utilities in Shoreline will help “streamline” the permitting process. This is opposite to what two recent investors have said about working with the Shoreline Water District. Both the Development Services of American and the Inland Washington Group have indicated they have enjoyed working with the Shoreline Water District. In a quote printed in the Lake Forest Park Patch on May 25th, Darin Davidson, President of the Inland Washington Group, said they “appreciate the efforts of the Shoreline Water District in helping make the project a reality.” The Shoreline Water District asks that this unsupported sentence be removed.
- The Shoreline Water District would like the City to amend the first paragraph on Page 87 of Attachment G by deleting the phrase, “as with the future assumption of the Shoreline Water District.” No discussion has occurred to date regarding the assumption of the Shoreline Water District, now or in the future. Plus, this section only deals with the Ronald Wastewater District.

Ms. Pottinger submitted a written copy of her comments for the record.

STUDY SESSION ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – NEW POLICIES FOR CAPITAL FACILITIES, NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND UTILITIES

Commission Review of Natural Environment Element Goals and Policies (Attachment A)

- **Page 15 of Staff Report.**

Chair Moss asked staff to review the document once again to make sure that capital letters are used consistently throughout. Ms. Redinger said staff has a growing list of words to “word search” throughout the entire Comprehensive Plan. This list includes hyphenated phrases, etc. Chair Moss encouraged staff to also review the formatting to make sure it is consistent.

Chair Moss requested additional clarification about the comment in the margin related to **Goal NE II**, which suggests the analysis section should document what the City is doing to ensure the goal is implemented. Ms. Redinger agreed to obtain additional clarification from the Parks Department.

Chair Moss suggested that **Goal NE II** should be amended to read, “Regulate land disturbances and development to conserve soil resources and protect people, property and the environment. . .”

- **Page 16 of Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully said he believes **Goal NE VII** should be retained. If the goal is removed, there would be no mandate to create regulations that require natural and on-site solutions. While both agreed it is important to retain the goal, Commissioner Craft and Vice Chair Esselman

suggested the statement should be rewritten to be more goal-oriented rather than regulatory, perhaps by replacing the word “mandate” with “promote.”

Chair Moss suggested that **Goal NE V** should be amended to read, “. . .greenhouse gas emissions, promotion of efficient. . .” She also suggested that **Goal NE VII** should be amended by removing the comment between “and” and “feasible.” In addition, she suggested that using semicolons in **Land Use Policy NE 5** would make it easier to read. She suggested there was insufficient information in the analysis to support **Land Use Policy NE5**, and she particularly suggested the City’s “Forever Green” website could be specifically called out.

Chair Moss referred to **Land Use Policy NE1** and pointed out that the City does not have any rural, suburban fringe, and agricultural lands. Ms. Redinger referred to Council Member Hall’s PowerPoint presentation, which pointed out that the City has the choice of doing infill in built-out areas or removing acres of forest. She suggested that this policy statement should clarify that the suburban fringe, rural areas, open spaces and agricultural lands they are trying to preserve are regional rather than local. Commissioner Scully suggested the language be changed to read, “Encourage infill development in order to preserve suburban fringe, rural areas, open spaces, and agricultural lands in the region through infill development.”

Commissioner Montero recommended that **Land Use Policy NE5** be amended to read, “. . .motivate individuals, businesses, and community organizations to protect the environment. . .”

- **Page 17 of Staff Report**

Commissioner Montero recommended that **Land Use Policy NE7** be amended to read, “Coordinate with other governmental agencies, adjacent communities, and other non-profit organizations. . .”

Vice Chair Esselman observed that **Land Use Policy NE10** encourages rather than incentivizes green building. She asked if that is because green building is now the standard for development. Ms. Redinger said this question is related to the “big picture” question of what level of incentives the City wants to provide. She suggested that “encourage” is a broad enough word that can lead to incentive regulations. Commissioner Craft said he would prefer the word “sustainable” instead of “green” in **Land Use Policy NE10**. He observed that there are other ways for sustainable development to occur besides “Built Green” or “LEED” certified. Commissioner Esselman commented that this change would allow “sustainable building methods” to become an incentive to go beyond what the City currently requires. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Chair Moss referred to **Land Use Policy NE15** and asked if “preventing new flooding impacts” is covered elsewhere in the City’s regulations. Commissioner Craft observed that this goal is covered a few different ways in various areas of the code. In keeping with the City’s goal to condense the Comprehensive Plan, he felt this policy could be removed and the City could be assured of the fact that concerns about flooding would be addressed by various City regulations. Commissioner Maul asked if the City has any long-standing flood impacts that have not been resolved. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively. Chair Moss said there is inadequate drainage infrastructure in some areas of the City, and the surface water creates a flood-like environment. Ms. Redinger agreed to seek

feedback from the Surface Water Manager about whether or not it would be appropriate to remove this policy and then report back to the Commission.

Chair Moss commented that the language in **Land Use Policy NE17** does not seem to flow well. Ms. Redinger said this policy was added by the Emergency Manager, and she assumes it relates to the Hazard Mitigation Plan's goal to promote education. Chair Moss agreed it is important to have a policy for promoting public education, but she suggested the policy could be restructured for clarification.

- **Page 18 of Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully asked why the word “preserve” was changed to “conserve” in **Land Use Policy NE25**. Chair Moss suggested this change was made to avoid using the same word repeatedly throughout the document. Chair Moss pointed out that word “minimize” is used in both **Land Use Policies NE19 and NE20**, and perhaps **Land Use Policy NE 19** could be expanded now that the tree code has been updated. Commissioner Scully cautioned that sometimes being creative and using different words that mean the same thing can be confusing and misinterpreted. He suggested they use one word to mean “keep in place.”

Commissioner Craft suggested that **Land Use Policies NE19 and NE20** could be combined into a single policy. Chair Moss pointed out that **Land Use Policy NE20** focuses on critical areas and their buffers, and **Land Use Policy NE19** would apply on a much broader scale. She also recalled that there has been significant community debate about the “removal of healthy trees,” (Land Use Policy NE 19) and it is likely to come up again as a citywide issue. Again, she suggested that **Land Use Policy NE 19** could be expanded upon.

Chair Moss asked if **Land Use Policy NE24** is intended to apply to both habitats and species. Commissioner Scully explained that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife independently identifies the preservation of both priority species and priority habitats. He suggested the City's policies should be consistent. Chair Moss recommended that the policy be restructured for clarification. Commissioner Scully suggested the language be changed to read, “Preserve habitat designated by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as priority species or priority habitats through regulations. . .”

Chair Moss asked what is meant by the term “resource” as used in **Land Use Policy NE28**. Ms. Redinger said the resource would be the wetland and/or habitat. Chair Moss suggested that this policy be clarified by deleting the words “to the resource.”

- **Page 19 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Montero said that although **Land Use Policy NE36** does not specifically address vehicles, the intent is to get people out of their cars. He suggested that an additional sentence be added to encourage car sharing for single-occupancy vehicles. Commissioner Maul commented that the policy should encourage people to not use private vehicles, whether they are single-occupancy or not, particularly if good transit service is available. Chair Moss agreed that the policy reads

awkwardly, but the intent is to encourage people to use alternatives other than automobiles. Commissioner Montero said he supports the policy to get people out of their cars, but that is not the reality. For those who cannot use mass transit, walk or cycle to work, some accommodation must be made to encourage them to car share or use alternative propulsion systems, etc. Commissioner Craft agreed that the City should also promote car sharing or carpooling. Chair Moss summarized that the policy is intended to encourage a paradigm shift in how people think about getting from Point A to Point B.

Commissioner Scully expressed his belief that **Land Use Policy NE30** should not be deleted.

Chair Moss noted that the word “gasses” might need to be changed to “gases” in **Land Use Policy NE38**. She also suggested that a comma should be placed after “gases” and the word “and” should be deleted.

- **Page 20 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss suggested that **Land Use Policy NE45** should be rephrased to read, “Mimic natural process by using green infrastructure wherever feasible.” She commented that “strive” seems like a weak goal. Commissioner Craft also suggested that “green infrastructure” should be replaced with “green” and/or “sustainable” to retain consistency throughout the document. He said he would prefer to use “sustainable” since it entails various aspects.

Commissioner Craft noted that **Land Use Policy NE44** is very similar to **Land Use Policy NE10**, which was discussed earlier, except it specifically talks about removing regulatory barriers. He suggested that **Land Use Policy NE10** could be amended to read, “Encourage the use of sustainable building methods and materials and remove regulatory barriers.” **Land Use Policy NE44** could be deleted. Ms. Redinger explained that “green infrastructure” is the correct term for **Land Use Policy NE10**. In other words, “plants instead of concrete.” Commissioner Craft again suggested that replacing “green” with “sustainable” would make the policy much clearer. Chair Moss suggested that to help differentiate from other policies in which “green” or “sustainable” have been used, the policy should clarify that “green” in **Land Use Policy NE10** refers to “plant based” or “vegetation.”

Chair Moss observed that many of the recommendations from the SE Neighborhoods Subarea Plan could be applied citywide. While many of the recommendations might already be covered in other policies, she suggested the Commission and staff review the recommendations and consider how they could be integrated on a citywide scale into the draft Natural Environment Element.

- **Page 21 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss referred to the list of potential additional items the Commission could include in the Natural Environment Element. Ms. Redinger reported that staff is working on a Climate Action Plan, and she anticipates this effort will eventually result in additional Comprehensive Plan policies. However, the plan is not slated for completion until the summer of 2013. Chair Moss observed that supporting analysis for the Natural Environment Element only briefly talks about the City’s newly updated tree code and becoming a “Tree City.” There are no related policies. Ms. Redinger agreed

to do a word search to identify where “Tree City” is referenced in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Moss recognized that the policies and goals overlap between different elements, but there are times when a point is valuable enough to restate in more than one element.

Commission Review of Natural Element Supporting Analysis (Attachment C)

- **Page 29 of the Staff Report**

The Commission recognized that alternative language would need to be inserted into the second to the last paragraph if the voters approve the Seattle Public Utility water system acquisition in November. Chair Moss suggested the supporting analysis should make it clear that people can review the Emergency Preparedness Plan that is posted on the City’s website to identify additional resources in the case of an environmental event.

Chair Moss questioned the use of the term, “cumulative social habits” in the last sentence in the 1st paragraph. She also suggested that an action word needs to be added to this sentence for clarity. In addition, she suggested that some commas could be replaced with semicolons.

- **Page 30 of the Staff Report**

Vice Chair Esselman requested additional information about how the hazard rankings were determined. Chair Moss said she was surprised by the 2009 rankings; but if they were based on public feedback, they cannot be changed. Mr. Szafran pointed out the 2009 rankings occurred at the time the Public Health Lab Master Plan was being done, and the significant amount of public education may have eased fears about hazardous materials. Ms. Redinger agreed to provide more information about whether the rankings identify perceived threats or hazards that are most likely to happen. The Commission agreed that rather than the current community-based hazard rankings, a technical-based study that identifies and scientifically ranks the actual potential hazards would be more appropriate to include in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Scully questioned whether “climate change” belongs in the table of hazards. This section is intended to reference short-term emergency events and how to plan for them. Chair Moss agreed that climate change is a gradual long-term process rather than a single emergency event. Ms. Redinger said she understands the distinction made by Commissioner Scully, but she pointed out that climate change can lead to a series of drastic events such as drought, flood, fire, mosquito outbreak, etc. Commissioner Craft commented that climate change involves many different factors; whereas the other items in the table identify potential immediate threats. On the other hand, even the scientific community does not quite understand the long-term impacts of climate change.

Commissioner Montero asked for more information about the Shoreline Emergency Management Council, which made the recommendation to include climate change as an element of the severe weather hazard discussion. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this question and report back to the Commission. Chair Moss noted that if the decision is made to use a more scientific approach when ranking hazards, the preceding paragraph would need to be changed, as well. Ms. Redinger pointed out that there is a section specifically about climate change on Page 34 of the Staff Report

(Attachment C). If the hazards are ranked by a more scientific risk assessment, Commissioner Craft suggested that language related to climate change would be more appropriately addressed elsewhere. This section relates to hazards that pose immediate threats. Vice Chair Esselman cautioned against stating exactly what will happen in Shoreline as a result of climate change. The Commission agreed that the supporting analysis could acknowledge that climate change will have an impact on the community without stating specifically what the impacts will be.

- **Page 31 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked if the subductive plates referenced in the 3rd bulleted item are the same as those referenced above. Ms. Redinger agreed to seek additional information to determine whether or not the term “subductive plates” should be plural.

Chair Moss suggested that the words “being at” should be replaced with “either” in the paragraph just above the National Earthquake Reduction Program (NEHRP) Soils Map. This would make it clear that moderate to high risk and high risk are separate categories.

- **Page 32 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss recommended that the 1st paragraph be changed by replacing “in the first few minutes” with “immediately.” She also pointed out that the commas after “fires” in the 4th and 5th lines of the 2nd paragraph could be deleted.

Vice Chair Esselman questioned the need to include language related to tornados in the 2nd paragraph because they are rare occurrences. Chair Moss recalled that as a result of climate change, areas in the United States that did not historically have tornadoes are now experiencing them. In addition, there were a few small tornadoes in the Puget Sound area last year. The Commission agreed that tornadoes should be referenced in the paragraph. However, the last three sentences should be deleted and replaced with a sentence stating that tornadoes are dangerous and rare, but they have occurred in the area.

- **Page 33 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully pointed out that the word “receive” in the 3rd line of the 1st paragraph should be changed to “receiver.” Ms. Redinger explained that the deleted language came directly from the Emergency Hazards Plan, and Chair Moss suggested it would be appropriate to provide a reference to the Emergency Hazards Plan for more detail.

Chair Moss noted that the word “and” should be added before “Richmond Beach” in the second paragraph. She also suggested the 2nd and 3rd sentences in the 3rd paragraph should be combined by placing “, and” after “storm.” It was noted that neighborhoods located at higher elevations get more snow and ice than those located at lower elevations. However, perhaps it would not be appropriate to call out specific neighborhoods if the list is not all inclusive.

- **Page 34 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Craft recalled that the Commission agreed earlier to eliminate the list of specific changes that will occur in Shoreline as a result of climate change. He also suggested that the 2nd sentence in the 3rd paragraph should be changed to read, “City and emergency services should develop plans to educate people about the aforementioned hazards.” Rather than singling out just two concerns, the City should create an emergency plan to address all of the most critical concerns. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

- **Page 35 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Montero asked if it would be possible to include a small graphic for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains, similar to the graphic provided for the landslide hazard areas. Commissioner Craft recalled that the floodplain maps are currently being updated. Ms. Redinger responded that while they would not be imbedded in the body of the text, one or two 11” x 17” maps would be provided in the analysis section for each element. The floodplain map could be included, but the liquefaction map would likely be eliminated.

Chair Moss pointed out that the statement about the properties along 27th Avenue NW and the railroad tracks being the most vulnerable (2nd paragraph) has been made elsewhere in the element. This language is redundant and could be eliminated. Ms. Redinger agreed these properties have been called out as the most vulnerable for a number of hazards because their geographic location makes them more susceptible.

- **Page 37 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss invited the Commission to provide feedback regarding staff’s comment that the last sentence of the 1st paragraph should either be made a policy or be removed from the analysis. She asked if steep slopes and land cover maps are readily available. Mr. Szafran answered that the City already has a steep slopes map and a tree coverage map. Chair Moss suggested that there would be some value in creating a policy that addresses the increased risk of fires during hot weather and windy conditions and that it might be difficult for emergency vehicles to access some areas. However, she acknowledged that this concern may already be addressed elsewhere.

Chair Moss recalled that the Mount St. Helens eruption resulted in ash that not only clogged ventilation systems and machinery, but caused health hazards for a long period of time. She suggested that the last sentence in the third paragraph should be changed by eliminating the words, “to machinery and transportation.”

- **Page 41 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss recommended that the 3rd sentence in the last paragraph should be changed to read, “Priority habitats provide unique or significant value to many species.”

- **Page 43 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Moss suggested that the 4th sentence in the 1st paragraph should be changed to read, “Ronald Bog and Twin Ponds are dredged bogs” because the language later states that these areas will eventually revert back to bogs. Commissioner Scully clarified that Ronald Bog and Twin Ponds are currently lakes that were historically dredged. Because no further dredging will occur, they will both eventually revert back to bogs. The Commission agreed not to change the language.

- **Page 44 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked if a surface water and wetland area map would be included at the end of the section. Ms. Redinger said staff has not decided which maps would be included in the Natural Environment Supporting Analysis. The City has a map showing surface water and wetland areas, but it may not be included in the supporting analysis.

Commissioner Scully suggested that if McAleer Creek, Thornton Creek and an area of Puget Sound adjacent to Richmond Beach are still on the Washington State list of water features that do not meet water quality standards, the 1st full paragraph should be retained so they can be addressed in the future.

Commission Review of Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies (Attachment E)

- **Pages 62 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Craft pointed out that the first bulleted item in **Capital Facilities Goal CF I** should either be deleted until the citizens vote to approve acquisition of the Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline or make note that the vote is pending. Commissioner Craft commented that it should not be retained as a City goal if the citizens vote against it. Ms. Redinger suggested that this language should be flagged pending the outcome of the vote to further study the feasibility of the acquisition. She said the current language came directly from the City Council’s goals.

Commissioner Montero asked if acquiring the Seattle Public Utilities water system in Shoreline would remain a goal if the vote is positive. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively, but noted that the language may be updated to reflect the outcome of the election. Commissioner Montero asked if changes are necessary to address Ms. Pottinger’s earlier comment about the expiration of the Shoreline Water District franchise. Commissioner Scully clarified that her objections were related to later language that is more positive about the acquisition.

Chair Moss referenced the 6th bulleted item in **Capital Facilities Goal CF V** and asked staff to describe the term “locationally and aesthetically sensitive.” Ms. Redinger agreed this is not a good descriptive term, but the intent is to make sure that utilities are placed in the proper location. Staff agreed to rework this section for clarity.

- **Page 64 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Montero suggested that **Capital Facilities Policies CF10 and CF12** should be combined because they are redundant.

- **Page 65 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Montero suggested that another policy be added under “Coordination and Public Involvement” that reads, “Encourage implementation of new public services from technological innovations.” This policy would encourage the City to incorporate new technology as it comes forward in the future.

Chair Moss pointed out that each of the bulleted items in **Capital Facilities Policy CF17** have been addressed or described in other policies. She suggested that all language after “utility services” should be deleted.

- **Page 66 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss suggested that “emergency services” be included in the list of services listed in **Capital Facilities Policy CF8**.

- **Page 67 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss requested that the information provided in **Capital Facilities Goal CF30** be provided in a table format similar to what was provided in the Utilities Element. This would make the information easier to read and provide consistency.

Commission Review of Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis (Attachment G)

- **Page 77 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully recommended that the last sentence in the 1st paragraph should be deleted. While it may be true that the City will eventually take over some non-city managed services, the supporting analysis is not the right place to state that the City can do a better job of managing these services.

Chair Moss pointed out that the supporting analysis talks about the creation of a new Emergency Operations Center when the new police station is built, but there are no goals and/or policies specifically related to an Emergency Operations Center. Mr. Szafran agreed to research this question further and report back to the Commission.

- **Page 78 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Craft referred to the 3rd full paragraph questioned if the supporting analysis is the right document to advocate for unification of utilities. While the language suggests that the City could provide more efficient services by unifying some of the water and sew utilities with City

operations, no explanation or documentation is provided to back up the statement. He asked staff to review the supporting analysis and flag and eliminate the advocacy-leaning statements.

Chair Moss pointed out that the words, “to decide” should be removed from the 2nd sentence in the 3rd paragraph from the bottom.

- **Page 81 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss noted that language on Page 80 talks about eastside storefronts, and language on Page 81 talks about neighborhood centers east and west. She asked that consistent language be used throughout the document. She also asked that punctuation and addresses be consistent.

Chair Moss referred to the last paragraph and asked what type of equipment would be needed to operate an Emergency Operations Center from the Fire Department’s community room. Mr. Forry answered that televisions, computers, supplies, maps and all other equipment necessary to support the Emergency Operations Center would be provided by the City.

- **Page 82 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss requested that an additional sentence be added to the 3rd paragraph (public school facilities) to make note of the improvements that are currently underway at Shorecrest and Shorewood High Schools. This is a significant undertaking that is worth mentioning in the supporting analysis. Ms. Redinger said all of the language pertaining to schools was forwarded to representatives of the Shoreline School District, and they may provide some editorial comments regarding this section, as well.

- **Page 83 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked that the table be reformatted so that all information can be provided on one line.

- **Page 84 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss pointed out that the 2nd paragraph under “Existing Water System” is redundant of language contained in the Utilities Element.

- **Page 85 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully noted that the paragraph at the bottom of Page 85 and top of Page 86 is also an advocacy statement that should be removed from the supporting analysis.

- **Page 87 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss noted that the completed Brightwater facility is incorrectly identified as a planned facility. Because this facility has actually been completed, she suggested the language should be moved to the section for existing facilities.

Commissioner Montero reminded the Commission of Ms. Pottinger's request to strike "as with the future assumption of the Shoreline Water District," from the 1st sentence of the 1st paragraph. The Commission indicated support for this change.

- **Page 89 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked staff to reformat Table CF-2 to make it easier to read and more consistent with other tables throughout the document.

- **Page 91 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked what is meant by the term "capital fundraising strategies." Ms. Redinger said this includes grants, bonds and levies.

- **Page 92 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss advised that the word "and" should be deleted from the last sentence of the 4th full paragraph.

- **Page 94 of the Staff Report**

Ms. Redinger reported that staff received clarification from the City Attorney that language related to capital funding strategies could be deleted. Instead, this section would reference the Capital Improvement Plan, which is the 6-year plan that is required by the Growth Management Act.

Commission Review of the Utilities Element Goals and Policies (Attachment I)

- **Page 113 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss pointed out that a reference to the Capital Facilities Element for water, stormwater, and sewer facilities is stated twice in the second paragraph. Therefore, the latter reference should be deleted.

Chair Moss asked for Commission feedback about whether or not the changes made previously to **Capital Facilities Goal CF V** should also be applied to **Utilities Goal U I**. The Commission concurred that the changes should be applied in both goals.

- **Page 114 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss asked if language would be added under the "Solid Waste" section to reflect that the transfer station has closed or to address potential remedy through a CleanScapes contract or other provider. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this question and report back to the Commission.

- **Page 115 of the Staff Report**

Commissioner Scully said it makes sense to combine **Utility Policy U11 and the diluted Utility Policy U14**, but he cautioned that they say slightly different things. Given recent community interest in encouraging Seattle Public Utilities to not trim trees unnecessarily, the combined policy should address tree trimming in general by removing the words “within major utility transmission corridors.”

- **Page 116 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss requested feedback from the Commission about the staff comment that suggests that **Utility Policy U22** could be eliminated because it is redundant. The Commission concurred that the policy could be deleted as recommended by staff.

Commission Review of Utilities Element Supporting Analysis

- **Page 121 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss pointed out that the last sentence in the last full paragraph appears to be redundant to the first part of the paragraph.

- **Pages 122 and 123 of the Staff Report**

Chair Moss pointed out that other types of telecommunication services are available in the City beside those listed in the last paragraph. Therefore, she suggested that the reference to CenturyLink and Frontier should be deleted. Commissioner Montero recommended that the entire telecommunications section should be rewritten to reflect the significant merging of telecommunication services. Mr. Forry agreed to rewrite this section for future Commission consideration.

- **Page 125 of the Staff Report**

It was noted that the list of “general facilities” should be updated to indicate that the Historical Museum owns their building now.

Chair Moss pointed out that Lightwave and AboveNet Communications are not addressed elsewhere in the supporting analysis. Mr. Forry pointed out that Electric Lightwave and AboveNet pass through the City, but do not provide service to any parties in Shoreline. Chair Moss suggested that an asterisk be added to make note of this fact.

Public Comment

There was no one left in the audience to comment during this portion of the meeting.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Markle did not have any additional items to report to the Commission.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Establishing a Subcommittee for Light Rail Station Area Planning

Chair Moss questioned if establishing a subcommittee for light rail station area planning is premature at this time, based on recent information staff received from Sound Transit. She recalled the Commission felt a sense of urgency when they thought Sound Transit would be moving forward more quickly. Ms. Redinger said there still seems to be a sense of urgency for the community to get involved in station area planning now. However, the City will not likely start public outreach on the issue until June of 2013. She said she does not know how much the City will be able to provide facilitated management, so the subcommittee would have to be self directed. Staff is considering what other type of facilitated outreach the City could do in addition to open houses and attending neighborhood meetings.

Commissioner Craft said he would like to know more detail about the high-level coordination schedule that was provided earlier by staff. He recalled that at the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting there was some advocacy about starting the process. However, he questioned how effective a subcommittee would be without staff support to provide necessary information.

Vice Chair Esselman suggested they postpone establishing the subcommittee until early 2013. Chair Moss agreed and noted that the Commission already has a full schedule with the Comprehensive Plan update. Commissioner Craft recalled that the immediacy issue focused on the need to show Sound Transit that the City was serious about having two stations in Shoreline. Concern was expressed that if the City did not act in an immediate fashion, they could potentially lose one of the stations. He suggested staff provide more guidance about whether or not this is still a concern.

Commissioner Montero said he sees station area planning as a long-range effort to identify a vision for how the neighborhoods should be redeveloped if and when light rail stations are developed. He recommended that far-range planning should start as soon as possible. This early effort could help convince Sound Transit that two stations in Shoreline would be appropriate.

Chair Moss pointed out that additional information and resources will be developed between now and the end of 2012 that might give some ideas to the subcommittee. The Puget Sound Regional Council has scheduled an open house the end of October, which might be helpful for all Commissioners to attend. She emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan update is the City Council's number one priority at this time, and staff will be heavily involved with this process throughout the remainder of 2012. They will not be available to provide staff support for a subcommittee.

Commissioner Scully agreed with Commissioner Montero that there is no down side to establishing a subcommittee to move forward with planning now. However, it is important to keep in mind that the subcommittee would be discussing concepts and gathering information but not setting final parameters. Commissioner Craft said he supports the creation of a subcommittee now to discuss how the light rail stations will impact the City, what the neighborhoods should look like, and to what degree station area

planning should be incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan. However, it is important to recognize that the process would move forward at a slightly slower pace than originally anticipated.

Ms. Markle clarified that when staff met with Sound Transit representatives to discuss station area planning, they knew that the City Council and Planning Commission were pushing for both plans to be done in 2013 to support their funding. They know the City is serious about having two stations, but they cannot commit to the one at 145th Street because they are currently studying three potential locations in their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Sound Transit expressed concern about the City getting too far ahead of their draft EIS process, which will be completed in 2013. Staff proposed the new schedule to better line up with Sound Transit's process. She said it would be helpful for the subcommittee to review the draft EIS and provide comments from a different perspective.

Ms. Markle said staff is very immersed in the Comprehensive Plan update at this time, and they are also working hard to learn all they can about concepts such as transit-oriented development and transit-oriented communities so they can better feed information to the Commission, neighborhood groups and interested members of the community. She noted that the cost of planning for just one station area is estimated to be about \$250,000. She said staff cannot provide direction to the subcommittee until at least October. However, if a subcommittee is formed prior to that time, they could spend time learning about what other areas are doing and familiarizing themselves with the surroundings at both of the proposed station areas. Chair Moss commented that forming a subcommittee now to begin gathering information would send the message that station area planning is important to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Montero said it would also allow the subcommittee to participate in upcoming meetings regarding station area planning and report back to the Commission.

The Commission agreed to establish the subcommittee as soon as possible to begin the fact-finding process, recognizing that no staff support would be available at this time. Commissioners Montero, Maul, Craft and Scully indicated an interest in serving on the subcommittee. The Commission agreed to postpone selection of subcommittee members and discuss the issue at the next meeting to further refine the subcommittee's focus.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no committee or Commissioner reports or announcements.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran noted that no specific subject has been scheduled for the September 6th agenda. Chair Moss suggested the Commission continue discussion about the formation of a light rail station area planning subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT

DRAFT

TIME STAMP
August 16, 2012

CALL TO ORDER: 0:05

ROLL CALL: 1:30

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 1:45

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS: 1:56

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 5:24

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 6:20

**STUDY SESSION ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – NEW POLICIES FOR
CAPITAL FACILITIES, NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND UTILITIES**

Commission Review of Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies: 10:50

Commission Review of Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis: 55:00

Commission Review of Natural Environment Element Goals and Policies: 1:39:20

Commission Review of Natural Environment Element Supporting Analysis: 1:53:06

Commission Review of Utilities Element Goals and Policies: 2:18:21

Commission Review of Utilities Element Supporting Analysis: 2:26:10

Public Comment: 2:31:02

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 2:31:08

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Establishing a Subcommittee for Light Rail Station Area Planning: 2:31:18

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 2:51:10

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 2:51:24

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT