

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, October 18, 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. September 20 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. PUBLIC HEARING	7:30 p.m.
A. Comprehensive Plan Major Update	
• Staff Presentation	
• Questions by the Commission	
• Public Testimony	
• Final Questions & Deliberations	
• Vote to Recommend Approval or Denial or Modification	
Closure of Public Hearing	
8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	9:00 p.m.
9. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	9:05 p.m.
10. AGENDA FOR November 1	9:35 p.m.
11. ADJOURNMENT	9:45 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

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Comprehensive Plan Update: Public Hearing		
DEPARTMENT:	Planning & Community Development		
PRESENTED BY:	Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner Steve Szafran, AICP, Senior Planner Rachael Markle, AICP, Director P&CD		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing	<input type="checkbox"/> Study Session	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

This staff report summarizes the following topics as they relate to the 2012 update of the City of Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan:

- History of the process, including staff and Commission review, and public participation;
- Resolution of Big Picture Questions identified as part of the process; and
- Environmental analysis and agency review of the draft.

The focus of the October 18 agenda will be a public hearing on the full, InDesign version of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Following the hearing, Commission may further revise the document and/or make a recommendation to City Council. The Comprehensive Plan Update is currently scheduled as an agenda item at every Council meeting in November, with December 10 slated for potential adoption.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Process

The State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that cities and counties update their Comprehensive Plans on a regular basis (RCW 36.70A.130 [5]); in the case of King County, the state requirement is for the update to be completed by June 30, 2015. Shoreline's City Council directed staff and the Planning Commission to complete the update by the end of 2012, primarily so that it reflects Vision 2029, which was adopted in April 2009.

The current version of the Plan was last updated in 2005 and contains 300 pages of text and tables. Project goals included revising the document to be more succinct, user-friendly, and graphically interesting.

Approved By:

Project Manager 

Planning Director 

The following criteria were used for *removing* policies and other text:

- Background- Approximately half of the current document (about 150 pages) was background, including information about the City's incorporation and public processes for creating and updating the Plan.
- Redundant- Many policies were restatements of policies found in other elements of the Plan.
- Obsolete- Many policies were outdated or had been accomplished (such as construction of Aurora).
- Regulatory- Many policies were more detailed than is appropriate for a general guiding document.
- Superseded- If the City is already mandated to do something by local, state, or federal regulations, it is unnecessary to have a policy statement about it.

The following criteria were used for *adding* policies or other text:

- To comply with GMA or other updated requirements.
- To support Vision 2029 and Framework Goals, or other Council Goals.
- To promote consistency with other guiding documents:
 - Functional Master Plans (Transportation; Surface Water; Parks, Recreation and Open Space; and Shoreline Master Program);
 - Strategies (Environmental Sustainability, Comprehensive Housing, and Economic Development); and
 - Subarea Plans (North City, SE Neighborhoods, Town Center, and Point Wells).

Following initial staff review and proposed revisions, the update process had two major components.

1. Planning Commission Review:

On January 5, 2012, the Commission discussed a process to complete update the Comprehensive Plan by the following December. Below is a schedule of their review process for individual elements and full drafts.

- February 2- Community Design and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
- March 1- Transportation
- April 5- Natural Environment (proposed as a new element, formerly part of Land Use)
- April 19- Capital Facilities and Utilities
- May 3- Economic Development
- May 17- Housing
- June 7- Land Use and Land Use Map
- June 21- Shoreline Master Program and Economic Development
- July 9- Joint dinner meeting with City Council to discuss Big Picture Questions
- August 2- Community Design, Housing, and Land Use
- August 16- Natural Environment, Capital Facilities, and Utilities
- September 20- Full draft of entire Plan
- October 4- Land Use, Capital Facilities, and Utilities
- October 18- Public Hearing on full draft Plan

2. Public Participation

Public participation is a major requirement of GMA and an important City value. In order to create opportunities for meaningful involvement by the Shoreline community, staff engaged in the outreach initiatives described below:

- Speaker series- The City hosted five events, with the following speakers and topics:
 - January 25, Community Design Element- Chuck Wolfe, Urban Land Institute, *Six Urbanist Themes for 2012*
 - February 22, Transportation Element- Sara Schott Nicolic, Puget Sound Regional Council, *Equitable Transit Communities*
 - April 12, Natural Environment Element- Jenny Pell, permaculture designer, *Beacon Food Forest*
 - April 25, Economic Development Element- Rob Bennett, Portland Sustainability Institute, *EcoDistricts*
 - September 12, Land Use Element- Matthew Kwatinetz, QBL Real Estate, *Sustainability, Culture, and Integrated Economic Development Strategies*
- Comprehensive Plan Update webpage (www.shorelinewa.gov/2012update)- This site contains background and purpose of comprehensive planning, an embedded Vision 2029 video, links to the current Plan and Speaker's Series videos, as well as staff reports, draft versions of all elements reviewed to date, and Commission minutes from each discussion.
- Outreach- The Comprehensive Plan Update was featured in the May 2011 *Currents* "Special Planning Edition", and the October 2012 edition, which announced the Public Hearing date. Speaker's Series events have been published in the newsletter as well. Staff also disseminated information about the events through Constant Contact and social media.
- Interested parties- Staff has received input from several organizations, including the King County Housing Development Consortium, King County Public Health, Shoreline Historical Museum, Ronald Wastewater District, Shoreline Water District, several local churches, Futurewise, a state representative, and city residents. Many changes were made based on these recommendations.
- Public Hearing and environmental review- Both of which have a public comment period. No comments have been received to date.

Big Picture Questions

Staff compiled a list of "big picture questions" to facilitate discussion at the July 9 joint City Council and Planning Commission dinner meeting. Most of those topics were not discussed that evening, but through Commission deliberation, have since been resolved. They are listed here with a staff response that includes policy references within the draft Plan.

High Priority Discussion Topics

- Develop and communicate policies regarding Shoreline's commitment to the timing of Light Rail Station Area planning prior to finalization of station locations.

- Light Rail Station Area Framework Goals are included as Land Use policies LU20-43.
- The Land Use Map includes Special Study Area boundaries encompassing a half-mile radius from potential stations at N 185th Street and N 145th Street. These boundaries will be refined as the initial task of a public process beginning in 2013.
- Direction relating to potentially increasing height and/or density, and enhancing design standards for commercial, mixed-use, and high density residential areas.
 - LU9: Through a commercial zoning consolidation process, create a new zone to replace the Mixed-Use Zone and the Industrial zone, combine redundant commercial standards, and base transition and design standards on Town Center Subarea Plan, using “form-based” rather than maximum densities.
 - The Plan also creates two Land Use designations for Mixed-Use (LU10 and LU11), one of which applies to areas suited for higher intensity development, such as along the Aurora Corridor, and another better suited to a neighborhood scale for commercial areas along 15th Avenue NE and others.
 - Goal CDV: Consolidate redundant commercial, industrial, and mixed-use development standards, and include design and transition standards for all commercial zones.
 - There are numerous policies in the Community Design and Housing Elements that provide direction for design considerations, including transitions to different uses or those with varied intensity.

Other Big Picture Questions

Housing

- Direction for Potential Housing Development Code Revision Packet (aging in place, lot to structure ratio, housing styles, Accessory Dwelling Units, Transit-Oriented Development, etc.)

The Plan provides guidance to promote a variety of housing styles, including:

 - Goal HII: Encourage development of an appropriate mix of housing choices through innovative land use and well-crafted regulations.
 - H1-H6 fall under the subheading of “Facilitate Provision of a Variety of Housing Choices.”
 - H27: Support opportunities for older adults and people with disabilities to remain in the community as their housing needs change, by encouraging universal design or retrofitting homes for lifetime use.
 - LU31, LU40, LU42, and H17 provide direction for Transit-Oriented Communities.
- Affordable Housing: There was strong community support at the May 17 meeting for being more aggressive about affordability requirements and incentives; should the Plan reflect this?

The Plan includes specific recommendations for increasing affordability and addressing homelessness in Shoreline, including:

- Goal H11: Preserve and develop housing throughout the city that addresses the needs of all economic segments of the community, including underserved populations, such as households making less than 30% of Area Median Income.
 - There is an entire subheading called “Promote Affordable Housing Opportunities” that contains policies H7-H19.
 - H29: Support the development of public and private, short-term and long-term housing and services for Shoreline’s population of people who are homeless.
 - H32: Work to increase the availability of public and private resources on a regional level for affordable housing and prevention of homelessness, including factors related to cost-burdened households, like availability of transit, food, health services, employment, and education.
- Cottage Housing: Should it be called something else? Should the City revise regulations to allow this style again?
 - H6: Consider regulations that would allow clustered housing in residential areas, and revise Development Code to allow and create standards for a wider variety of housing styles.
 - Density Bonus: An affordable housing density bonus has been part of the regulations for a long time, but until recently, no one had utilized it. When a local church tried to apply it, it became apparent that it wasn’t achievable because of other lot restrictions, such as lot coverage (at least in single-family zones). Should there be policy language to revise the affordable housing density bonus through exemptions or variances to make it more feasible?
 - H7: Allow an increase in permitted density to facilitate development of affordable housing, and consider creating exemptions to make a density bonus feasible when lot coverage or other development standard would otherwise make it unattainable.
 - Housing Trust Fund- Are there any potential funding sources to establish a mechanism to support increased affordability by means other than policy?
 - H9: Explore the feasibility of creating a City housing trust fund for development of low- income housing.

Land Use

- Should Shoreline pursue becoming designated as a PSRC Regional Growth Center?
 - Goal LU XI: Nominate Shoreline as a Regional Growth Center as defined by the Puget Sound Regional Council.
- Mandates vs. Incentives: Green building and affordability are two areas most impacted by this debate.
 - LU57, CD44, H2, H8, H13, ED4, ED22, ED23, NE6, NE10, NE18, NE21, NE24, and NE47 mention incentives for energy efficiency and environmentally-friendly design, affordability, historic preservation, mixed-use, and preservation of natural features and functions.

- EcoDistricts: What should the action verbs be- pursue, consider, etc. (or not include concept at all)?
 - LU55: Explore whether “Ecodistricts” could be an appropriate means of neighborhood empowerment, and a mechanism to implement triple-bottom line sustainability goals by having local leaders commit to ambitious targets for green building, smart infrastructure, and behavioral change at individual, household, and community levels.
- Should expanded commercial uses be allowed in High Density Residential?
 - This concept is not addressed in the draft Plan.
- Should Campus zones be allowed to have new uses as part of a Master Development Plan permit instead of requiring an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to do the same?
 - LU18: The Campus land use designation applies to four institutions within the community that serve a regional clientele on a large campus. All development within the Campus land use designation shall be governed by a Master Development Plan Permit. Existing uses in these areas constitute allowed uses in the City’s Development Code. A new use or uses may be approved as part of a Master Development Plan Permit.
- Should standard land use designations be assigned to Special Study Areas (SSAs)?
 - LU19: The Special Study Area designates future subarea planning or Light Rail Station Areas. The underlying zoning for this designation remains unless it is changed through an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Development Code.
 - The designation of SSA was removed from all parcels except the Light Rail Station Areas. Staff examined each area previously designated for special study and concluded that the issues that prompted the original designation had been resolved, and that there does not appear to be a time in the foreseeable future for additional study of these areas to be a priority on the Planning and Community Development Department work plan. All areas in question were assigned a land use designation that is compatible to their current zoning. Technically, Ballinger Commons is developed at 6.5 dwelling units per acre, and the draft Land Use Map designates it as Low Density Residential, which perpetuates a nonconformance that could be resolved in the future based on Council direction.

Capital Facilities/Utilities

- Does Council have direction for what these elements should say about potential SPU (or other utility) acquisition?
 - CFI: Provide adequate public facilities that address past deficiencies and anticipate the needs of growth through acceptable levels of service, prudent use of fiscal resources, and realistic timelines.

To support Goal CF I:

- Acquire Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) water system in Shoreline;
- As outlined in the 2002 Interlocal Operating Agreement, complete the assumption of the Ronald Wastewater District; and prepare for the expiration of the Shoreline Water District franchise (scheduled for 2027) by evaluating assumption and consolidation with the City's water system acquired from the City of Seattle (SPU).
- There are other references to potential acquisitions or assumptions throughout the Capital Facilities and Utilities Goals and Policies, and Analyses.

Economic Development

- Home based businesses: How does the City balance desire to create more local economic development opportunities with neighborhood concerns like parking, signage, etc.?
 - ED3: Encourage and support home-based businesses in the City, provided that signage, parking, storage, and noise levels are compatible with neighborhoods.
 - U16: Promote opportunities for distance learning and telecommuting to implement economic development and climate initiatives, such as encouraging more home-based businesses that provide jobs without increased traffic.
- Clean/Green Industries- How does the City encourage living wage, "clean tech" jobs while mitigating potential conflicts with adjacent uses?
 - LUX: Allow areas in the city where clean, green industry may be located.
 - LU1X: Minimize or mitigate potential health impacts of industrial activities on residential communities, schools, open space, and other public facilities.
 - CD4: Buffer the visual impact on residential areas of commercial, office, industrial, and institutional development.
- Food carts- Does the City want to promote these and other incubator initiatives?
 - This concept is not addressed in the draft Plan.

Natural Environment

- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR): Does the City want to keep or refine language to consider developing or participating in a program? If so, state, regional, and/or local?
 - LU58: Support regional and state Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs throughout the city where infrastructure improvements are needed, and where additional density, height and bulk standards can be accommodated.
 - NE6: Provide incentives for site development that minimizes environmental impacts. Incentives may include density bonuses for cluster development and/or a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

Environmental Review and Checklists

The adoption of a Comprehensive Plan is considered a non-project action under the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) because no permit or license is issued by the City; this action is subject to environmental review under SEPA. To fulfill this requirement, an environmental checklist was prepared to assist in identifying likely adverse significant impacts, and determining mitigation for the impacts that do not rise to the level of being significant.

Existing environmental documents were evaluated to assist in framing the scope of the environmental review. As with any environmental review, background information is valuable. Existing environmental documents are often consulted to see what and how environmental issues were addressed during prior planning efforts. If the existing documents meet the needs of the proposal, they can be formally adopted. The City adopted several documents used in previous actions, ranging from the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) issued for the original Comprehensive Plan to technical memoranda prepared by consultants addressing some of the new policies included in the update.

A formal Notice of Adoption was issued by the City on September 27, 2012. The checklist for this proposal incorporated and expanded on information in the adopted documents. The checklist and background information were made available to the public when the Responsible Official issued a decision on the significance of potential impacts.

To make this Threshold Determination, consideration must be given to environmental and technical information when evaluating the significance of impacts. The technical information considered included the draft Comprehensive Plan policies, Development Code regulations, and adopted Master Plans (Transportation; Surface Water; and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space). The document was reviewed for consistency with King County's Countywide Planning Policies, the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040, and the City of Shoreline's Vision 2029.

Based on evaluation of the available information, staff found that the update will not require changes to the natural or built environment, and no probable significant impacts were identified. Staff recommended a Threshold Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS). The DNS was issued by the Responsible Official on October 3, 2012. The DNS was noticed, along with the public hearing on October 3, 2012, and the comment period ends on October 18.

Staff also prepared required check-lists and submitted the draft Plan for review by the Puget Sound Regional Council, King County, and the Washington Departments of Commerce and Ecology. These agencies require that Comprehensive Plans be submitted for review within 60 days of potential adoption.

NEXT STEPS

Criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan are delineated in SMC 20.30.340- Amendment and review of the Comprehensive Plan (legislative action). The regulation is included below in *italics*, with staff response immediately following.

A. Purpose. *A Comprehensive Plan amendment or review is a mechanism by which the City may modify the text or map of the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the provisions of the Growth Management Act, in order to respond to changing circumstances or needs of the City, and to review the Comprehensive Plan on a regular basis.*

B. Decision Criteria. *The Planning Commission may recommend and the City Council may approve, or approve with modifications an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if:*

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*
 - o Staff reviewed the Plan for consistency with the Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies, and for internal consistency with other Plan elements and City policies, and determined that the draft document meets this requirement.

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*
 - o This update captures a snapshot of Shoreline in 2012, and will guide growth according to the vision established by the community and Council. Changing circumstances and values that are reflected in this update include an evolution of the city from a suburban fringe to a more self-sustaining urban environment, with a desire for more local jobs, services, and amenities, a multi-modal transportation system, and potential management of utilities. Another example of evolving values is the inclusion of economic and social equity considerations in addition to the focus on environmental sustainability.

3. *The amendment will benefit the community as a whole, will not adversely affect community facilities, the public health, safety or general welfare.*
 - o Policies included in the draft 2012 Comprehensive Plan are intended to benefit the community, and promote public health, safety, and general welfare. Examples include Community Design policies meant to direct development of design and transition standards, Natural Environment policies meant to protect natural resources and functions, Transportation policies meant to promote walkability and connectivity, and Housing policies meant to offer a variety of housing choices and levels of affordability appropriate for a diverse population.

Following the public hearing, if the Commission believes these criteria have been met, they may make a recommendation to Council. Staff would then present the draft to Council, with the goal of adoption on December 10, 2012.

If you have questions or comments prior to the meeting, please contact Miranda Redinger at (206) 801-2513 or by email at mredinger@shorelinewa.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

A Word version of the draft Comprehensive Plan that will be the subject of the public hearing was placed on the City's project web page (www.shorelinewa.gov/2012update) on October 3. Planning Commission received a hard copy of the InDesign version of this draft at their October 4 meeting. An updated digital copy of the InDesign version was sent to Plancom and posted on the project web page on Thursday, October 11. The Notice of Adoption, SEPA checklist, and SEPA DNS are also posted on the web page. Therefore, there are no physical attachments for this staff report.

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

September 20, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Moss
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Scully
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

Commissioners Absent

Vice Chair Esselman
Commissioner Montero

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 and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Scully and Wagner. Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioner Montero were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Cohen reported that on September 17th, the City Council directed staff to get started on the Light Rail Station Area Planning Work Plan. They also asked staff to further refine the adopted Station Area Planning Study Area Map. They are expecting staff to complete this work by the spring of 2013. He reminded the Commission that they recently formed a Light Rail Station Area Planning Subcommittee, as well.

Mr. Cohen advised that the Echo Lake, North City and Meridian Park Neighborhoods held a joint meeting on September 18th, and light rail station area planning was the key topic. Presentations were made by representatives from Sound Transit, and approximately 100 people attended. He reviewed some of the comments and concerns expressed at the meeting. He summarized that the meeting was a type of “kick-off” for the public involvement process, and there will be many more public meetings sponsored by the City. Sound Transit announced they will send a letter next spring to owners of properties where acquisition may occur.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Brian Carroll, Ronald Wastewater District Board President, asked to speak now regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update as he must attend another public hearing, as well. He thanked the City for including many of the District’s comments into the draft Comprehensive Plan. However, the District believes the introductory words found at the bottom of Page 130 are misleading. He explained that the intent of the 2002 Interlocal Operating Agreement is not to further the goal of consolidating services. In fact, the agreement (Section 3.2) actually prohibits consolidation, change of ownership, or any other change to the current situation with Ronald Wastewater District for an initial period of 15 years or longer. He encouraged the Commission and staff to consider eliminating the first phrase. While it may have become a goal afterwards by the City staff, it was not part of the agreement.

STUDY SESSION: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE – COMPLETE DRAFT

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger recalled that in previous meetings, the Commission went through each element of the Comprehensive Plan page-by-page to discuss wording and other details. Because the task before them tonight is to review the entire document, staff suggests the Commission maintain a higher level of focus. Staff is suggesting their review of the draft Comprehensive Plan Update should focus on:

- **Answering the remaining “big picture” questions.** Ms. Redinger referred to the list of “big picture” questions that were identified for the joint dinner meeting with the City Council in July. Staff believes most of the questions have been resolved, and they will review the Comprehensive Plan Update to identify the specific policies that address each of the issues. She invited the Commissioners to identify any unresolved “big picture” questions for discussion this evening.
- **Identify redundancies or issues that are not thoroughly covered.** Ms. Redinger suggested that policy topics that are included more than once within an element could be combined so the language is not unnecessarily duplicative. They should also identify single policies that attempt to convey too many points and should be divided into separate statements for clarity. Also some policy topics are included in multiple elements, and the Commission should consider if it is necessary for the policy to be stated in each one. Lastly, they should identify policy topics that are not addressed.
- **Remind staff if there are any edits they feel were left out.**

- **Prioritize order for goals, policies and elements.** Ms. Redinger reported that staff has done only minimal reorganization, so the Commission should feel free to note the goals and policies they feel should be higher in the order. She referred to the introduction, which the Commission has not yet had an opportunity to review. She noted that a lot of background information was deleted, and the pictures will be placed as sidebars in the InDesign version. The introduction includes a list of the elements. She pointed out that because the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements have a different feel and are denser than the other elements, staff moved them to the end of the document just prior to the Shoreline Master Program. The Natural Environment Element was placed right after the Land Use Element and is followed by the Economic Development and Housing Elements. She explained that after tonight's meeting, staff will prepare the document for a public hearing. The updated, document will also be used for various checklists for the Puget Sound Regional Council, Department of Commerce, Department of Ecology, King County, etc. and page numbers will need to be cited. Staff does not want to drastically rearrange the document after they prepare the public hearing version, so it is important to carefully consider the prioritization of each element now.
- **Compile a list of terms to search and replace.** Ms. Redinger explained that the draft plan is a compilation of many different documents by various authors and editors. Consequently, it contains stylistic differences and other inconsistencies. Staff has attempted to edit the document to be more internally consistent, but they would appreciate comments from the Commission via email.
- **Identify terms that should be defined in Glossary or sidebars.** Ms. Redinger advised that staff has highlighted words or phrases in the draft document that would be helpful to define in sidebar text when the InDesign version has been completed. She invited the Commission to identify via email additional terms that need further explanation.

Ms. Redinger explained that because the document will be reformatted, the Commission should not concern themselves with formatting issues at this time. She also cautioned that they should not devote too much of their discussion towards word choice or grammar edits since these comments can be forwarded to staff via email.

Ms. Redinger summarized that if the Commission feels comfortable at the end of their meeting, they may direct staff to schedule and notice a public hearing on the full draft Comprehensive Plan document as soon as October 18th. She advised that the document would also be forwarded to state and regional agencies that require 60 days for review. The goal is for the entire document to be adopted by the City Council on December 10, 2012.

Commission Review of the Comprehensive Plan Update Elements

The Commission discussed the best approach for reviewing the lengthy document. They agreed to review each element page-by-page. However, they agreed not to focus significantly on the supporting analysis, which provides factual information the Commission does not have leeway to change substantially. . They further agreed to avoid wordsmithing the document unless there is language that changes the intent or content. Grammatical changes should be forwarded to staff via email. The Commission concurred that the "big picture" items have all been discussed previously.

- Land Use Element Goals and Policies

Commissioner Scully said **Policy LU3** indicates that appropriate zoning for the High Density Residential (HDR) designation is Residential 12 (R-12) and up. His recollection is that the Commission discussed, if not decided, removing R-12 from the HDR category. Mr. Szafran recalled that the Commission agreed to leave R-12 in to give property owners the option of applying for a rezone or not. Ms. Redinger said her understanding was that the Commission did not feel comfortable eliminating R-12 from **Policy LU3** until a site-specific analysis had been performed on properties with both an HDR Comprehensive Plan designation and an R-12 zoning designation. She noted that **Policy LU4** directs staff to complete this higher-level analysis. The majority of Commissioners concurred with staff's recollection. Chair Moss reminded the Commission of the City's ability to update the Comprehensive Plan on an annual basis. This issue can be addressed in a future year once the analysis has been completed.

Commissioner Wagner referred to **Policies LU3 and LU12** and recalled the Commission previously discussed that the Mixed Use 1 (MU1) and Mixed Use 2 (MU2) designations should not place a cap on the number of residential units allowed per acre. Instead, a form-based code approach should be used. She said her preference is to avoid putting a cap on the number of residential units allowed per acre in areas designated as HDR, MU1 or MU2. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the yellow highlighted language is not policy language and staff intends to place it in a sidebar textbox. Commissioner Wagner suggested all the highlighted language that lists appropriate zoning for a particular designation should be eliminated because it is too specific and restrictive. If this change were made, **Policy LU4** would no longer be necessary. Chair Moss commented that while **Policy LU4** would be irrelevant as a goal, the Commission may still want staff to perform the higher-level analysis.

Commissioner Craft agreed with Commissioner Wagner's suggestion to remove the language related to appropriate zoning for a particular designation. Regarding **Policy LU4** he noted that the additional analysis would occur anyway if and when a property owner requests a rezone. Mr. Szafran agreed that the higher analysis would be done on a case-by-case basis as rezone requests come forward. However, **Policy LU4** calls for doing the analysis on a wholesale basis for all properties (approximately 40 parcels) that fall within this category.

Commissioner Maul expressed concern that eliminating the reference to appropriate zones would make it difficult for a property owner to clearly understand what zones would be allowed based on the land use designation. Mr. Cohen reminded the Commission that one criterion for rezone approval is that the proposed zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Listing specific zones allowed in each land use designation provides a range for making a decision about what is appropriate for a particular site. Commissioner Wagner agreed that the Commission has used the appropriate zones as a guideline when reviewing rezone applications. However, they would never have recommended approval for R-48 zoning to be placed next to R-4 zoning even if the Comprehensive Plan would have allowed it. She expressed her belief that other language in the Comprehensive Plan would provide clearer direction regarding the need for transition than locking people in with numbers.

The Commission agreed to continue their discussion regarding the proposal to eliminate all specific references to density from this section of the Comprehensive Plan at a future meeting after staff has

obtained feedback and direction from Director Markle. Chair Moss also invited staff to provide a recommendation as to whether or not **Policy LU4** should remain a policy in the Comprehensive Plan. She encouraged Commissioners to forward their thoughts on the issue directly to staff.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that if the reference to density remains in this section of the Comprehensive Plan, the last sentence in **Policy LU11** should be amended because it references a zone (Arterial Business) that does not currently exist.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that **Policy LU7** should be replaced with a policy that calls for the creation of code language that allows for flexibility to protect existing stands of trees and vegetation. Commissioner Craft pointed out that the term “stands of trees” is too general and should be replaced with more specific language.

Commissioner Maul questioned the use of the word “design” in **Policy LU37**. Mr. Cohen said that standards for transition have been included in the commercial design standards and might also apply to station areas. He suggested that, in this case, “design” may be an appropriate term. The Commission directed staff to study **Policy LU37** further and provide additional direction at a future meeting.

Commissioner Wagner referred to **Policy LU45** and suggested that if they are going to specifically call out the potential annexation of 145th Street, they should also call out the potential annexation of Point Wells. She noted that specific references could be deleted because both areas are covered elsewhere in the plan. Chair Moss suggested that if the City is going to pursue annexation of the Point Wells site at some point in the near future, the area should be specifically called out in this section of the Land Use Element.

Chair Moss inquired if a potential annexation would have to meet all of the criteria outlined in **Policy LU44**. She suggested that perhaps the word “and” at the end of the 7th bullet should be replaced with “and/or.”

Commissioner Wagner referred to **Policy LU49** and suggested that evaluating existing park-and-ride facilities should not be a significant City priority given other items on the City’s agenda. She suggested this policy be deleted. Ms. Redinger said the location of existing park-and-ride facilities will be looked at in the context of light rail station area planning. However, she agreed that this evaluation does not require a specific Comprehensive Plan policy.

Commissioner Scully suggested that **Policy LU49** should be expanded to read “assure adequate and optimally (or appropriately) located park-and-ride capacity for planned light rail.” He noted that the Land Use Element includes numerous policies that discourage auto dependency, which is great. However, the City is not there yet. There is a lot of single-family residential development in Shoreline, and adequate parking areas must be provided in order to maximum use of the high-capacity transit opportunities. Chair Moss commented that the City can evaluate and make recommendations related to park-and-ride capacity, but she questioned their ability to move existing facilities.

Commissioner Maul suggested that the term “triple bottom line” in **Policy LU54** should be added to the glossary. Ms. Redinger noted that this term was highlighted because it will be defined in a textbox within the sidebar.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that **Policy LU53** should not be limited to just the station area planning process. The policy should apply to all future planning efforts, with a particular emphasis on station area planning. Commissioner Craft suggested that the term “LEED-Neighborhood Development” should be defined in the sidebar. He suggested that the policy should be more generic to recognize there are other sustainable opportunities in addition to LEED.

Ms. Redinger said that in other instances where the Comprehensive Plan previously referenced LEED they have tried to either be general or list all sustainable opportunities. LEED-Neighborhood Development is called out specifically because it is the only program of its kind on a neighborhood scale. Commissioner Craft suggested that the reference to LEED-Neighborhood Development could be maintained, but the more generic term “sustainable” could also be added so that other programs could be considered if and when they are available.

While most people will prefer to use an electronic version of the Comprehensive Plan, Chair Moss cautioned that some will want a printed format. The Commission should not assume that the sidebars will cover all issues, even if that means more information must be included in the appendix. She also commented that the plan uses an incredible number of acronyms, and these should be listed in a separate section of the appendix.

Chair Moss pointed out that **Policies LU56 and LU57** are very similar and could perhaps be combined.

Chair Moss questioned if **Policy LU69** is the correct reference to use in **Policy LU61**. Ms. Redinger agreed to review this policy and adjust the language accordingly.

Chair Moss pointed out that **Policy LU70** should be amended by adding “Washington State” before “Department of Ecology.”

- Housing Element Goals and Policies

Commissioner Wagner expressed concern that **Goal H IX** is too generic. Perhaps some examples should be provided such as sidewalks, pocket parks, infill development closer to schools, walking capacity to schools, etc. The Commission agreed that examples could be added in the sidebar.

Commissioner Craft suggested that rather than limiting the focus of **Goal H III** to underserved populations such as households making less than 30% of Area Median Income (AMI), the number should be changed to 80% to encompass more households within that range. Commissioner Scully reminded the Commission of public comment that while the City has done a lot to serve households under 50% of the AMI, it has not done enough for households that are under 30%. He explained that 30% is such a low income that it is difficult to get any private housing without a significant subsidy. He concluded that the City’s Housing Element does not adequately address the homeless and households under 30% of the AMI. Commissioner Craft said he heard the advocates’ comments about households

under 30% of AMI. However, in his own research and conversations, he found the City is failing to serve a very large section of its population (households between 30% and 80% of AMI). While he is not proposing the City ignore households under 30% of AMI, he would like the policy to be more inclusive by increasing the percentage number. Commissioner Scully said he would not be opposed to bullet points to identify the different categories of households, but providing a range would make it too easy to put the affordable housing towards the upper end of the range because a profit can still be made without a lot of subsidy. Providing housing for households under 30% of AMI requires a lot of public and/or private grant money. Households under 30% of AMI should be called out in the goal as a special need.

Ms. Redinger said households under 30% of AMI was specifically called out because the City is obligated to incorporate King County Countywide Planning Policies, which dictate a specific analysis for housing. She summarized that the City is doing relatively well and has been particularly successful creating housing for households between 50% to 80% of AMI, but the Countywide Planning Policies specifically call out the need to focus on policies for households at 30% AMI and below. The Commission agreed that the different types of households should be listed as bullet points in **Goal H III**.

Chair Moss asked if the Housing Element would provide a link to the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. Ms. Redinger said a special section for subarea plans will be added to the updated Comprehensive Plan so the subarea plans do not need to be housed within the Comprehensive Plan, itself. They could do the same with the Economic Development, Environmental and Housing Strategies. Another option is to provide a hyperlink reference in the appropriate analysis sections. Commissioner Wagner cautioned against specifically linking other plans to the Comprehensive Plan as supporting analysis.

Commissioner Scully recalled that the Commission discussed adding a separate policy and/or goal to the housing section to address homelessness. Currently, the only policy related to this topic is **Policy H18**, which discusses non-profit agencies. Staff noted that homelessness is also addressed in **Policy H32**.

- Transportation Element Goals and Policies

Commissioner Wagner expressed concern that while the introduction to this element is well written, it is also very technical. She requested the Commission's permission to submit changes that would make the introduction more succinct and less complicated. Chair Moss invited Commissioner Wagner to submit proposed changes to staff. She directed staff to make a note in the next packet to specifically draw the Commission's attention to the revised language.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that **Goals T I** and **T V** are duplicative. She suggested that **Goal T V** should be retained and moved to **Goal T I**. She also suggested that **Goals T III and T IV** are vague and should be deleted and replaced with a single goal that reads, "Improve transportation infrastructure to allow for safer use of non-automobile transportation." Further, she recommended that **Goals T VIII and T IX** be moved to become **Goals T II and T III**.

Commissioner Scully agreed with all of Commissioner Wagner's proposed changes, except he would like to retain **Goal T IV**, which encourages alternative modes of transportation with the specific intent of reducing the number of automobiles on the road. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Chair Moss suggested that **Goals T II and T VII** could be combined to read, “work (or coordinate) with transportation providers and regional partners to develop and implement safe, efficient, and effective multi-modal.”

Commissioner Wagner noted that **Policy T1** talks about making safety the first priority of citywide transportation planning and traffic management. She reminded the Commission of previous discussions about how light rail should be the highest priority in the Commission’s work plan. She suggested that **Policy T1** either be amended or a new policy added to make it clear that light rail is a high priority. Commissioner Scully agreed that a policy should be added to identify light rail as a City priority. However, **Policy T1** should be retained as it talks about safety in terms of transportation planning around traffic management.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that **Policy T2** is a broad policy that opens the door to transit. He agreed that transit is important, but it should be second to safety. There are numerous modes of transportation, and he expressed concern that placing the light rail policy first may give it more than it is due. After further Commission discussion, Chair Moss summarized that safety must always come first. She suggested that language could be added to **Policy T2** to draw attention to light rail. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Wagner commented that she does not see public outreach and education programs related to bicycling options and safety (**Policy T19**) as a real public need. She said she does not envision the City engaging in a significant amount of public outreach. If bicycling facilities are provided, people will use them without the City doing significant advertising. Chair Moss noted that the policy also discusses the need to coordinate or partner with outside agencies, and many have done public outreach and education. The Commission agreed that the policy could be rephrased to place more emphasis on the City partnering with outside agencies rather than creating its own public outreach program. Commissioner Craft suggested that changing “develop” to “coordinate” would address this concern.

Chair Moss suggested that the term “Transportation Master Plan” could be abbreviated to “TMP.”

While the potential annexation of 145th Street is called out elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan, Commissioner Wagner questioned whether it should also be explicitly called out as a policy in the Transportation Element. Chair Moss requested additional clarification from the Planning Director and the Transportation Planner regarding this issue. Ms. Redinger pointed out that the potential annexation of 145th Street was a recommendation of the Southeast Subarea Plan, which was adopted after the Transportation Master Plan. She agreed to provide more information about this issue for future Commission discussion.

- Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element Goals and Policies

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the proposed language in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Transportation, Economic Development and Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) Elements was lifted directly from corresponding plans that were previously adopted by the City Council. The Commission discussed their ability to amend the proposed language in these elements and add new language to

capture all the critical points. They did not propose any changes to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element.

- Economic Development Element Goals and Policies

Commissioner Scully expressed concern about **Policy ED12**, which calls for focusing on the Aurora Corridor as the economic core of the City. He noted that there are numerous vacant storefronts in the North City area. He said citizens are becoming concerned that so much money is being spent on the Aurora Corridor while the neighborhood commercial business sectors are not thriving. He expressed concern that **Policy ED12** may unfairly prioritize the Aurora Corridor and give the false impression that the City is not concerned about the other commercial business districts. He suggested the policy should be removed.

Commissioner Craft agreed with Commissioner Scully's concern. He suggested that, in addition to the Aurora Corridor, **Policy ED12** could list all key commercial business districts as being important. Commissioner Maul reminded the Commission that the City is planning to spend substantial amounts of money to plan for two station areas that will become economic hubs by default because of their connectivity to the rest of the state. While he agrees that all commercial areas are important, he cautioned against listing them all in **Policy ED12**. Ms. Redinger reported that staff is preparing a map folio that will contain approximately two maps for each analysis section. The Economic Development Map will highlight areas for revitalization and may be more illustrative than a policy that lists all of the commercial business district areas.

Commissioner Scully suggested that **Policy ED13** adequately addresses the City's goal of revitalizing commercial business districts without particularizing any one. Therefore, **Policy ED12** could be eliminated. Commissioner Wagner noted that **Policy ED7** also speaks to this issue. The remainder of the Commission agreed that **Policy ED12** should be eliminated.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that clarifying language should be added to **Policy ED21** to make it clear that, in addition to shared parking, the City should also encourage shared access points to reduce the number of curb cuts, connectivity between buildings, etc. She suggested staff use the video tour they prepared for the Fred Meyer site as the framework for clarifying this policy. Mr. Cohen suggested that these issues may already be addressed in the Community Design Element.

- Natural Environment Element Goals and Policies

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this element.

- Community Design Element Goals and Policies

Commissioner Craft referred to **Policy CD13** and said he is opposed to encouraging drought-tolerant plantings throughout the City, which can be invasive. He said he would prefer the policy to simply encourage native species, which are abundant in their variety and can be used in a number of ways. He recommended that "and/or drought-tolerant" be deleted.

- Capital Facilities Element Goals and Policies

Chair Moss said she assumes that the bulleted items in **Goal CF I** would only remain if the voters approve the acquisition of Seattle Public Utilities' water system in Shoreline.

Commissioner Scully cautioned that the 2nd bullet in **Goal CF I** should be careful to specifically state the language in the 2002 Interlocal Operating Agreement with the Ronald Wastewater District. He said the public testimony indicated that was not the case. Ms. Redinger agreed to research this matter further and report back to the Commission.

- Utilities Element Goals and Policies

Chair Moss pointed out that **Goal U III** would only remain if the voters approve the acquisition of Seattle Public Utilities' water system in Shoreline.

- Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Element Goals and Policies

Chair Moss asked why language related to wetlands was highlighted on Pages 58 and 59. Ms. Redinger said the highlight was to indicate that the language would be moved to a sidebar because it is more explanatory than policy.

Chair Moss suggested that in **Policy SMP25**, a more formal reference should be provided for the Critical Areas Ordinance. Mr. Szafran said the reference should be "Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 20.80."

Commissioner Scully asked if the SMP Element includes a buffer averaging policy that allows for flexibility as long as the buffer preserves the integrity of a wetland. Mr. Szafran said the Shoreline Master Program contains specific regulations to address this issue.

Chair Moss recommended that **Policies SMP32 and SMP33** be condensed into a single policy. She commented that the SMP Element contains 105 policies, which is significantly more than any other element. She suggested the policies could be regrouped so that some could be combined to eliminate the current redundancies. She commented that condensing the policies would make the element clearer. Because the element references the Shoreline Master Program, she questioned the need to list each specific policy.

Commissioner Wagner noted that this element affects just a small population of people and the actual regulations are extremely detailed. She agreed that the number of policies could be significantly reduced. While she is not opposed to condensing the element, Ms. Redinger expressed concern about time constraints based on the City Council's desire to adopt the update by the end of 2012. Commissioner Scully said that because condensing the policies would not have a significant overall affect, the Commission and staff resources would be better placed elsewhere for now. Chair Moss encouraged Commissioners to review the element and forward recommendations to staff for consolidating and moving around the various policies.

Ms. Redinger explained that the public hearing must be noticed 15 days before the hearing. That means the City will need to publish the document that will be the subject of the public hearing the day before the Commission's next meeting. She said she does not believe the City Council would be amenable to an extension request. She explained that while the Commission could have an informal discussion regarding the unresolved issues on October 4th, it may be difficult for staff to incorporate all the comments into a new draft document and prepare a formal staff report. She reminded the Commission that a lot of work must still be done to prepare for the public hearing on October 18th. Other than a reminder of the high-level issues that still need to be addressed, the Commission agreed that no staff report would be necessary for their continued discussion on October 4th. Chair Moss invited the Commissioners to forward comments and suggestions on each element to staff by the close of business on September 24th.

- Land Use Element Supporting Analysis

Chair Moss pointed out that the numbers in the narrative do not always match up with the numbers in the actual tables, and this can create confusion. She suggested that, in some cases, the tables might not be as helpful as a brief narrative and providing both can be duplicative. Ms. Redinger said some of the tables and key considerations have been highlighted because they may be more interesting as sidebars. She asked the Commission to specifically point out instances where the tables and narrative are not consistent. Chair Moss suggested that **Tables LU-3 and LU-4** could be replaced with narrative. Mr. Szafran responded that the tables are necessary to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). Commissioner Craft noted that rounding the numbers in the tables may have resulted in the inconsistencies discussed by Chair Moss. Commissioner Scully said he is a visual person and tables are useful to him.

- Housing Element Supporting Analysis

Chair Moss asked why 2012 data was not provided in **Charts H-10 and H-11**. Ms. Redinger said she assumes that 2012 data is not yet available. Chair Moss recommended that actual dollar amounts should also be shown for the various Average Median Income (AMI) percentages to make the table more relevant.

- Transportation Element Supporting Analysis

The supporting analysis for the Transportation Element was not available for the Commission's review.

- Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element Supporting Analysis

The supporting analysis for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element was not available for the Commission's review.

- Economic Development Element Supporting Analysis

Chair Moss suggested that having both line charts and pie charts to illustrate the same information can create confusion. Commissioner Scully concurred. Commissioner Craft noted that the pie charts

illustrate percentages and the line charts identify actual numbers. He suggested that the line charts should be used to illustrate both percentages and actual numbers and the pie charts should be eliminated. Commissioner Maul commented that the pie charts provide a quick picture, and a line chart takes longer to assimilate. He said he would like to review the updated line charts before the pie charts are eliminated. Once again, Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that staff has only limited time to prepare for the public hearing. She said she would prefer not to spend a significant amount of time reconfiguring charts and graphs at this point.

- Natural Environment Element Supporting Analysis

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this supporting analysis.

- Community Design Element Supporting Analysis

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this supporting analysis.

- Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this supporting analysis.

- Utilities Element Supporting Analysis

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this supporting analysis.

- Shoreline Master Program Supporting Analysis

The Commission did not provide any comments regarding this supporting analysis.

- Outstanding “Big Picture” Questions

The Commission reviewed the discussion topics identified in the document prepared by staff for the joint City Council/Commission meeting of July 9th and concluded that each one was addressed in the draft Comprehensive Plan goals and policies as appropriate. The topics included:

- Light rail station area planning
- Potential housing development code revision packet: There are numerous policies that talk about universal design, accessory dwelling units, transit-oriented development, etc. Lot structure ratio is not relevant to the Comprehensive Plan and will be discussed as part of a future code revision packet to implement the Comprehensive Plan for housing.
- Affordable housing
- Cottage housing: Chair Moss noted that the Commission previously agreed to change “cottage” housing to “clustered” housing, and the glossary should be updated accordingly.
- Density bonuses: There is a policy in the housing section to reexamine the density bonus structure.

- Housing Trust Fund: The Comprehensive Plan covers this issue more broadly by encouraging the City to look for financial resources and opportunities to collaborate.
 - Becoming a Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Regional Growth Center: A policy was included that the City should consider becoming a Regional Growth Center, and the City Council would likely have a higher level discussion regarding the benefits of this designation.
 - Mandates versus incentives: There are a number of policies that call out incentives, and mandates are regulations.
 - Eco Districts: Language related to eco districts was changed from a goal to a policy, using very soft language.
 - Expanding allowing commercial uses in High-Density Residential designations: This issue will be addressed as a development regulation to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Allowing campus zones to have new uses as part of their master development plan: The policy related to this issue was taken out of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Instead, the issue could be further addressed as a potential future amendment. This may be appropriate for a higher-level discussion by the City Council.
 - Assigning designations to the special study areas
 - Living wage jobs: Staff agreed to do further research to identify the most appropriate term (living wage or family wage) and then do a word search to make sure the correct term is used throughout the document.
 - Food carts: Food carts are allowed and do not need to be further addressed by a specific Comprehensive Plan policy.
 - Transfer of Development Rights
- Prioritization of Elements

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission of staff's earlier proposal for arranging the elements and invited them to share their thoughts. She also invited them to specifically review the introductory language she referenced earlier and share their thoughts with staff via email by the close of business on September 24th. She noted that the italicized language represents Vision 2029, which was formally adopted by the City Council. They would need very good rationale for recommending changes to Vision 2029.

Commissioner Maul said he supports the order proposed in the Staff Report because land use, housing, transportation, and parks all contribute to economic development. Chair Moss expressed her belief that the Community Design Element offers a broad framework that many other elements feed into. She suggested that the Community Design Element should be placed second after the Land Use Element. The Commissioners agreed to forward their additional comments regarding the order of the elements to staff by Monday.

Chair Moss said she would also forward staff a list of terms to search and/or replace, along with suggested edits in "track changes" format.

Public Comment

Charlotte Haines, Shoreline Water District Commissioner, said she has been a resident of Shoreline for over 50 years and was present to address the following seven major concerns the District has about the current Comprehensive Plan:

- The organization of several components of the plan is duplicative and results in several inconsistencies. For example, the 1st paragraph on Page 49 of the plan identifies that the Utilities Element shall include electrical, telecommunication and natural gas lines, and the 2nd paragraph states that publicly-operated utilities will be discussed in Capital Facilities Element. However, the Utilities Element includes **Goal U III** (acquire the Seattle Public Utilities system in Shoreline) and **Policies U1 and U2** (identify utility providers and levels of service and investigate alternative service provision options). Also, the 1st sentence in the Capital Facilities Element Supporting Analysis states that city-managed and non-city managed facilities are addressed in the Capital Facilities Element. The 2nd full paragraph on Page 127 indicates that stormwater management systems are also categorized as city-managed capital facilities. Ms. Haines pointed out that unless the City is considering privatizing the operation of water, sewer and stormwater systems in the City, these items need to be removed from the Utilities Element.
- The 3rd paragraph on Page 116 (Capital Facilities Element) identifies the Growth Management Act (GMA). She explained that the GMA is the philosophy that “growth pays for growth.” The Shoreline Water District does this by requiring developers to pay a connection charge to cover their share of the existing system costs as well as improvements necessary for development.
- The last paragraph on Page 123 states that “there are currently differences in the level of investment between SPU and the SWD,” and that “the City is interested in assuring that the level of reinvestment back into the water systems will be a rate sufficient to meet the long-term goals of the Shoreline community.” She recalled that in August the Shoreline Water District asked how the City believes it can improve the reinvestment back into the water system at a greater rate than what the District is currently doing. She recalled that Commissioner Craft previously recommended that the paragraph be removed as it was an advocacy-leaning statement. However, the change was never made.
- Page 129 (Capital Facilities Element) states that “most utility services are financed by rates.” On Page 135 (Utilities Element) there is a discussion about utility taxes going to the City of Seattle. Because the utility taxes collected by the City of Seattle are identified in both sections, she suggested the City should also identify that it currently collects a 6% franchise fee from Seattle Public Utilities that goes into the City of Shoreline’s general fund and not back into the utility.
- The second paragraph on Page 130 states that “the community has expressed a desire to maintain current level of service.” She noted that the GMA identifies that infrastructure shall be adequate at the time development is available for occupancy. There has never been a problem with permitting delays or moratoriums because of the Shoreline Water District. In fact, both the Development Services of America and The Inland Group, two current local developers, have identified working with the Shoreline Water District on their projects as having been beneficial

to the developer and to the District. The District does not see how the City can provide better essential services than the Shoreline Water District, which has been in operation for over 80 years. They do not believe the District should be evaluated for acquisition.

Chair Moss pointed out that Ms. Haines exceeded the five minutes allowed for public comments. Her comments are all included in the document she submitted as an exhibit, which will be attached as part of the record.

Kelly Rider, Suburban Cities Policy Director for the Housing Development Consortium of King County, referred to a previous conversation between Commissioners Craft and Scully about the importance of housing that is affordable to households at or below 30% AMI versus 50% AMI, 80% AMI, etc. She urged the Commission to think about the different priorities, and how the various tools can fit the different priorities. The Comprehensive Plan process is great for establishing a vision for the City, and she appreciated listening to the Commission talk about how the housing needs of the community can be met. However, at some point in time, the Consortium hopes this will become a discussion about reality, the tools that can actually be implemented in the City, and what is politically possible.

Ms. Ryder noted that the draft Comprehensive Plan contains a policy that talks about a potential City housing trust fund, which is great. However, the Commission's discussion regarding this policy focused on whether or not a housing trust fund is realistic. She commented that in order to meet the needs of households at or below 30% AMI, more funding is absolutely necessary. At the same time, if you are providing housing for households at 50% AMI that is now more affordable to those earning 30% AMI, that's at least a step forward. It is important to think about how the different tools can help fill the void for different income limits, and lowering the affordability levels even a small amount is incredibly important. She emphasized that the needs for households at or below 30% AMI are incredibly critical, particularly when talking about the homeless population. She encouraged the Commission to think of the housing needs and the various tools as a package as opposed to just focusing on different income limits.

Continued Commission Discussion

Commissioner Scully referred to Ms. Haines' comment that the organization of the draft Comprehensive Plan is duplicative and results in inconsistencies. He suggested that the 2nd sentence in the 2nd paragraph on Page 49 should be reworded to make it clear that publicly-operated utilities are discussed in both the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements. He said it is not the Commission's intent to suggest that the City wants to privatize public utilities. The remainder of the Commission agreed that the language should be modified by adding "also" before "addressed."

Commissioner Scully said he agrees with Commissioner Craft's comment from a previous meeting that the last paragraph on Page 123 is argumentative and should be removed. Ms. Redinger said that, after further review, staff stayed with their conclusion that a little bit of advocacy was okay because the analysis is intended to justify policy. She agreed to submit an additional request to show the math that was used to reach the conclusion stated in the paragraph. Commissioner Scully asked if the language in the paragraph is based on policy direction from the City Council or if staff just disagree with the

Commissioner's concern. Ms. Redinger said she was not involved in the staff discussion regarding this issue. Commissioner Scully expressed concern that the Shoreline Water District disagrees with the statements in this paragraph, and he is not sure the City has the basis to support the conclusions.

Commissioner Wagner suggested they retain those elements of the paragraph that are not directly related to the agreement between the City, Seattle Public Utilities, and the Shoreline Water District. She recalled an example shared earlier by Director Markle where Aurora Avenue was dug up six months after completion to accommodate a Shoreline Water District capital facilities improvement. Because the City did not have control of this improvement, the development efforts were not coordinated. She summarized that there are tangible examples of the benefits of acquiring a utility, such as streamlining the permitting process. However, assertions such as controlling the water utilities would allow the City to improve its fire protection, facility future development, etc. would require additional analysis.

Commissioner Scully expressed concern that the language in the paragraph is related to a turf war between two public entities. He said he does not want to see a lot of advocacy in what should be a neutral document. The voters will make the final decision, and the Commission's resources and influence should not be used to decide the issue at this time.

Commissioner Scully summarized that Ms. Haines and other community members have expressed concern that they do not want to see the acquisition of the Shoreline Water District become a foregone conclusion because of fuzzy language in the Comprehensive Plan and elsewhere without a real hard look first as to whether it makes sense. He said he would prefer to delete the paragraph to eliminate future confusion. Commissioner Craft said he supports the 1st sentence of the paragraph; but beyond that, the language becomes advocacy.

Ms. Redinger said the issue involves a number of different public utility entities, and she does not understand the sensitivities, the processes, or the background information well enough to clearly answer the Commission's concerns. The Commission directed staff to invite Jeff Forry, Permit Services Manager, and Mark Relph, Public Works Director, to attend the October 4th meeting to provide additional feedback on this issue. Ms. Redinger agreed to provide more specific feedback regarding each of the points raised by Ms. Haines, and the Commission could continue their discussion on October 4th. Chair Moss stressed the need to resolve all of the Commission's questions related to the draft Comprehensive Plan prior to moving it forward for public hearing.

Chair Moss reported that, at her request, Ms. Redinger has provided the Commissioners with a colored version of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. She invited them to review the map and prepare to share their thoughts and concerns on October 4th. She suggested that perhaps the Land Use Element Supporting Analysis should provide some clarifying language regarding the proposed new Mixed Use 1 and 2 designations. Mr. Szafran clarified that rather than creating a new land use designation, the proposal is to divide the existing Mixed Use designation into two separate designations.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that if the sidebars that describe the zones that are allowed in each Comprehensive Plan designation are eliminated, there would be no definition that describes the purpose of the Mixed Use 1 and 2 designations and what zones would be allowed.

Ms. Redinger summarized that the Commission would like staff to focus on the purpose of calling out specific zones to fit the land use categories. They would also like staff to consider whether or not the supporting analysis contains enough information to explain why the new Mixed Use 1 and 2 designations are necessary. In addition, the Commission would like more information to address comments related to the Utilities Element. She suggested that these topics should be the major focus of the Commission's continued discussion on October 4th.

Commissioner Wagner suggested different names for the proposed Mixed Use 1 and 2 designations to distinguish them from the current Mixed Use zones. Mr. Szafran explained that, on the heels of the Comprehensive Plan Update, staff will propose changing the name of the Mixed Use zones to something different.

Commissioner Wagner suggested the Commission propose a slightly smaller and/or slightly larger concentric circle to identify the light rail station study areas. Ms. Redinger said this option was presented earlier to the Commission and they decided against it. Chair Moss said the Commission decided to identify a broad study area now and then fine tune the boundaries as they consider specific parcels in the future.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Cohen did not report on any additional items during this portion of the meeting.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Light Rail Station Area Planning Subcommittee reported that they have established a meeting date. Chair Moss asked the Subcommittee to notify staff after each meeting so that time can be allotted at the following Commission meeting for an update.

Chair Moss announced that interested Commissioners have notified staff of their desire to attend the American Planning Association Conference, and staff has completed the registration process.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran said the agenda for October 4th will include a discussion on follow up items related to the Comprehensive Plan Update. He asked if the Commission also wants to move forward with the previously scheduled presentation by Dan Eernisse, Economic Development Program Manager, regarding the Community Renewal Area. The Commission agreed to postpone the presentation.

Ms. Redinger advised that staff would update the draft Comprehensive Plan based on comments and recommendations by the Commission. They will forward the pages where relevant changes are proposed to the Commission prior to the October 4th meeting. However, no official staff report will be prepared. The Commission would receive a complete staff report, along with the updated draft Comprehensive Plan, on October 4th so they can prepare for the public hearing on October 18th. She reminded the Commission that the draft Comprehensive Plan provided for the public hearing may not be converted to InDesign format yet.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT

TIME STAMP
September 6, 2012

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: 0:38

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 0:50

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS: 1:10

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 6:40

STUDY SESSION: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAJOR UPDATE – COMPLETE DRAFT

Staff Presentation: 9:40

Commission Discussion: 19:44

Public Comment: 2:18:29

Continued Commission Discussion: 2:27:20

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 2:51:27

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS; 2:51:38

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 2:53:05

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT