

AGENDA
CITY OF SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, November 17, 2005
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center
Mt. Rainier Room
18560 1st Avenue NE

	<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 REPORT	7:03 p.m.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:08 p.m.
a. November 3, 2005	
6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:10 p.m.

The Planning Commission will take public testimony on any subject which is not of a quasi-judicial nature or specifically scheduled for this agenda. Each member of the public may comment for up to two minutes. However, Item 6 (General Public Comment) will be limited to a maximum period of twenty minutes. Each member of the public may also comment for up to two minutes on action items after each staff report has been presented. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and number of people permitted to speak. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded. Speakers must clearly state their name and address.

7. PUBLIC HEARING	7:15 p.m.
i. Annual Docket of Development Code Amendments	
a. Staff Report	
b. Public Testimony or Comment	
c. Close Public Hearing	
8. COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS	8:15 p.m.
9. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS	9:15 p.m.
10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	9:20 p.m.
11. NEW BUSINESS	9:25 p.m.
12. ANNOUNCEMENTS	9:26 p.m.
13. AGENDA FOR December 1, 2005	9:29 p.m.
Update on Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Master Plan	
14. ADJOURNMENT	9:30 p.m.

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 546-8919 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 546-2190.

This page intentionally left blank

CITY OF SHORELINE
SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

November 3, 2005
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Rainier Room

PRESENT

Chair Harris
Vice Chair Piro
Commissioner Sands
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner McClelland
Commissioner Hall
Commissioner Kuboi

STAFF PRESENT

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Rachael Markle, Assistant Director, Planning & Development Services
Jill Marilley, City Engineer
Kim Lehmborg, Planner II, Planning & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

ABSENT

Commissioner MacCully
Commissioner Phisuthikul

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chair Harris, who presided.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Harris, Vice Chair Piro, Commissioners Sands, Broili, McClelland, Hall and Kuboi. Commissioners Phisuthikul and MacCully were excused.

Chair Harris introduced and welcomed Joe Tovar, the City's new Director of Planning & Development Services. Each of the Commissioners briefly introduced themselves.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A discussion regarding the Cottage Housing Transmittal Letter was added to the agenda under “Unfinished Business.” The remainder of the agenda was accepted as proposed.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Tovar briefly introduced himself to the Commission. He said he is happy to be with the City of Shoreline and is a city planner, by trade. While attending graduate school at the University of Washington he realized that he wanted to live in the Washington area. He said he has five children and is working on selling his house and moving to this side of the lake. He concluded by stating that his previous position was Assistant City Manager for the City of Covington. Prior to that he worked for the State Growth Hearings Board and as the Planning Director for Kirkland. He said he is working to understand the issues the City of Shoreline is currently dealing with and was impressed with the very competent City staff and how well the City is run. He is currently working to establish contacts within the community to gain a clear understanding of the issues that are important to the community.

Ms. Markle referred the Commissioners to an invitation they each received from the Richmond Beach Neighborhood Association. They are meeting on November 8th and have invited City planning staff, the new Director of Planning & Development Services, and Planning Commissioners to discuss issues regarding development and planning in the Richmond Beach area. She asked that interested Commissioners notify her of their intentions to attend the meeting. Chair Harris indicated that he would attend the meeting on behalf of the Commission. Commissioner Sands said he might attend the meeting, as well.

Commissioner Kuboi requested an update on the vacant positions in the Planning & Development Services Department. Ms. Markle reported that they finished interviews for the Planner III (Team Leader for the Long-Range Planning Team) position. Hopefully, she and Mr. Tovar can meet tomorrow and discuss the applicants, check references, and perhaps hire someone as early as next week. She further reported that they have reviewed applications for the other vacant planner position in long-range planning. They will now work to finalize the candidates and identify the strategy that would be used for interviews.

Commissioner Kuboi recalled that in the near future, the City of Kirkland plans to measure their community’s support for the concept of cottage housing now that their two projects have been evaluated. He asked how they plan to gauge the community’s response. Mr. Tovar said he would contact their Planning Director to request additional information and provide a report to the Commission at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 20, 2005 were approved as amended.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Broili informed the Commissioners that they were invited to participation in a field trip to Vashon Island on November 8th at 11:00 or 11:30 a.m. Their parks department has put together a tour of a park on the Island that was logged about a year and a half ago. The logging occurred in a very sustainable, low-impact way and jumpstarted the process of mimicking an old-growth forest pattern through replanting. He said they actually made \$40,000 in the process for their Parks Department. Interested Commissioners should contact Lisa Dustin. He encouraged all Commissioners to attend the tour.

Vice Chair Piro and Commissioners Hall, Broili and McClelland briefly reported on their attendance at the American Planning Conference. They all reported that the conference was worthwhile, well attended, and they learned a lot.

STAFF REPORTS

Presentation: Sidewalk Program Update

Jill Marilley, City Engineer, provided a presentation on the Sidewalk Program that is currently evolving. She pointed out that her presentation was also provided to the City Council in April, and it had an immediate impact on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that was adopted by the City Council over the summer. She reported that due to the hard work the Commission put into the Transportation Master Plan, the 2006-2011 CIP identified \$5 million over the 6-year period to begin constructing sidewalks where they are lacking throughout the City. Ms. Marilley said that once the Transportation Plan was adopted by the City Council, staff immediately started to focus on sidewalks and how the plan could be implemented. The presentation they made to the Council in April helped them understand the needs in the community, the cost, and some different approaches for implementation.

Ms. Marilley recalled that the City of Shoreline was primarily developed under the King County development standards. When most of the homes were built, there were no requirements for sidewalks. Now, they have to retrofit or rely on redevelopment to address this need. She referred to the recent cooperation between the City and Fred Meyer to provide new sidewalks along Linden Avenue behind the store and along 183rd Street. She noted that they did not require them to rebuild the sidewalk along 185th or provide a sidewalk along Aurora Avenue because their frontage on Aurora Avenue is very small. In addition, the Aurora Project would address this need in the future.

Ms. Marilley recalled that the Commission's Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee spent quite a bit of time working on the sidewalk issue. To get a better idea of the current status of sidewalks in Shoreline, they reviewed the previous bond committee work and the somewhat piecemeal work that had

been done prior. The intent was to fold the Sidewalk Plan into the CIP so that implementation could occur. She referred to the results of the recent citizen survey, which clearly indicated a need and desire for more sidewalks. In addition, she noted that sidewalks were a major reason why people wanted to incorporate into the City of Shoreline. She said the Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee felt it was important to clearly inform the City Council about the magnitude of the need for more sidewalks.

Ms. Marilley referred to the colored map that was provided in the Commission's packets to give an idea of where sidewalks are located now. She pointed out that, for the most part, the north/south corridors either have been or will be completed within the next few years. There are also clear east/west corridors that have sufficient space for pedestrians. However, on a number of the arterials there are spaces where sidewalks have not been completed, and there is already a program in the CIP to address this need.

Ms. Marilley said the Sidewalk Plan focused on arterials only because the magnitude of the need for residential sidewalks is so large that they couldn't even begin to estimate the costs. In addition, every residential street has its own individual needs for drainage, engineering, etc. Furthermore, she said the study focused on school zones. She recalled that in August of 2003 a bond committee was formed to place a sidewalk bond issue on the ballot. While they didn't actually go out for a bond issue at that time, a lot of work was done and this was folded into the Transportation Master Plan. School access still remains a priority in the community.

Ms. Marilley reviewed that while the Transportation Master Plan establishes three priorities for sidewalks, the City's study only focused on Priorities 1 and 2 (arterials and school zones) to get an idea about the magnitude of cost. The intent was to come up with low-cost interim solutions that would give pedestrians a sense of place and improve pedestrian safety. Wider shoulders were identified as one of these low-cost solutions. When streets are repaved or restriped, wider shoulders could be provided for pedestrian space.

Ms. Marilley said that as they reviewed long-term solutions, they tried to make sure they were contact sensitive. They looked at the neighborhoods to see how the solutions would fit with what is already there. However, this has the potential of conflicting with development. She explained that the City's standards for development are very clear about what street improvements must be installed (concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk). However, staff recognizes that if it is appropriate for the City to consider options other than the traditional, they must also reconsider what developers should be allowed to do. This issue would be coming before the Commission in the future.

Next, Ms. Marilley referred to the handouts that were provided to illustrate the different types of sidewalk facilities. While the traditional standard style is concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk, there are also other styles such as asphalt paths, concrete curbs with asphalt walkways, etc. There are also different ways to handle drainage issues when constructing pedestrian walkways. For example, a swale between a road and an asphalt pathway could separate the pedestrians from the traffic. Another example would be a wide shoulder with a ditch or swale along side it.

Ms. Marilley said that once they identified the locations where additional sidewalks were needed, as well as different options that could be used, staff attempted to prepare planning level estimates for all of

the alternatives for each of the segments that were in the CIP. They evaluated possible construction scenarios and determined that, for some segments, it would not be appropriate to do some of the alternatives. However, they tried to identify at least three options for each segment to come up with a range of cost. For the Priority 1 sidewalks, the range was from \$8 million to \$15 million. However, this would only cover the first 11.5 miles of pedestrian pathways. Just focusing on Priority 1 projects, the City's available funding would be used up fairly quickly. Priority 2 projects would result in another 10.2 miles of pedestrian pathways, but would add somewhere between \$10 and \$22 million to the total cost.

Ms. Marilley explained that the advocacy on the City Council was to put as much funding as possible into the Sidewalk Program. Again, she said that the City Council identified \$5 million over the 6-year CIP for sidewalks. She referred to the document titled, "Possible Scenario -- \$2 Million 6-Year CIP Program." The intent of this document was to make it clear that the available funds would not go very far. Therefore, the City would have to make some hard choices about how they want to move forward.

Ms. Marilley said staff continues to investigate the availability of new materials. Some might work better for surface water, such as porous asphalt. However, there could be some tradeoffs with longevity and there is no hard evidence to indicate its long-term durability. Any type of asphalt product would be less costly to install than concrete surfaces.

Ms. Marilley pointed out that because the City has a Sidewalk Plan, they could compete for various grants to help fund their projects. Much of the money identified in the CIP would be used for leverage or matching funds when competing for grant monies. While there are no large grant funding opportunities for sidewalks, the City has been quite competitive for the monies that are available, and they hope to continue this trend.

Ms. Marilley explained that in the traffic section of Public Works, staff has started the development of "Neighborhood Action Plans." Right now, they are focusing on the following neighborhoods: North City, Briercrest and Ridgecrest. The Assistant Traffic Engineer has been meeting with these neighborhoods to not only learn what their traffic needs are, but also what their public works needs are. The intent is to assess what individual communities see as priorities. The Engineering Department would review the Neighborhood Action Plans to see if the sidewalk plan created by the staff fit the neighborhood's goals.

Ms. Marilley reported that in July, the City Council passed the CIP with \$5 million to fund a larger Sidewalk Program. Staff is in the process of identifying high impact and high visibility projects that could be done next year so people could see that progress is actually being made. In conjunction with public feedback and coordinating with the different neighborhoods, staff could start to develop programs a few years ahead. If the City knows the sidewalk improvements that would be done in two years, the necessary surface water improvements could be combined with the sidewalk improvements for an overall cost savings.

Ms. Marilley advised that at the end of January staff would present the 2006 Sidewalk Program. Staff anticipates that the first sidewalk improvements identified in the plan should begin in early June. She

emphasized that in addition to this Sidewalk Program, the City has a sidewalk repair program that focuses on repairing existing sidewalks and closing some of the missing spaces.

Ms. Marilley said that as they consider the appropriate sidewalk solution for each segment, they would present information to the Commission regarding the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program. They would also have to consider how to handle the City's engineering standards so they are equitable to developers. The sidewalk alternatives that are appropriate for the City to use should also be appropriate for developers to use.

Commissioner McClelland said it is helpful to have a menu of different sidewalk options. She asked if all the alternatives would be ADA compliant. Ms. Marilley answered affirmatively. She explained that the City teamed up with the City of Portland to create the alternatives provided in the report. The City of Portland did a similar program, so they have already tested many of the alternatives. She said she has also discussed other alternatives that have been used in Portland, which are ADA appropriate and have more to do with the materials that are used. There are unique materials coming out that work better with surface water, and are also ADA compliant.

Vice Chair Piro said he participated in the Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee, and he enjoyed working with staff. He emphasized that the residents of the City have sent a strong message that sidewalks are a number one transportation priority. He said it is delightful to see how the Sidewalk Plan has evolved since the Commission's work on the Transportation Master Plan. The subcommittee emphasized the need of having a menu of options to use when determining what sidewalk treatment would be most appropriate for a development rather than just using the traditional curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Vice Chair Piro suggested that as staff works with neighborhood groups, it would be helpful to provide visual drawings of real life applications for each of the alternatives. This would help the community understand how the different treatments could be applied. He said he could provide some pictures and illustrations to aid in this effort since sidewalks are an issue that interests him a lot.

Commissioner Broili questioned the demand for sidewalks. He said he participated on the advisory committee and the survey that evolved from that effort. His understanding was that the demand was not so much for sidewalks but for pedestrian corridors, trails and linkages. He suggested that the City get into the habit of using a term other than sidewalks. What they are actually talking about are opportunities for people to move through the community somehow other than by vehicle, and this can be achieved through a lot of different alternatives.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that the current Development Code requires developers to construct curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Ms. Marilley said that developers are either required to construct a curb, gutter and sidewalk, or if they qualify, they could pay into the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program. Commissioner Broili pointed out that there are undeveloped corridors that are owned by the City and provide impromptu paths. He suggested that it wouldn't take a lot of money to develop these paths, and this could help the City reach their goal of providing more pedestrian corridors and opportunities.

Commissioner Broili referenced books about creating “green streets” and “livable street,” which were created by the City of Portland. He said these books outline treatments for the streets, sidewalks, pedestrian corridors, etc. He recommended that all the Commissioners review the books for additional information.

Commissioner Hall agreed that it is important to provide connections to pedestrian facilities. Ms. Marilley said that when the Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee discussed the prioritization of sidewalk projects, they discussed this concept. While the Sidewalk Plan primarily focuses on arterials, low cost solutions to link and create the community could be considered as part of “Neighborhood Action Plans.” Commissioner Hall expressed his concern that only focusing on arterials would not help the situation of getting children safely to school. No one wants their child to have to walk over to a main arterial in order to get to school.

Commissioner Hall recalled that the Commission previously expressed concern about the small amount of funding that has gone into the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program. It has become clear to the Commission that this program would never come close to solving the City’s pedestrian problem. While the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program is a good way to avoid forcing developers to invest in a sidewalk where it doesn’t make sense, it won’t address the community’s demand for more sidewalks. The City must find creative ways to double or triple the funding that goes into the program if they want it to have an impact.

Commissioner Kuboi said his understanding is that the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program offers an alternative to developers, but it does not often result in money being put in the program because there is a preference to do the improvement right in front so the City can get a benefit from the developer from that improvement. The City is not in a position to require the developer to contribute to the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program rather than constructing the sidewalk improvement. He requested insight from staff on how the City could or should provide incentives to encourage developers to put the money into the program, instead. This would allow them to aggregate the funds to do meaningful sidewalk projects. Otherwise, developers would continue to construct “sidewalks to nowhere.”

Ms. Marilley agreed that it is important that these dollars be used for meaningful projects. However, some of the legal limitations that are placed on the program end up limiting the creativity that could go into it. Developers do not participate in the program to create a lot of public improvements; they are out to make a profit. For example, if frontage improvements were required for redevelopment of a single-family lot where no other sidewalk exists, a person would have the ability to contribute to the Fee-In-Lieu-Of Program. The staff would estimate the fee based on what it would cost the property owner to construct the sidewalk. However, if the City were to construct the sidewalk, they would have to pay prevailing wages, etc. that would increase the cost significantly. In addition, the money could only be used in a certain area. The City is in the situation of waiting for sufficient funds to do a meaningful project, and they must figure out how the program could be changed to be much more flexible, while still meeting the legal requirements.

Vice Chair Piro asked Ms. Marilley to explain how the Sidewalk Plan would dovetail with the City’s “Green Streets” effort. Ms. Marilley said the Sidewalk Plan would be one component of the overall Green Streets Program. The issue was discussed at length during the Transportation Master Plan

process. She explained that there is a very broad definition for the term “Green Streets,” but the intent is to create a boulevard type feel in certain areas. As the City does improvements to arterials, they try to incorporate the different components of the Green Streets Program. Vice Chair Piro summarized that “Green Streets” are not meant to be just “pretty” streets, but places where bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles could all move safely and efficiently. In addition, the design of facilities in these corridors would be done in an environmentally sensitive manner.

Commissioner Broili pointed out that the SEA Street Program in Seattle is a good example of combining surface water management with safe pedestrian corridors, traffic calming and beautification. These street designs have ended up being \$100,000 less than the cost of conventional street development. Ms. Marilley pointed out that no development money went into this pilot project. Stormwater management funds and grants were used. As they apply the concept in other areas, however, Seattle has had to use city funds. One of the priorities identified in the Surface Water Master Plan is for surface water and transportation staff to get together and come up with solutions that work cost effectively and can be implemented easily. Commissioner Broili summarized that staff should look for ways to combine stormwater mitigation, sidewalk and street improvement dollars to get a “bigger bang for the buck.” Ms. Marilley said that is exactly what staff is trying to do.

Commissioner Kuboi pointed out that the Federal Government recently re-appropriated the transportation legislation, which includes an approximate \$6 million component for safe routes to school. He recalled that this funding is typically administered at the State level. There is an opportunity for the City to obtain some funding for sidewalk projects through that program, as well.

If sidewalks are such a high priority as per the citizen survey, Commissioner Kuboi questioned why the bond measure that was considered in 2003 did not go forward. Commissioner Broili said the decision had nothing to do with the bond, itself. But because of the economic climate that existed at the time, the bond committee felt that getting a bond issue to pass would be very difficult. Commissioner Kuboi referred to the citizen survey and asked if sidewalks were offered as a choice or if people came up with sidewalks on their own. Ms. Marilley answered that sidewalks were one of about ten choices that citizens were asked to prioritize. Again, Commissioner Broili emphasized that rather than sidewalks, the citizen survey indicated pedestrian facilities as a priority need. The Commission agreed that they should use a term other than “sidewalks.” Commissioner Hall agreed that it is important to find a term that resonates with the community. However, he did not feel the term “pedestrian facilities” would be appropriate, either. The correct term should make it clear that they are talking about a safe place for pedestrians to walk.

Commissioner McClelland reminded the Commission of the importance of connecting pedestrian facilities to destinations to provide safe passage. She asked who would be responsible for “telling the story” that would sell the sidewalk plan to the community. Ms. Marilley said this would be the Staff’s responsibility, and they recently received training on how to sell a problem and offer different solutions that the community can feel a part of. She said that starting in January, she would be visiting the various neighborhood groups to discuss the CIP. Part of this discussion would include options for providing pedestrian facilities. She stated that it was very courageous for the City Council to include \$5 million in

the CIP for pedestrian improvements, and it is up to the staff, the Commission and the City Council to deliver a product based on the identified priorities.

Mr. Tovar suggested that public health is another value that could be wrapped into the whole issue of pedestrian mobility. In fact, it is part of the rationale for why the community wants to have more pathways, walkways, sidewalks, etc. As time goes by, this would become more and more important for personal health, as well as safe passage for children and others who walk to their destinations. He suggested that they cast around for what the right terminology would be so that the City's goals could be clearly communicated to the public.

Ms. Marilley briefly updated the Commission on various other CIP Projects. She reported that construction of the Aurora Avenue Project is on schedule, and they are working on a number of crossings and doing networks to help minimize some of the work when they switch to the other side of the road. They will work nights through the end of November and then everyone will switch to days. During the night, the traffic is significantly reduced and the crews have been able to move much faster through the project. Ms. Marilley reported that excavation for the pedestrian bridges for the Interurban Trail has started. The City had done explorations indicating that the soil conditions would make construction of the footings for the bridge rather difficult. However, the contractor found a much better situation.

Ms. Marilley further reported that last Friday the contractor for the North City Project hosted a party for the workers and business owners to celebrate the topping off of the project. At this time, 98% of the underground work has been completed. Now the aboveground work can begin. She emphasized that dropping the poles would be the last part of the project. Sidewalks are starting to go in, as well. She asked that the Commissioners share the news regarding the City's major projects with others in the community.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was provided during this portion of the meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Workshop Continuation: Annual Development Code Amendments

Ms. Markle reminded the Commission that, at their last meeting, they started reviewing the Development Code Amendments. During their review, the Commission was invited to voice their questions and request additional information that could be provided prior to the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ACCEPT THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS (D-1 THROUGH D-21) AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER HALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Ms. Markle reminded the Commission that they couldn't make a decision regarding the proposed amendments until after the public hearing scheduled for November 17, 2005. She invited the Commissioners to contact staff with additional questions or requests for information prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner McClelland referred to proposed **Amendment D-12** and requested further clarification regarding the size of "tree pits" and "tree grates" depending on the size of the sidewalk. Commissioner Sands explained that, in some cases, the underneath of the pit is 4' by 4', and the part that is exposed on top may be narrower than that. Commissioner Broili said his understanding is that a straight pit is used when a tree is planted in just soil that is mounded at least as high or higher than the surrounding sidewalk. With a grate, the soil would be lower than the sidewalk and the grate would go over the top. Commissioner Hall added that the width of the sidewalk makes a difference in terms of the width of the resulting path. By requiring a grate for narrower sidewalks, there would still be a level surface of sufficient width to accommodate wheel chairs, etc. He clarified that placing a tree within the sidewalk area would not be the preferred alternative. It would be preferable to place the trees within the 4-foot planting strip to provide a much more accessible sidewalk.

THE MOTION WAS TABLED UNTIL AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Continued Discussion: Cottage Housing Transmittal Letter

Vice Chair Piro recalled that after the Commission's last discussion regarding the Cottage Housing Ordinance, they agreed to develop a letter of transmittal to accompany the material the City Council would be reviewing. It was also suggested that the letter contain a balance between the people who voted on both sides. Vice Chair Piro said he used input from both Commissioner Kuboi and Commissioner McClelland to make changes to the draft letter. He said he also invited staff to provide guidance to make sure the discussion stayed focused on content rather than wordsmithing.

Commissioner Kuboi referred to Paragraph 3 and pointed out that the motion was to repeal the existing Cottage Housing Ordinance and not the amended ordinance.

Commissioner Sands referred to the comments Commissioner Hall provided right before the Commission voted on the motion in regards to the Comprehensive Plan including a policy that specifically states the City would attempt to institute some type of cottage housing plan. He suggested that this be mentioned briefly in the transmittal letter to remind the City Council that they might want to review and revise that section of the Comprehensive Plan at some point in the future if they choose to eliminate the Cottage Housing Ordinance. The remainder of the Commission agreed.

Commissioner Hall referred to Land Use Policy 27, which states that cottage housing would be allowed in residential areas. He pointed out that if the City Council were to eventually repeal the only code provision that would allow cottage housing, this policy should also be changed. Commissioner Kuboi asked staff if using the word "allow" in Land Use Policy 27 would require the City to implement an ordinance for cottage housing at some point in the future. He reminded the Commission that, philosophically, they supported the concept of cottage housing, but it needed to be approached from a

more holistic perspective. The City may go through a period of time where they don't have any cottage housing ordinance on the books, but hopefully, this would just be an interim period. Ms. Markle said she does not believe that Land Use Policy 27 would require the City to have a cottage housing ordinance on the books right now. She reminded them that the Comprehensive Plan is a 20-year document. Commissioner Kuboi said he would not want to imply to the City Council that if they were to repeal the Cottage Housing Ordinance, they would somehow be in non-compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Hall pointed out that the debate within the community regarding cottage housing is not related to code issues. The debate was about whether the City should allow more than six units per acre in an R-6 zone, which is a policy issue. If the City Council wants to allow a density bonus for small houses, the proposed amendments would probably address the code related concerns. But the issue of cottage housing should be discussed as a policy issue of the Comprehensive Plan rather than a code amendment issue. If the community strongly feels that the City should never allow more than six units per acre in an R-6 zone, then this policy should be removed from the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tovar said he is not prepared to provide comments regarding the interpretation of the word "allow." However, his insight would be that all plans should be clear. If the City interprets the word "allow" to mean "consider at some point," then it would be considered more aspirational direction than a direct requirement. He concluded that each word in the code and the Comprehensive Plan has a very specific meaning that must be made clear, and Land Use Policy 27 could create a legal issue down the road if the City Council were to eliminate the Cottage Housing Ordinance. Citizens who are concerned about cottage housing could raise some concerns about the concept still being mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the City must be very candid regarding the meaning of Land Use Policy 27.

Commissioner Sands agreed that if the City Council ultimately desires to eliminate the Cottage Housing Ordinance once and for all, they should eliminate Land Use Policy 27. If they choose to leave the policy in the Comprehensive Plan, they should recognize that the issue could be brought up again at a later date. Commissioner Hall said he would support a statement in the transmittal letter to point out that there is a policy in the Comprehensive Plan to allow cottage housing in residential areas. The remainder of the Commission agreed that it would be appropriate to reference Land Use Policy 27 in the transmittal letter.

Commissioner Hall said that while the Commission voted 4 to 4 to repeal the Cottage Housing Ordinance, the transmittal letter should also point out that the proposed amendments to the Cottage Housing Ordinance were previously forwarded to the City Council on a 7 to 1 vote. It is important that the City Council clearly understand that if they decide to retain the Cottage Housing Ordinance, the Commission recommends adoption of the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Hall referred to the final sentence in the second to the last paragraph of Page 2, which states that cottage housing, by itself, is not a significant contribution in meeting the Growth Management Act goals. He suggested that this language might understate the issue a little bit. If the Cottage Housing Ordinance does get repealed, at some point the City must consider other ways to meet the growth target mandated by the Growth Management Act. He suggested that the language in the

transmittal letter be changed to state that cottage housing is not critical in meeting the City's growth target. The Commission agreed that this paragraph should be clarified to more clearly express the Commission's viewpoint.

Vice Chair Piro reviewed the following changes to the transmittal letter:

- Strike out the word "amended" in Paragraph 3.
- Add language about the current Comprehensive Plan policy.
- Add language in the first paragraph about the 7-1 Commission vote on the proposed amendments to the Cottage Housing Ordinance.
- Change the second to the last paragraph to indicate that cottage housing is not critical to the City's ability to meet the City's growth target as mandated by the Growth Management Act.

Vice Chair Piro advised that he would run a final version of the transmittal by Commissioner McClelland and then forward it to staff to format. It would then be forwarded to Chair Harris for final signature. The Commission agreed that the transmittal letter could be forwarded to the City Council once Chair Harris has signed it.

The Commission referred to the findings and conclusions that were prepared by staff for the proposed amendments to the Cottage Housing Ordinance. Commissioner Hall recalled that Commissioner McClelland raised a concern at a previous meeting that the findings prepared by staff did not accurately capture what the Planning Commission used as its basis. The Commission agreed that staff should review the minutes from the previous meeting to make sure changes are made to address the Commission's concern. The Commission agreed that once the letter and findings have been finalized, the entire package should be sent to the City Council with no further review by the Commission.

Commissioner McClelland reported that Paul Grace facilitated the committee meeting that was held at the request of the City Council to consider the public process for reviewing the Cottage Housing Ordinance. Based on the Commission's current view on cottage housing and because the committee meeting was being held so late in the process, after the Commission has already reviewed the proposed amendments, Mr. Grace questioned whether there was a purpose for holding a community meeting. She advised that next Monday the City Council would decide if they still believe that a meeting forum should be held before the amended ordinance is presented to them. If they decide to hold the forum, it would be scheduled for November 29th at the Highlands Recreation Center, and the purpose would be to create an environment where the Planning Commission, the City Council and citizens would all have an opportunity to talk together.

Ms. Markle advised that as soon as the Commission's transmittal letter regarding the Cottage Housing Ordinance is ready, staff plans to forward it to the City Council instead of waiting for them to make a decision regarding the public forum.

Commissioner Kuboi said it was clearly pointed out that the public forum would provide an opportunity for open dialogue between the citizens, the City Council and the Planning Commission. He said it is essential that the meeting be structured in such a way to ensure that proper order is maintained. The

meeting would be advertised to the public. He said that while expectations for Commission attendance was not made clear, it is important that as many Commissioners as possible attend if the City Council decides to move forward with the meeting.

Commissioner Kuboi said it was not clear to him whether the Commissioners would be able to speak at the public forum as both citizens and Commissioners with individual opinions, or if they must speak only of the Planning Commission's position as a body. He said he would be uncomfortable participating in the discussion if he were not able to share his own thoughts that may or may not have been represented in the final recommendation of the Commission as a whole.

Commissioner Kuboi asked if the staff has discussed options for encouraging involvement from the development community as well as the public. Ms. Markle advised that the staff has a mailing list of about 120 individuals, including cottage housing developers, who would receive a personal invitation to the public forum.

The Commission briefly discussed the format for the public meeting. Ms. Markle said that while the Commission could make suggestions about how the meeting should be run, the City Council would be in charge.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business scheduled on the agenda.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Harris reviewed that a public hearing on the proposed Development Code Amendments is scheduled for November 17th. In addition, staff has tentatively scheduled an update on the Richmond Beach Saltwater Park Master Plan. However, this presentation might be postponed to December 1st.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

David Harris
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

This page intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Public Hearing on Official Docket of Proposed Amendments to the Development Code
DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services
PREPARED BY: Kim Lehmborg, Planner II
PRESENTED BY: Rachael Markle, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services and Kim Lehmborg Planner II

SUMMARY

Amendments to the Development Code are processed as legislative decisions. Legislative decisions are non-project decisions made by the City Council under its authority to establish policies and regulations. The Planning Commission is the review authority for legislative decisions and is responsible for holding an open record Public Hearing on the official docket of proposed Development Code amendments and making a recommendation to the City Council on each amendment.

The proposed amendment language is found in the Notebook of Proposed Development Code Amendments, which has already been distributed to the Planning Commission. Copies of the notebook are available on line at www.cityofshoreline.com and at the Planning and Development Services Office at 17544 Midvale Avenue North in the City Hall Annex. If you have any questions regarding how to obtain or view a copy of this information, please call the Planning Commission Clerk at 206-546-1508. Attachment A contains a summary Table of the 2004 Proposed Development Code Amendments - Docketed.

The purpose of this meeting is to:

- Hold a public hearing on the proposed Development Code Amendments
- Make a recommendation to the City Council on each of the proposals

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

At the October 20, 2005 meeting, the Planning Commission finalized the official docket for the 2004 Development Code Amendment process, also requested staff to clarify some of the proposed amendments. Of the non-docketed items, proposed amendments to the tree retention code and proposals for density bonuses were placed on the 2006 work item agenda for further study. The docketed items will be discussed and a recommendation on whether or not to approve the proposed amendment will be passed on to the City Council for their review. The following analysis contains the issues and staff recommendation for each proposed amendment.

AMENDMENTS AND ISSUES

Attachment II includes a copy of the original and proposed amending language shown in legislative format. Legislative format uses ~~strikethroughs~~ for proposed text deletions and underlines for proposed text additions. The following is a summary of the proposed amendments, with staff analysis. Note that the proposals that are classified as technical amendments serve only to clarify code language or to properly reference code, they do not change the meaning or intent of the ordinance.

Amendment #1: 20.50.100 This amendment is staff initiated and is the result of a change in building code and is important to achieve consistency between the Development Code and the International Codes adopted by the City. Currently, the City allows for the construction of up to one 120 sq. ft. structure (SMC 20.50.110(1) in the required side and rear yard setbacks as an exempt structure, while the International Residential Code IRC R105.2(1) allows for the construction of up to a 200 sq. ft. structure as an exempt structure (exempt of building code requirements). This change would allow for the placement of up to one 200 sq. ft. structure located in the required side and front yard setbacks without permit, as long as the structure meets the fire separation requirements of the building code. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #2: 20.20.048 This is a citizen initiated proposal to reduce the size requirement of a Landmark Tree from a minimum diameter at breast height of 30 inches to a diameter at breast height of 24 inches. Although this may lead to the request for designation of a tree that has not yet reached the maturity in its life cycle to be considered a Landmark Tree, the tree must be evaluated by an arborist as part of the designation process. Because the designation is ultimately up to an arborist, the reduction in size will have little effect on the eligibility of the tree to be considered a Landmark Tree. Furthermore, only the property owner may request a tree to be designated as a Landmark specimen. Other jurisdictions have a process for the designation of Landmark Trees, and research indicates the requirement is typically based on the characteristics of the specimen, which must be examined by a certified arborist. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #3: 20.50.300 This is an amendment that was submitted by the City Legal Staff and is meant to adjust some of the requirements of a clearing and grading permit. This change will adjust the requirements to 1) Require a clearing and grading permit for all development activity, 2) Allow for the issuance of a clearing and grading permit for activity on already developed land 3) Regulate replacement trees under 20.50.330(D) Protected Trees, and 4) Properly reference 20.80 Critical Areas as the standard for activity on sensitive lands. These changes will help clarify when a clearing and grading permit is required and how it will be administered. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #4: 20.20.110 & 20.50.210 This change has been initiated by City staff and is meant to adjust the fence standards. The change would eliminate a provision that requires the construction of an alternating fence on private roads, a standard that is currently being imposed only on private access drives. This proposed amendment also clarifies where the height of a fence that is built on top of a retaining wall is to be measured from and would eliminate the openwork type of fence as a requirement. The current requirement does not allow property owners to build a privacy fence on top of a retaining wall to provide screening from the uphill neighbor; this change would allow neighbors to build fences to add privacy for their windows and yards. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #5: 20.50.110, 20.50.210, & 20.50.270 This proposed amendment was initiated as part of the 2003 Development Code amendments and was remanded to staff for further study.

Staff considered many variations of this proposal that would allow Police and other essential public facilities to use security fencing if it is appropriately screened from public areas. Under this proposed change, if the Police Department or any other essential public facility needed to use security fencing to keep the facility secure, they would be required to screen the fencing so that it is not visible from the street or other public areas. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #6: 20.30.150 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is intended to clarify when to complete a public notice of decision, and specifies that a notice of decision shall be issued for Type B and C Actions, not Type L Actions. This is a technical change, and does not change any of the noticing requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #7: 20.30.060 & 20.30.070 This proposed change was initiated by City legal staff and would change an application for street vacation from a Legislative - Type L action to a Quasi Judicial - Type C action. Currently Street Vacation applications are listed as Type L actions. These actions are being processed as Quasi-Judicial actions and therefore should be changed to a Type C decisions. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #8: 20.30.160 This proposed change was initiated by City legal staff to help clarify how land use action approvals are vested. By changing this section to allow for an automatic extension of vesting, the applicant may be granted the full two years allowed before expiration of approved land use action if the land use decision is subject to legal injunction. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #9: 20.30.740 This proposed amendment was initiated by City legal staff and is intended to add enforcement capacity for clearing and grading activities to properly reference the Enforcement Provisions of the Development Code. This is a technical amendment. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #10: 20.50.350 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff to ensure the proper installation of tree protection measures. This would allow staff the ability to enforce the installation of tree protection measures on site. Sometimes tree protection measures are not installed properly and lead to significant impact on the trees root system and eventual decline in health. If the protection measures were not installed properly, City staff would have the ability to utilize the bond to hire a third party to properly install and maintain the protection measures. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #11: This proposal was initiated by City legal staff and would change every occurrence of “Code violation” to “Code Violation” for consistency throughout the Development Code. This is a technical change and does not affect the regulatory content of the Development Code. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #12: 20.50.480 This proposal was initiated by a citizen, David Anderson. The issue Mr. Anderson is trying to address with this amendment is the need for additional design flexibility based on site conditions when locating street trees. A specific example, tree grates are allowed to be used. The tree grate must be a minimum of 4 ft. by 4 ft. On a six foot sidewalk that could create as little as a 2 foot area that is free and clear of the tree grate for pedestrian use. This could cause access issues, especially as the tree grows and the grate potentially begins to buckle upwards. The proposed amendment would limit the use of tree grates to 8 foot sidewalks unless approved by the Director. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #13: 20.30.290 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is necessary for consistency with the current adopted building codes. Currently, this section of the Development Code cites the “Uniform Fire Code”, and needs to be corrected to properly cite the “International Fire Code” that has been adopted by the City. Staff recommends approval of this technical change.

Amendment #14: 20.30.100 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is necessary to address a lack of expiration timelines for clearing and grading permit applications. Upon adoption of the International Building Code (IBC) the City lost requirements that were in place under the Uniform Building Code (UBC) for clearing and grading/site development permit application expiration. This proposed change would add clearing and grading permit application expiration regulations that are consistent with building permit application regulations.

Amendment #15: 20.40.240 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is meant to change the description of cage sizes from square feet to cubic feet, and to make other minor technical corrections in the Code. Currently, the Development Code regulates cage/aviary sizes for birds in square feet. Aviary sizes should be regulated in cubic feet so as to provide for the best living environment for birds. The other changes are necessary to add clarity and consistency to the Development Code.

Amendment #16: 20.30.295 & 20.40.110 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff. A temporary use permit was not listed in the use tables but was found in the list of supplementary criteria. Moving the requirements for a temporary use permit to the permit review and decision criteria section for Type A permits better locates this section for the user. Staff recommends approval of this technical change.

Amendment #17: 20.30.140 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is intended to clarify the content of this section, as this section regulates the internal processing of permit applications, not the expiration of application or permit. Staff recommends approval of this technical change.

Amendment #18 20.50.360 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff. This proposed change amends the performance assurance section of the Code to specifically address both the performance bonds and maintenance bonds in different subsections. The intent of this change is to make it easier for the reader to identify the specific requirements of a performance guarantee from those of a maintenance agreement. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #19: 20.30.165 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff. Upon adoption of the IBC the City lost requirements that were in place under the UBC for clearing and grading/site development permit expiration. This amendment adds a section to regulate the expiration of clearing and grading and site development permits. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #20: 20.30.430 This proposed amendment was initiated by City staff and is intended to clarify that section 20.30.430 governs the submittal and approval of site development permits for required subdivision improvements. This amendment also adds a reference to proposed section 20.30.265 to properly identify site development permit expiration limitations. Staff recommends approval.

Amendment #21: 20.30.80-180 This proposal intends to improve the neighborhood meeting process to better notify and inform interested persons about potential projects. Staff proposes to require the future applicant to provide more information in the meeting notice such as the

description of the project, zoning of the property, site and vicinity maps and identification of the land use actions that will be required to be applied for. Staff is also proposing to require the future applicant to cover basic information such as an introduction of the meeting organizer, description of the project proposal, list of anticipated permits the project may require, a description of how comments made at the meeting are used, and provide meeting attendees with the City's contact information should questions arise regarding future permitting of this project. They will also need to provide an attendee sign-up sheet. These changes are proposed to address comments received by staff that the level of information provided at these meetings varies depending on the meeting organizer. Staff also proposes that the meeting summary submitted as part of the permit application be mailed out to meeting attendees (those persons that have signed up with a legible name and address) by staff. The purpose of this step would be to give meeting attendees the opportunity to correct or supplement the neighborhood meeting summaries. Staff recommends approval.

DECISION CRITERIA

An amendment to the development code may be approved if:

1. The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; and
2. The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare; and;
3. The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

Staff has concluded that the proposed amendments do not conflict with any of the decision criteria.

OPTIONS

Following the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission may begin deliberation on the amendments for the purpose of making a recommendation to City Council. The Planning Commission has the following options:

1. Recommend an amendment for adoption as proposed;
2. Recommend that an amendment not be adopted or pursued; or
3. Recommend a Planning Commission alternative amendment for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing to receive comments on the official docket of proposed amendments to the Development Code. Following the public hearing, deliberate the options, and provide a recommendation to the City Council on each amendment.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A Table 1 – 2004 Proposed Development Code Amendments - Docketed

This page intentionally left blank

Proposed Development Code Amendments- Docketed

Table 1

Log #	Category	Requested Change	Requested By	Chpt	Section(s)	Title	Proposed Change	Staff Recommendation
D-1	Dimension	Change the size of allowed exempt structures to 200 Sq. Ft. to be consistent with the IRC.	City Planning Staff	20.50	100(1)	Location of accessory structures within required yard setbacks- Standards	Change allowed size from 120 Sq. Ft. to 200 Sq. Ft. and add requirement for fire separation as identified in the adopted building code.	Staff panel recommends adoption of this change for consistency between the Development Code and the Building Codes.
D-2	Trees	Reduce requirement of tree size for Landmark Tree to 24" DBH.	Boni Biery- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	20.20	48	"T" Definitions	Reduce requirement of tree size for Landmark Tree to 24" DBH.	A reduction in size requirements for a landmark tree may allow for a request for the designation of a landmark tree that is only a significant tree and has not reached a maturity in its life to be considered a landmark tree. However, this reduction in size only affects the eligibility of an application for designation as a landmark tree and does not exempt the application from being evaluated by a certified arborist. Furthermore, the application may only be filed by the property owner, who may desire to preserve the trees on their property. In this case there is no negative effect of reducing the requirements to 24" because the determination is ultimately up to an arborist, and the designation of a landmark tree may not be forced on a property owner. Staff panel neutral regarding this proposed change.
D-3	Clearing and Grading	Change the requirements to be more specific about when a C & G permit is required.	City Legal Staff	20.50	300	Clearing and Grading General Requirements	Remove 20.50.300 (E) , add provision that makes all replacement trees protected trees, modify language around when a clearing and grading permit is required, and modify language regarding compliance with the Critical Areas section of Development Code.	Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-4	Fence	Change fence requirements to make content amendments and allow for construction of a solid 6 foot fence on top of a retaining wall.	City Planning Staff	20.50	110 & 210	Fences and Walls- Standards	Change fence requirements to make content amendments and allow for construction of a solid 6 foot wall on top of a retaining wall. Eliminate language requiring an offset design for fences along private driveways.	The current provision in the code does not allow for the construction of a six foot solid fence on top of a wall, and limits a property owners ability to construct a privacy fence on top of a retaining wall allowing the uphill neighbor to have a full view into the downhill neighbor's yard. Change will also eliminate provision in the code that requires the construction of an alternating type fence on private roads. Staff panel found this to be too restrictive, and may promote the construction of fences and landscaping that can hide burglars/thieves. Staff panel recommends consideration of these proposed changes.
D-5	Security Fencing	Add provision to allow for barbed wire and razor wire fences for public and infrastructure facilities in residential and commercial zones so long as fence is effectively screened from neighboring public areas.	Police Department	20.50	110 (C), 210 (D), 270 (C & D)	Fences and Walls- Standards	Add provision to allow for barbed wire and razor wire fences for public and infrastructure facilities in residential and commercial zones so long as fence is effectively screened from neighboring public areas.	Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-6	Noticing	Add description to Administrative section of code clarifying when noticing is required for each type of permit.	City Planning Staff	Many	Many	Procedures and Administration	Add Clarifying language that the noticing requirement for notice of decision applies to Type B and C actions only.	Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-7	Administrative	Change Street Vacations to Type "C" actions.	City Legal Staff	20.30	70	Legislative Decisions	Change Street Vacations to Type "C" actions.	By changing a Street Vacation action to a Type C action, the appearance of fairness on ex parte communication would apply, and contact made with opponents or advocates of the vacation would be reserved until all evidence is submitted at the public hearing allowing all merits of the action to be identified prior to formation of opinion. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-8	Vesting	Add provision that allows applicant to apply for a stay if subject to LUPA process.	City Legal Staff	20.30	160	Expiration of Vested Status of Land Use Permits and Approvals	Add language that automatically allows for an extension of vesting under 20.30.160 if the approved land use permit is subject to a pending legal action or appeal.	By changing this section to allow for an automatic extension of vesting the applicant may be granted the full two years before expiration of approved land use action while decision is not subject to legal injunction. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-9	Technical	Amend section 20.30.740 D(2) to properly reference 20.50 and add legal language	City Legal Staff	20.30	740	Civil Penalties for Code violations	Amend section 20.30.740 D(2) to properly reference 20.50 and add legal language.	Technical amendment. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-10	Technical	Add provision to promote the protection of retained significant trees from damage during construction.	City Planning Staff	20.50	350	Tree Replacement and Site Restoration	Require the bonding of protection measures and tree maintenance to ensure survival and health for 36 months following construction.	This would allow staff the ability to enforce the installation of tree protection measures on site. Sometimes this is not installed properly and leads to significant impact on the trees root system and eventual decline in health. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.

Proposed Development Code Amendments- Docketed

Table 1

D-11	Technical	Change every occurrence of "Code Violation" to a capital "V". Change every reference to Director or Designee to just Director.	City Legal Staff	Many	Many	Many	Change every occurrence of "Code Violation" to a capital "V".	This helps provide for consistency. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-12	Technical	Create an alternative to allow for the planting of trees on the property line side of the sidewalk, not directly next to the street (comment also forwarded to Engineering for consideration in next Engineering Guide update).	David Anderson- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment	20.5	480	Street Trees	SMC 20.50.480 (C) allows for this option based on an existing condition. Proposed change would allow for design flexibility based on site conditions, and may allow for improved visibility and safety in some situations. Change would also require that sidewalks with tree pits maintain a minimum four foot passage strip, instead of the two foot strip that is currently allowed through the use of tree pits with a six foot sidewalk.	Damage to streets and sidewalks by tree roots, and impact of restricted root growth to trees would also be minimized by moving trees to private property side of sidewalk. Staff agrees that change should be made to the engineering guide to show this alternate design, and to limit the placement of tree pits when sidewalk is less than eight feet wide. Engineering staff and Staff panel recommend consideration of this proposed change.
D-13	Technical	Change the reference to Fire Code to properly identify the IFC, not the UFC.	City Planning Staff	20.30	290 B(4)	Variance from the engineering standards (Type A action)	Change the reference to Fire Code to properly identify the IFC, not the UFC.	This helps provide for consistency. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-14	Administrative	Add application expiration limitations.	City Planning Staff	20.30	100	Time limits	Change section 20.30.100 and 20.30.110 to include a clause regulating the expiration of a complete permit application.	Upon adoption of the IBC the City lost requirements that were in place under the UBC for clearing and grading/site development application expiration. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-15	Technical	Make technical changes to the Animals section of Zoning and Use Provisions.	City Planning Staff	20.40	240	Animals	Technical changes to 20.40.240 to properly describe sizes of cages for birds and eliminate birds from the animal specific section.	These minor changes are due to some inconsistencies found in the code. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-16	Technical	Move temporary use permits from use provisions to the review and decision criteria section. Change reference in use tables to properly reflect this change.	City Planning Staff	20.40	540	Temporary Use	Move temporary use permits from use provisions to the review and decision criteria section. Change reference in use tables to properly reflect this change.	A temporary use permit is not listed in the use tables but is found in the list of supplementary criteria. Moving the requirements for a temporary use permit to the permit review and decision criteria section for Type A permits better locates this section for the user. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-17	Technical	Make technical change to heading of section 20.30.140	City Planning Staff	20.30	140	Time Limits	Make technical change to heading of section 20.30.140.	This change will help clarify the content of the section. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-18	Clearing and Grading Permit Requirements	Change performance section to individually describe performance and maintenance bonds.	City Legal Staff	20.50	360	Tree replacement and site restoration	Change performance section to individually describe performance and maintenance bonds.	This change helps differentiate between a performance guarantee and maintenance bond. Staff Panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-19	Administrative	Add section regulating the expiration of clearing and grading and site development permits.	City Planning Staff	20.30	165	Permit expiration timelines for Clearing and Grading and Site Development Permits	Add section 20.30.165 that addresses time limits and expiration of site development and clearing and grading permits.	Upon adoption of the IBC the City lost requirements that were in place under the UBC for clearing and grading/site development permit expiration. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-20	Administrative	Add reference to site development permit for subdivision section that references the new permit expiration limitations.	City Planning Staff	20.30	430	Site development permit for required subdivision improvements – Type A action.	Add reference in 20.30.430 to properly identify new section regulating expiration of site development permit.	Upon adoption of the IBC the City lost requirements that were in place under the UBC for clearing and grading/site development permit expiration. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.
D-21	Noticing	Revise neighborhood meeting standards and noticing requirements to better notify the public of potential land use actions and allow potential issues to be identified and resolved prior to Planning Commission public hearings.	Michael Broili	20.30	80-180	Procedures and Administration	No proposed language was submitted. Staff drafted some amendments to try and address the comment. Clarify that the meeting notice include a description of the project, zoning, site & vicinity maps and possible future land use decisions i.e. rezone, SEPA, etc. Add minimum requirements for meeting content i.e. basic agenda for meeting. Add a step to have the City mail submitted neighborhood minutes to all meeting attendees for additions, corrections, etc.	Provide more information in the neighborhood meeting notice to better alert neighbors to potential projects/change. Add some basic structure to the neighborhood meeting to insure that adequate information is being relayed to meeting attendees for the purposes of early discussions. By mailing the meeting summaries submitted by the applicant's to the meeting attendees, attendees could verify the information. This could address concerns that the applicant's minutes are not reflecting the comments at the meeting. Staff panel recommends consideration of this proposed change.