DRAFT

These Minutes Subject to
March 4th Approval

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 4, 2010 Shoreline City Hall
7:00 P.M. Council Chamber

Commissioners Present	**Staff Present**
Chair Wagner	Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Vice Chair Perkowski	Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Commissioner Behrens	Miranda Redinger, Associate Planner, Planning & Development Services
Commissioner Broili	Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk
Commissioner Kaje	
Commissioner Kuboi	**Commissioners Absent**
Commissioner Pyle	Commissioner Piro

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wagner called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Wagner, Vice Chair Perkowski and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Kaje, Kuboi, Perkowski and Pyle. Commissioner Piro was absent.

Chair Wagner recognized the presence of Mayor McGlashan and Councilmember Eggen.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tovar announced that Commissioner Piro and former Commissioner McClelland have been elected to the College of Fellows of the American Institute of Certified Planners. He noted that appropriate acknowledgement and recognition would be given to both of these individuals.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

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

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOODS SUBAREA PLAN

Chair Wagner reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing.

Staff Overview and Presentation of Preliminary Staff Recommendation

Mr. Cohn provided a general overview of the proposed Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan. He referred to the current Comprehensive Plan Map, which identifies most of the southeast portion of the City as a special study area with no defined vision except for the properties along the edge. The vision for the edge close to Bothell Way Northeast and Northeast 145th Street is mixed-use, with a combination of commercial and residential uses transitioning to an area of high-density residential closer to the cemetery. He noted there is a small single-family area adjacent to the cemetery. The vision for the other edge calls for single-family with park and open space. However, a mixed-use area has been identified north of Northeast 150th Street on 15th Avenue Northeast to transition between the arterial and the single-family residential development. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan does not have a tight definition for "mixed-use," and it allows a variety of uses ranging from very intense commercial to multi-family residential. The purpose of the subarea plan is to provide not only direction for the middle portion of the study area, but additional direction for the edges.

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that the neighborhood has been asking for a subarea plan for numerous years, and the City Council directed staff to move forward two years ago. He reported that a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed to study the issue, and they started meeting in mid 2008 through the third quarter of 2009. They were briefed on the various aspects of comprehensive planning so they could develop a cohesive vision. They developed a set of goals and policies, and then spent time coming up with a recommendation on how a vision for redevelopment could be realized.

Mr. Cohn provided an illustration of the draft Comprehensive Plan Map, which outlines the proposed concept of transitioning from mixed-use to multi-family to less intense single-family uses. He noted that the Committee's Report was presented to the Commission at a study session on November 19, 2009, and staff condensed the report to develop the draft subarea plan that is now before the Commission. He advised that the proposed subarea plan would be implemented through the zoning map, which would be considered by the Commission at a later date. While not required, the Committee felt it was important to attach an implementation plan to carefully illustrate the transition. Once the Southeast Subarea Plan has been adopted by the City Council, staff could prepare a legislative rezone to implement the changes.

Mr. Cohn referred to an illustration of the proposed land use map, and noted that most of the area would remain single-family. The two transition areas (mixed-use to multi-family residential to single-family) are more tightly defined to specifically illustrate the transition concept. The designation of the

commercial areas would not change. However, the CAC did support a change near the middle of Northeast 145th Street, where high-density residential might be appropriate.
Mr. Cohn explained that staff reviewed the proposal as a non-project action under SEPA, and they issued a threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on January 28, 2010. No comments related to SEPA have been received to date, but the comment period continues for another week. Therefore, he recommended the Commission continue the hearing to March 4th for Commission continued deliberation and public comments specific to the DNS.

Mr. Cohn advised that late last week, staff received a minority report from some members of the CAC. It does not suggest changes to the subarea plan policies, but it focuses on a vision for the plan with lower-scale development in the commercial areas with transitions to the residential areas. He referred the Commission to the map that illustrates the recommendations contained in the minority report.

Ms. Redinger explained that the CAC was made up of a diverse group of residents, property owners and neighborhood representatives who were selected by the City Council. It started with 16 members, and 13 remained throughout the process. Their Subarea Plan Report focused on maintaining a variety of housing options, creating third places, and revitalizing small commercial areas to bring in more businesses that provide goods and services to the community. She noted that current zoning allows these types of businesses and developments to locate in specific areas along Bothell Way Northeast and north of the intersection at 15th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 145th Street. She observed that with the exception of a produce stand and veterinary clinic, there has been very little new development in the two commercial areas for years.

Ms. Redinger advised that the CAC grappled with how to encourage redevelopment so there are spaces for new businesses to serve the neighborhood. They also discussed how to create transition from the new development so that single-family homes would not be immediately adjacent to it. The CAC heard from many in the community, and after months of work, they developed a plan that the majority supported. She referred to the CAC's Subarea Plan Report, which was condensed by staff to make it a more appropriate format for the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Redinger informed the Commission that the majority of the CAC wished to encourage commercial redevelopment by providing incentives through increased housing density so resulting development would be able to provide more day-to-day goods and services to the community. They proposed this solution because the current zoning, which allows commercial development, has not resulted in new development in quite a long time. They believe that businesses need additional density to provide demand for their goods. Additional population would also be an incentive for them to locate in the neighborhood. She emphasized that the minority report does not agree with this premise and suggests that if the City were to continue to permit commercial development by restricting residential development, commercial development would eventually happen.

Ms. Redinger said there was clear consensus that the community wants more neighborhood retail and services in areas that are already zoned for commercial development, particularly to create more family-wage jobs, which would seem to call for a different type of incentive. The Minority and CAC Reports recommended two different options: the Minority Report assumes businesses will locate in commercial

areas under the current and possibly more restrictive variation of zoning; while the CAC Report suggests promoting new development by allowing greater density on some parcels and requiring ground floor commercial space.

Ms. Redinger said the CAC's Report also notes that it is equally important to address the question of transitioning from commercial to single-family areas. The CAC's Report suggests two options:

- Continue with the way transition is currently handled but employ transition elements such as buffering, façade articulation, step backs, etc. This could result in situations where commercial development is immediately adjacent to single-family homes or where multi-family structures of three and four stories are adjacent to single-family homes. The transition would thereby be handled by design standards as occurs in the Mixed-Use Zones and to a lesser extent in Community Business Zones. Transition standards are not addressed in Neighborhood Business or Office Zones.
- Use zoning to create transition. This is the way planners traditionally handled transition until 10 or 20 years ago. Traditionally, commercial zoning transitioned from apartment zonings to town house/duplex zoning to single-family zoning.

Ms. Redinger suggested it might be useful to ask the speakers whether they are in favor of mixed-uses in areas already zoned for commercial uses. If so, they should be invited to share suggestions about what should be encouraged and how.

Questions by Commission to Staff

Commissioner Kaje asked if the CAC made the conscious choice not to reduce the potential zoning capacity that already exists. Mr. Cohn said the CAC discussed the option of down zoning some properties but chose not to go in that direction.

Commissioner Pyle referred to the open space at the southern end of Paramount Park and recalled that the Commission previously heard a proposal for rezoning and platting the property. Mr. Cohn advised that the rezone and plat proposal were approved by the City Council. Commissioner Pyle observed that depending on the use chart that is generated as a result of the proposed Comprehensive Plan change, single-family uses could be prohibited if the property is rezoned to "Park Expansion." Mr. Cohn agreed that is one option. On the other hand, if it remains as single-family zoning and is developed as such, single-family uses would be conforming.

Commissioner Pyle asked if the CAC's report provides specific discussion about this parcel. Ms. Redinger said there is no specific discussion about this area. Instead, there are numerous general comments about creating green corridors and increasing opportunities for recreational space. Commissioner Pyle said he attended a recent conference where the discussion centered on the use of open space as habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. He observed that this parcel is an essential piece between the golf course and Thornton Creek.

Mr. Tovar suggested that is okay to identify the proposed park expansion in the Comprehensive Plan, which is a policy document. If the City Council were to adopt the proposed language, it would become

a statement of intent that at some point in the future, the City may acquire the property. However, zoning the property as "Park Expansion" would be inappropriate. He noted that Southwood and Paramount Parks are zoned residential and parks are permitted uses in residential zones. He cautioned against zoning the property as "Park Expansion." Instead, it should have some kind of residential designation.

Commissioner Pyle referred to the parcel that belongs to Acacia Memorial Park. While the land use is proposed to be changed to open space, it would remain zoned as residential. He asked if this zoning designation would preclude the Memorial Park from using the parcel in the future as an active cemetery ground. Ms. Redinger pointed out that this parcel is outside of the boundaries of the subarea. The CAC's only discussion about the Park was that its "residents" wouldn't be bothered by additional density.

Commissioner Pyle asked if any current or proposed locations within the subarea would be considered non-conforming uses. He also asked if a congregate care facility, similar to the one located at the intersection of 30th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 145th Street would be allowed in a high-density residential zone. Mr. Cohn said he would have to research the issue further. However, his expectation is that since the use already exists, it would be considered conforming.

Commissioner Kaje pointed out one of the policy statements suggests that there be an increased height limit of up to 50 or 60 feet in the R-48 zones, but only when adjacent to densities that are R-24 or higher. He said it appears this provision would apply to 12 parcels on the east side of 15th Avenue Northeast and approximately 12 parcels in the southeast corner. He asked if these locations are where the CAC was specifically recommending 50 to 60 feet. Mr. Cohn said staff would review this concept when they prepare the legislative rezone at some point in the future. However, he observed that the current height limit would allow developers to maximize density in the R-48 zones. Ms. Redinger said the point of the recommendation was to restrict or change the use table because some members of the CAC were uncomfortable with a blanket exemption.

Commissioner Pyle observed that no proposal for modifying of the actual Development Code has been prepared. Ms. Redinger agreed and noted that staff has slated time to work on the Development Code Amendments related to the Southeast Subarea Plan this summer. Commissioner Pyle summarized that policy implications or ideas that are approved by the City Council would be further developed by staff and brought back to the Planning Commission and City Council later in the year as Development Code amendments. Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the adopted Housing Strategy recommends implementing changes in housing styles through the subarea process, with more pilot regulations rather than broad-based City regulations. Some of the concepts in the report include accessory dwelling units, home-based businesses, etc. She announced that a University of Washington Graduate Planning Studio is helping staff work through some of the more complicated concepts, and they will come back with a more complete recommendation later.

Chair Wagner asked if the provisions that are created for accessory dwelling units would be applied equally throughout the subarea. Ms. Redinger said that the current code requires a 10,000 square foot lot in order to have a detached accessory dwelling unit. One consideration is making this allowable on a

lower lot size. Whether that would be across the board or dialed into more specific areas has not been decided. The CAC did not make specific recommendations, but it was a popular concept based on how accessory dwelling units normally work and the benefits they provide. Chair Wagner requested more information from the public and staff about whether these innovative housing ideas are intended to be applied throughout the subarea or limited to specific locations within the subarea. Mr. Cohn said the CAC did not get into the issue in depth.

THE COMMISSION RECESSED THE MEETING AT 7:35 TO ALLOW THEM AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THEIR DESK PACKETS (PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE RECEIVED AFTER THE STAFF REPORT WAS SENT OUT). THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT 7:50 P.M.

Public Testimony

Leslie Sandberg, Shoreline, (see Exhibit 6) said she lives in the Briarcrest Neighborhood and was present to speak in favor of the alternative commercial zoned area (EZ). She expressed her belief that change is inevitable for their corner of Shoreline. She said she would like to see development that has a goal of creating a destination/location such as an architecturally appealing commercial village that people would to drive out of their way to visit. Now is the time to plan well for multi-use venues that bring the arts, business and living spaces together as one. She said she looks to University Village as a good example of a place that invites customers to walk around and shop. There is also vibrant mixed-use space at Mill Creek Town Center. Closer to home, the Thornton Creek Development (near Northgate) is a perfect example of what is quality in art, business and living design. It is forward-thinking and beautiful. On the other hand, the Target Complex (north of Northgate) represents a disaster. She summarized that this is an opportunity to redevelop the Southeast Subarea into something that other communities will use as an example of "development done right." She submitted an article from *THE SEATTLE TIMES*, titled, "*Arts Have a Big Economic Impact in Seattle."* She summarized that she supports redevelopment of the subarea, but she wants the City to create a place that has a "joy of living" style. Hopefully, the community will have some say in what future development will look like.

Dennis Lee, Shoreline, said he is the land use representative for the Briarcrest Neighborhood. However, he was not present to speak as a neighborhood representative. Mr. Lee expressed concern that the zoning map was created in tiny pieces and was quickly approved by the CAC instead of being looked at with respect to the report. He explained that the minority report came about because some members of the CAC supported infill development as a trade for density, not infill development and density. He recalled that early in their discussions, the CAC talked about having businesses open to the neighborhood. However, the proposed language would create a situation where people will get upset and discouraged. He reminded the Commission that this is a Comprehensive Plan amendment process and not a zoning process at this point. He also voiced concern that the CAC did not consider a significant setback on the residential side of Northeast 145th Street. He said the minority report suggests the EZ zone because they need an economic zone to preserve business space for the next 20 years. Once an apartment building with nail salons below has been constructed, it will never be replaced with business development. Businesses will move further and further out, and density and sustainable jobs will be out of balance. Those who presented the minority report believe they need a place that is not

high-density commercial, and the only way to do so is to create a new zone. While mixed-use is intended to function as residential/commercial development, it is frequently interpreted to be high-density with nail salons below. He encouraged the Commission to consider some changes before sending the proposal forward to the City Council.

Diana Herbst, Shoreline, pointed out that the language contained in Pages 3 through 6 of the Desk Packet represents personal opinion and is not a fair representation of her street and neighborhood. While it suggests that residents in the area have deferred maintenance on their homes, she and four others on her street have recently replaced their windows with energy efficient two and three-pane windows. She also disagreed with staff's summary of her street's traffic pattern. People come to the end of the street by the cemetery, see the green light at Northeast 147th Street and speed to get through. She said she participates on the Traffic Advisory Board, and they have been trying for three years to get the traffic light covered so people cannot see it three blocks away. She expressed concern that no one has taken ownership of the traffic problems at Northeast 145th Street and Bothell Way Northeast. She said she intends to sell her property and move if the proposed subarea plan is approved as presented. Adding multi-family residential development would destroy the flavor of the neighborhood. She encouraged the Commissioners to read through the language in the subarea plan report, which does not appear to agree with the proposed map.

Bill Bear, Shoreline, said he is also one of the authors of the minority report. He reported that he attended a neighborhood meeting on February 3rd, which was the first opportunity for most of the neighbors to comment on the final zoning map and plan. He submitted a copy of their comments for the record (see Exhibit 7). He expressed his belief that Shoreline needs more jobs. He said he recently spoke to a former business owner who indicated he could not afford to operate a business in Shoreline because the cost of land and rent is too high. He expressed concern that the proposed MU3 and MU2 Zones that allow densities up to R-150 would create situations where the land would be too costly and very few businesses that offer living-wage jobs could afford to operate in this space.

Mr. Bear pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan calls for an equal amount of jobs and housing units. At this time, Shoreline has a ratio of .1 jobs to housing units, which represents a complete failure to follow Comprehensive Plan guidelines. The City's own requirement looks at adding 5,000 new jobs and 5,000 new housing units in the next 20 years, but this cannot be accommodated with an R-150 zone. He encouraged the Commission to review a study completed by King County called "Communities Count" to get a better idea of why people cannot afford to live and purchase homes in Shoreline.

Arthur Peach, Shoreline, said he was the chair of the CAC. He explained that the process was difficult and long. He observed that some of the things he supported were voted down by the CAC, and visa versa. The CAC consisted of a diverse group of citizens, and the suggestions were different. The committee voted through a majority process, and the document is now being presented to the Commission to review and assess.

Jan Stewart, Shoreline, said she lives in the Ridgecrest portion of the subarea. She referred to a letter she submitted that was included in the Commission's packet. She said she would like to have a better understanding of the correlation between the CAC's report and the maps. She said she supports much of

the CAC's report, and she appreciates their hard work. She questioned why issues related to Northeast 145th Street cannot be addressed as part of the subarea planning process. Also, she urged the Commission to keep the public hearing open to allow the public to continue to submit their comments.

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was present to represent the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group and the Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund. She asked that these two groups be recognized as parties of record, with legal standing in the matter currently before the Commission. She asked that the following documents be entered into the record by reference:

- Exhibit 8 – Shoreline Surface Water Master Plan
- Exhibit 9 – Thornton Creek and Westlake Washington Basin Characterization Report
- Exhibit 10 – 2005 Low-Impact Development Model created by the Puget Sound Action Team and Washington State University/Pierce County Extension

Ms. Way expressed her belief that, overall, the CAC's report is good and the process was effective. However, she suggested the following changes:

- **Housing.** H11 would remove obstacles to adult family homes in residential dwelling districts. She questioned what obstacles currently exist. She referred to a recent article in *THE SEATTLE TIMES*, which indicates that these types of uses continue to proliferate.
- **Community Design.** This section points out that there is considerable interest in having design standards and a design review process incorporated into the subarea plan. She recognized that staff is currently working on this issue, but she suggested that it be included as part of the subarea plan.
- **Parks, Recreation and Open Space.** PR1 calls for supporting the development of trails and designated pathways to connect the Interurban Trail with Paramount Park, Hamlin Park, Southwood Park, etc. This goal should also include a connection with Jackson Park. She reminded the Commission that there is currently a process to create a "bands of green" walking trail around the Jackson Park Golf Course. In addition, PR7 states that the path over Lewis Creek and Paramount Open Space should be upgraded. This is a good goal, but a box culvert should also be created for the creek.
- **Natural Environment.** Watersheds are not mentioned in the proposed language. She noted that the headwater of the Thornton Creek Watershed is located within the subarea, and Thornton Creek is the largest watershed in Seattle and Shoreline. It is also a salmon bearing stream. The plan should make note of Hamlin Creek, which is in the Characterization Report. In addition, NE14 designates the area between Seattle's Jackson Park and Hamlin Park as a potential "green corridor" to provide a contiguous ecosystem for wildlife. The language should be corrected by replacing "Hamlin Park" with "Paramount Park." She referred to Commissioner Pyle's earlier comments about the plat that was recently approved by the City Council and pointed out the property is not currently being developed. She emphasized that it has been the neighborhood's long-time goal to have this connection.

Ms. Way concluded her remarks by asking that the Commission keep the public comment period open. She observed that low-impact development, drainage and stormwater are not addressed in the proposed plan, yet the CAC identified them as key issues that must be considered.

Stacy Haiar, Shoreline, said she has been a resident of the subarea for three years and a member of the CAC, which she felt represented a good balance of people in the neighborhood. Their ideas came from people in the community and were not driven by developers and/or City staff. She said she is in favor of higher density in the neighborhood to support more business and retail development. She reported that the CAC went through many reiterations of the map and ended up with a fitting place for the density along the transit corridors. They took great efforts to sort through all the input they received from the public to create a vibrant vision and make it fit in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map. She expressed her belief that mixed-use development can work well if done correctly and in the right place. It can attract vibrant people and businesses to the neighborhoods, and there are many examples of this throughout Seattle and the United States.

Jeff Mann, Shoreline, expressed his belief that the process was fair and balanced. However, he did voice some concerns in his comment letter (Exhibit 5). In particular, he felt there was a lack of inclusion of non-resident property owners in the process. Although the residents had the benefit of being personally contacted on numerous occasions, he did not believe the non-resident property owners received adequate notice. He said he had no knowledge of the February 3rd community meeting because he doesn't live in the Briarcrest Neighborhood and did not get fair notice of the process. He expressed his belief that the process was skewed, and people who were in the position of wanting more density were in the minority. He suggested the "minority report" should actually be called the "majority report," because it represents the majority of the people. They have used numerous tactics to get people on their side and to sway the decision. He asked the Commission to keep this in mind.

Sigrid Strom, Shoreline, said she lives in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood near Fircrest and is a former member of the CAC. She said she has a serious concern about the SEPA Determination and would like to know the appropriate process for vetting her issues. She expressed concern that staff is referring to the plan map as the Comprehensive Plan. She clarified that the map is a land use map that is supposed to be a potential application of the Comprehensive Plan. When she reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan, she found general goals and policies, etc., which is what is contained in the report. She observed that nearly everyone is in consensus that the goals and policies in the CAC's report are solid. However, there is no consensus related to the proposed map, and that is primarily what the minority group is objecting to. She emphasized that there was no vision created throughout the process, which is one of the potential problems. She asked the Commission to read the general comments contained in the minority report related to vision. She said the overriding concern is to preserve the existing character of the neighborhoods.

Cara McKinnon, Shoreline, said she lives in the southeast corner of the subarea where increased density is being proposed and she participated on the CAC. She commented that the proposed light rail station on 5th Avenue Northeast was not addressed in the subarea plan. She also expressed her belief that the subarea plan should include options for addressing issues related to Northeast 145th Street and access to the proposed light rail station. She observed that, at this time, there is a very delicate balance of homeowners and renters in the southeast corner, and it is a very safe neighborhood. She voiced concern that adding increased density could create a problem. She observed that while all of the CAC members supported the concept of accessory dwelling units, the concept was never made part of the proposed plan. She expressed her belief that if density is increased, it would be fair to allow accessory

dwelling units throughout the subarea. She recalled that developers pointed out that the R-24 zoning designation would result in large town house development. They argued that R-48 would allow for more innovative and smaller town houses. The 35-foot height limit was attached to the R-48 zone so that adjoining neighborhoods would not be impacted by very tall buildings.

Jesse Salomon, Shoreline, said lives across the street from the northern border of the subarea. He said he is generally in favor of higher-density and infill development. Everyone must take some responsibility for accommodating the increased density so that sprawl can be prevented and the environment outside of the cities can be preserved. He expressed concern about the affect that greater density would have on the 15th Avenue Northeast Corridor and other places. He reported that he was hit by a car while crossing 15th Avenue Northeast towards his house. Although he had the walk signal and almost made it across the street, a person turned right without even bothering to look for pedestrians. Prior to that incident, he and his girlfriend have almost been hit of four separate occasions. He said he does not attempt to cross on the crosswalk; jaywalking is safer. He summarized that if the City is going to allowed increased density, they must address the traffic safety problems.

Mark Holmes, Shoreline, said he also participated on the CAC and submitted a letter in response to the minority report. He observed that it appears there is a general mistrust of government and the process. However, he felt the CAC has come up with a plan that provides a proper process. The plan addresses the issues that will happen as development occurs. He expressed his belief that redevelopment is inevitable and has been happening in the neighborhood, and that is one of the reasons the Housing Strategies and Southeast Neighborhoods Citizen Advisory Committees were formed. He summarized that the CAC's plan represented a consensus of the entire group, everyone had an opportunity to influence the plan, and concessions were made by both sides. He suggested the minority report is unfair and unnecessary. He said he is in favor of additional density. The businesses in the neighborhood seem to be lacking because there are not enough customers to keep them vibrant. Development, if done in the right way, could bring in more businesses and help the existing businesses.

Camilla McKinnon, Shoreline, said she lives in the Briarcrest Neighborhood. She said she is in favor of development, but not so much density all in one area. She observed that the traffic is already bad, and Northeast 145th Street must be dealt with. She suggested that if additional density is added, there must be a trail system to provide connections. She said she does not believe there is a need to change the existing codes for adult family homes. If they are going to have additional density, there must be an opportunity for design review, so that the resulting development will be something everyone likes. She would like nicer buildings to be developed that do not encourage and increase crime, which could be a result of the proposed new dense zoning. Design review would ensure that nicer development occurs. She also expressed concern that the existing water table in the area proposed for greater density is very high. When previous apartment complexes were built, adjacent neighbors experienced flooding. There needs to be some safeguards to prevent these types of impacts. She pointed out that most people who live in the Briarcrest Neighborhood own their homes, and it is generally a very safe neighborhood. The residents know each other, and the houses are affordable and well cared for.

Les Nelson, Shoreline, said he was glad to see that a proposed land-use map is available for the public's view. He noted that the City's website provided only a description of the plan, as well as two zoning

maps. He expressed concern that the zoning map made it appear as though the City was trying to change the zoning for a complete area, which is not an appropriate process. Typically, a land-use map is created first, and then property owners apply for rezones that are consistent with the land-use map. He noted that none of the three alternatives used zoning designations that are currently part of the code. He said he has been confused about the process that is being used to push through the subarea plan.

Laethan Wene, Shoreline, said the City already has enough adult family homes in Shoreline, and they do not need more.

Scott Solberg, Shoreline, said he lives in the North City area of Shoreline and participated on the CAC. He said he is generally in favor of the proposed plan, which is the result of a lot of work by numerous dedicated citizens. He estimated that approximately 1,500 man hours were put into the process. He said he read both the CAC's report and the minority report. He suggested that as the Commissioners visit the neighborhood and compare the written report with the proposed zoning map, they will see why the CAC designated certain areas for higher density to entice and promote redevelopment of certain parts of the neighborhood. He expressed his belief that, for the most part, the subarea is an excellent bedroom and residential community. It is predominantly single-family residences, and the majority of the CAC did not believe the proposed plan would impact this situation. He recognized that some members of the CAC disagreed, but the minority report did not offer options for addressing their concerns. He implored the Commission to consider the amount of time and effort the CAC members put into their report.

Patty Hale, Shoreline, said she lives in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. While she was not on the CAC, she did attend several of their meetings. She thanked all of those involved and said it was evident that they were passionate and were concerned about how their end product would impact the overall quality of life for this segment of Shoreline. She emphasized that the subarea is one of the prime areas of affordable housing, and will probably be one of the first to recover as the recession lifts. As people transition through the neighborhoods, each new generation makes changes and improvements. The homes have provided a diverse community for people to live in. She observed that the plan recommends placing the majority of the density mandated by the State Growth Management Act into one subarea that includes what the State is considering for Fircrest, yet Fircrest is not even addressed in the plan. She suggested the Commission keep the Fircrest property in mind and not be overly generous in how they might zone or perceive the density for the overall neighborhood.

John Davis, Lynnwood, said he owns two R-12 properties in Briarcrest, and he submitted a written comment, as well. He spoke in general defense of the CAC's work. Because of his vested interest in Briarcrest, specifically, he attended nearly half of their meetings. He found the process to be a true democracy in action, even though it seemed to move at a snail's pace at times. He encouraged the Commission to give the multiple concerns quick, lucid and serious consideration and come to a decision as soon as possible. The process has already been long. The CAC worked hard and there was passion on both sides of the issues. Even though he might be classified in the pro-density increase camp, he would categorize himself as more moderate than high-density. A lot of reasonable thought must be put into the process of how to best set the standards for the future of the community. He thanked the CAC for working over a long period of time to accomplish their task. He said he hopes the process can come to a quick conclusion because the time frame has already exceeded his resource of funds.

Final Questions by the Commission

Commissioner Kaje recalled that earlier in the meeting staff indicated there would still be an opportunity for the public to comment on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination. He asked that staff clarify when the various public comment periods would begin and end. Mr. Cohn answered that tonight's meeting was noticed as the appropriate time for the public to provide comment regarding the subarea plan. The SEPA threshold determination was released last week, and the two-week comment period would continue through February 11th. Staff's thought was that the public comment portion of the public hearing would be closed at the end of this meeting. Any additional written comments related to the SEPA Determination would be forwarded to the Commission members prior to their continued deliberation of the matter on March 4th. At the continued meeting, staff would respond to the Commission's questions but the public would not be offered an additional opportunity to provide oral testimony.

Commissioner Kaje asked staff to explain the SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS). Mr. Cohn answered that the SEPA requires the proponent to compare the proposed change to what is currently allowed. The staff's analysis compared the impacts of the proposal based on what is currently allowed. They believe that the impacts have all been identified on a non-project basis, and none are substantial. However, additional analysis would be conducted when specific projects are proposed. At this time, staff believes there is no need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Staff seriously reviews each of the public comments and makes a decision whether to maintain the DNS or change the declaration.

Commissioner Kaje asked if the zoning recommendation was included as part of the staff's DNS or if it included only the subarea plan policy language and proposed land use map. He observed that zoning decisions should not be part of the current action. Mr. Cohn said the DNS was based on the current Comprehensive Plan, which has mixed-use on the southeast corner that allows some very significant density increases. Compared to the proposed plan, even under the most likely scenario, they did not anticipate any probable change. He summarized they did not look at zoning per se, but they did look at the likely potential development as a whole under the proposed plan versus the existing plan.

Chair Wagner said her understanding is the current proposal is a Comprehensive Plan change. The zoning map was a product of the CAC and included as part of the report, but it is not the subject of the public hearing. Mr. Cohn explained that the Commission is being asked to make two recommendations: one related to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map amendment and another related to the implementation strategies for zoning. The Commission could choose not to make a recommendation on the implementation strategies, but the CAC felt very strongly that an implementation strategy would be helpful. It was noted that the current Comprehensive Plan does not provide direction for implementation.

Commissioner Broili said his understanding is that the zoning map is a suggestion of a direction the Commission may want to take as a strategy based on the proposed subarea Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Mr. Cohn said that the near-term strategy is related to zoning and can be done in a relatively short time frame. Another piece would be more general questions about changing regulations for

accessory dwelling units, etc., which would come later. The Commission must make a recommendation as to whether the proposed implementation strategy is appropriate or not, and the City Council would make the final decision. Commissioner Broili asked if it would be appropriate, at that time, to discuss the concept of form-based zoning. Mr. Cohn agreed the Commission could recommend this approach, but it would take some time to develop implementing code language. The implementation strategy could be divided into phases: the immediate implementation would involve legislative zoning and could happen in the near term and the next phase would involve follow-up actions, including form-based code, accessory dwelling units, etc.

Commissioner Pyle clarified that the current hearing is to discuss the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan, which is a variation of a Comprehensive Plan amendment. The zoning map that was an attached to the Staff Report was merely provided for reference purposes and could be pursued later through a legislative rezone process. The subject of the hearing was noticed as a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Cohn agreed. However, he clarified that the CAC attached a recommendation for zoning to their report. A separate hearing would be conducted at a later date for the Commission to consider the zoning proposal.

Mr. Tovar clarified that the CAC was charged with presenting a proposal for a Comprehensive Plan amendment, and that is what they provided in their report. However, the CAC also felt strongly that they needed to present some zoning concepts to illustrate what the implications of the policy recommendations might be. He emphasized that this is not a hearing on a legislative rezone. The Commission's responsibility is to forward a recommendation to the City Council on the Comprehensive Plan amendment. He suggested the Commission could recommend the City Council adopt the Comprehensive Plan amendment but that it not take affect until the City has adopted a legislative rezone and/or other appropriate zoning tools to implement the plan. This would result in the planning document taking effect at the same time as the implementing zoning. Otherwise, the Comprehensive Plan would be inconsistent with the zoning because there would be no corresponding zoning in place for parts of the subarea.

Commissioner Pyle summarized that one option is for the Commission to recommend the City Council evaluate or consider putting in place an action to pursue a legislative rezone that is the minimum necessary to bring the properties that are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan change into consistency. Only modest changes would be made, and the economy and market over time would allow for additional quasi-judicial rezones on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Tovar agreed that is one approach the Commission could take. Another option would be to approve a legislative rezone to make the zoning completely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

In response to Commissioner Broili's earlier question, Mr. Tovar explained that a form-based code would place less emphasis on density use, etc. and more emphasis on building envelope, dimensions, etc. He cautioned that staff is not advocating a form-based code approach at this point. However, it is an option that is being considered for the Town Center Subarea Plan. He suggested the Commission discuss the issue with the City Council at their joint meeting in April. Commissioner Broili observed that a number of the public comments spoke about aesthetics, transitions, etc. and a form-based code is one option for addressing these types of concerns.

Commissioner Behrens observed that while the zoning map makes reference to three different types of Mixed-Use (MU) Zones in the southeast corner of the subarea, the zones are not defined in the proposed subarea plan. Ms. Redinger referred to Page 39 of Exhibit 2 (CAC Report), which describes the various mixed-use zones. She explained that MU3 is the mixed-use zone that was adopted by the City Council and includes a full spectrum of incentives. It starts with a base height and allows a greater height with community amenities such as affordability components, open space, green building, etc. MU2 was created by the CAC but also followed previous Commission discussions. This zone would be capped at 48 dwelling units per acre but still encourage a mixture of uses in the same building or area. MU1 was another proposal by the CAC, which would cap residential density at 12 dwelling units per acre. She noted that the desk packet also includes information from the City's Economic Development Director regarding the economic development ramifications associated with the MU1 zone.

Commissioner Behrens suggested a chart be included in the proposed subarea plan to clearly identify the elements of the three different zones. Mr. Cohn agreed that if the Planning Commission decides to recommend approval of the three MU zones, a chart could be prepared by staff. However, there would be no need to go into this level of detail in the subarea plan if the Commission decides they do not want to talk about zoning as part of the subarea plan process. Chair Wagner clarified that MU language is related to the zoning map and should not be addressed as part of the subarea plan. She suggested the Commission should answer the question of whether or not they want to recommend the City Council consider the concept of three MU zones, but that would be as far as they would go with zoning issues. If the City Council agrees, staff would prepare appropriate draft zoning language for the Commission's consideration at a future time.

Commissioner Behrens said it is important to keep in mind that CAC created a vision for how they see the neighborhood, which identifies different types of mixed-use densities. He agreed that the zoning map would be the appropriate place to put specific titles on the three zones, but he would like the concepts to be included into the subarea plan, as well. Ms. Redinger explained that the CAC did not get to the level of detail of creating the type of use chart that is typical for zoning categories. Their discussion was more conceptual in nature. The only specifics generated by the CAC were related to height and density caps. Pursuing the various levels of MU zoning would be accomplished through follow up Development Code amendments.

Commissioner Kaje explained that as the Commission works through the process, they must follow a specific sequence process for implementation. He said he places great value in the fact that the CAC did recommend their ideas for what zoning might look like. He said he walked through each of the streets in the subarea to get a better idea of what is happening in the neighborhoods. He expressed his belief that the zoning map is a very important reflection of the community's vision. However, the Commission may decide that it is not appropriate to address the zoning issue as part of this first step in the process.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that one MU Zone is already part of the Development Code. Mr. Cohn agreed that there is currently one MU Zone in the Development Code at this time. While the Commission discussed the option of creating a second MU Zone, they chose not to go that route. Commissioner Pyle clarified that under the proposed Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, the mixed-

use land use designation has an option to include MU as one of the potential zoning categories that could be put in place under that land use designation. Mr. Cohn pointed out that the policies in the proposed subarea plan make it clear that there should be more than one MU zone.

Commissioner Pyle noted that the only new land use designation that is not already in the Comprehensive Plan is "Park Expansion." He questioned if it would be more appropriate to ask the Parks Board to amend the Parks and Recreation Plan. Mr. Cohn said the issue could also be handled through policy language. Mr. Tovar explained that it is appropriate to talk about potential and preferred uses in the Comprehensive Plan if they want to make a recommendation to the City Council that the property be considered a priority for future park expansion. He suggested it would serve well to make this statement in the narrative of the plan, but designating the property with a specific symbol may not be necessary and may be misleading. The property is not a park at this time. It is platted and zoned and could be used as a single-family development. However, if the City Council decides they would like to acquire the property for public purposes at some point in the future, it would make sense that the Comprehensive Plan provides some policy rationale.

Mr. Cohn clarified that the mixed-use designation in the proposed subarea plan is not really the same designation as the mixed-use designation in the current Comprehensive Plan. There is no expectation that the new mixed-use designation would include the lower-density residential categories. It is very much a mixed-use category that allows a variety of commercial and multi-family types of uses. It may take some tweaking to provide further clarification before the document is forwarded to the City Council.

Commissioner Kuboi asked if the Commission would still be able to ask questions of staff if the public hearing is closed. Mr. Cohn explained that the Commission could keep the public hearing open for deliberation, which would allow the Commission to continue to ask questions of staff. Staff would prefer that the questions are forwarded via Plancom so that all Commissioners would know the types of questions that are being asked. The week before the Commission's continued deliberation, staff would pull all the questions together and develop written responses for inclusion in their next packet. The public would have access to the questions that have been asked, as well as staff's responses.

Chair Wagner referred to Recommendation H9, which suggest that language be added to the Development Code to restrict development of "megahouses." While the CAC's report provides a bit more description regarding their intent, she requested staff provide more background regarding their discussion. Ms. Redinger said the language came from the Housing Strategy, which was adopted by the City Council. She recalled that during the public meetings conducted by the Housing Strategy CAC, citizens provided pictures from the Southeast Neighborhoods to show the impact of having very small houses next to large apartment buildings or megahouses. The Housing Strategy CAC concluded that there are other local governments working on code language and potential solutions for the problem, and they deferred the issue to give other municipalities time to test their code language to see if it has the desired affects. The Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan CAC agreed that this was a concern worth noting. Without delving into specific Development Code language, they directed staff to look at potential policies.

Chair Wagner referred to Recommendation H11, which would remove obstacles to adult family homes in residential zoning districts. She recalled that this issue was raised at an earlier Commission meeting, and she asked staff to provide more background. Ms. Redinger said this recommendation came from a gentleman who owns property in the subarea area who was hoping for an upzone. He said that someone had approached him with a particular project that would involve disabled adults in wheelchairs. As per the new low-impact development requirements, he would be unable to make the project work with the footprint necessary to accommodate the accessibility requirements and one-story living because of impervious surface caps. She reminded the Commission that, in general, the trend is to go a little higher and have more ground space for stormwater. However, the CAC suggested that perhaps there should be some flexibility, particularly in the hardscape coverage, for projects with specific considerations, such as ADA requirements.

Chair Wagner referred to Recommendation T6, which talks about implementing improvements along 15th Avenue Northeast to revitalize business, increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and usability, and add vehicle capacity where necessary. She observed that the public typically expresses concern that they would like to reduce traffic. Ms. Redinger said the CAC discussed different treatments for improving vehicular capacity, specifically diagonal parking, etc. She said whatever happens on 15th Avenue Northeast will depend on what takes place at Fircrest. She commented that the CAC did spend a fair amount of time discussing Fircrest, and the State's Project Manager for the Fircrest Master Plan spent an entire meeting talking about what was proposed under the Master Plan. However, this plan has been placed on hold by the State so it was difficult for the CAC to analyze impacts associated with how the area would be developed. She agreed that, in general, the trend is to reduce and calm traffic, but the CAC also discussed other techniques in case there was a need for more capacity.

Commissioner Kaje asked the chair of the CAC to share the vision the CAC would like the City to pursue for the section of property in the very far southeast corner of the subarea that borders Lake City Way. He noted that the opportunities would be very different if the properties were treated as a comprehensive type of development opportunity versus parcel by parcel. Mr. Peach said the CAC talked extensively about this corner of the subarea. They recognized that the property was landlocked because there was no access from the west side going east. At this time, the properties are accessed via a road through the church property. The CAC discussed the option of shifting properties on the back side of 30th Avenue Northeast to create access to the properties properties. Another option would be to purchase property from the church or cemetery to make an access road. However, the CAC did not really come up with a solution to the problem. The City's options are further limited because Northeast 145th Street is controlled by three jurisdictions. Ms. Redinger said the CAC asked the traffic engineers about the possibility of opening up more east/west access, and they indicated they did not want to encourage cut-through traffic. It was noted that, based on previous citizen input and traffic studies, various measures were taken previously to discourage cut-through traffic. They felt that a plaza or courtyard with businesses on the outside and parking on the interior would be more aesthetically pleasing, and they suggested the businesses should front the neighborhood to encourage the types of businesses the neighbors would use. Mr. Peach added that there was also some discussion about inverting the four quadrants located west of the business area to create a type of cottage housing community, but this concept did not make it into the CAC's report.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that the CAC members walked the southeast corner of the subarea extensively. There is currently a lot of vacant space because of the remnant parking lots. There was a lot of discussion about developing a larger block of this property. He observed that the issue is discussed in some of the proposed policies, but it is difficult to consider the appropriate approach when there are so many different ownership interests.

Commissioner Kaje requested staff invite the City's stormwater engineer to describe the current status of the area. He said it appears the area is currently under stress, and he questioned what capital projects the City has planned for the area, particularly the southeast corner. He noted that any new development would be required to meet the new stormwater standards, so very positive things could happen. Ms. Redinger said stormwater was discussed often by the CAC and is a very important topic. She noted that staff has maps to pinpoint known problem areas, and they have talked with their environmental services team and water quality specialist. They are hoping that some of the students from the University of Washington Graduate Studio will take on the hydrologic aspects of the subarea plan. Up to this time, the City has not had a lot of staff resources to devote to this issue. She agreed to come back with additional information as requested by Commissioner Kaje. Commissioner Pyle said there was a lot of conversation about stormwater during some of the quasi-judicial rezones that occurred in the past in the subarea, and there is extensive information in the record regarding the current conditions.

Vice Chair Perkowski referred to Recommendations PR3 and PR4 and asked if any specific areas were pointed out for where more open green space was desired. He also asked if the "park space per capita" information was developed for just this area. Ms. Redinger answered that "park space per capita" is something the City has discussed as a potential metric for concurrency. The neighborhood is extremely fortunate to have Paramount Park, Paramount Open Space, Southwood Park and Hamlin Park in the immediate vicinity. The CAC discussed that if they were to craft a standard and identify a ratio to compare with other jurisdictions, this particular area could probably take a lot more development before park resources become stressed. The intent was to set a baseline, identify the current status, and keep the ratio skewed to plenty of outdoor amenities and open space for everyone. However, the CAC did not discuss potential standards.

Vice Chair Perkowski asked if there were any specific suggestions for more park and open space beyond the area identified as potential park expansion. Ms. Redinger said there was a lot of discussion about green corridors and making sure there is contiguous natural habitat and preservation of open space. It was noted that when planning for multi-family units, it is very important to include a requirement of open space for play areas, green space, etc. The concern was that there still be plenty of recreational opportunities as the area redevelops. Vice Chair Perkowski referred to Recommendation NE6 and asked if there is a map to identify potential daylighting opportunities. Ms. Redinger answered no.

Commissioner Behrens recalled that the City's new MUZ requires additional open space, depending on the density of the development. He strongly suggested that at some point the City must identify the amount of open space that would be required in each of the proposed new MU zones. He summarized that the members of the CAC have spent a lot of time trying to figure out exactly what the different types of MUZ might require in their neighborhoods.

Commissioner Kuboi said it appears that a number of the Community Design Recommendations incorporate a lot of subjectivity as to what is good and/or preferred design. He specifically referred to Recommendation CD8, which recommends density and zoning regulations and design review process that are flexible enough to allow for creativity in design, but restrictive enough to ensure the protection of the community. He asked if this recommendation is reflective of the importance of design review in implementing the regulations. Ms. Redinger said the CAC talked more about design standards than design review. She reminded the Commission that design review and design standards are currently a city-wide process, and the Commission could choose to recommend the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea as a pilot project. Another option would to include the subarea as part of the larger process the City is currently doing with Makers Consulting to establish a more broad-based design review process. Mr. Cohn emphasized that good design is important to the neighborhood. Commissioner Kuboi agreed but pointed out that this particular tool is only referenced in the Community Design Section and is not mentioned in the Land Use or Housing Sections where a design review process might become helpful. Mr. Cohn said that if the Commission agrees, it would be appropriate to reference the concept in other sections as appropriate. Ms. Redinger pointed out that this tool is typically referenced in the document by the term "transitional elements." Commissioner Broili said he would be more comfortable using the term "design standards."

Commissioner Kaje said that while the subarea has access to a few good parks, it is important to keep in mind that the City, as a whole, is bereft in park space per capita when compared with other jurisdictions in Puget Sound. Studies have shown that Shoreline and Lake Forest Park have the least park space per capita, and some cities have four times the amount of parks. He noted that, particularly in the southeast corner of the subarea, there is no easy pedestrian access to the existing parks, and there are no neighborhood scale parks in the area, either.

Commissioner Kaje referred to a letter from Mr. Mann which states that the CAC came to realize that amenities such as sidewalks, trails, lighting, etc. need funds from development because, according to staff, the general fund is not for those purposes. He explained that if the City wants to move forward with subarea planning and visions for various areas of the City, they need to get beyond the idea that they only improve things incrementally when development occurs. He encouraged the City to look more proactively at ways to fund the types of things that make the whole community richer, and not just the area in front of a particular development. Ms. Redinger said many people commented at the open houses about the need for more sidewalks, and staff talked about how sidewalks get built. They explained that the City first developed as a suburban area of King County, and approximately 400 miles of roads were built without sidewalks. The City coffers cannot support putting in sidewalks everywhere neighborhoods would like them. They also talked about fee-in-lieu-of programs, sidewalks to nowhere, etc. They did not indicate that the only way to get sidewalks was through redevelopment, but that is one of the tools that redevelopment can provide funding for. She suggested that the intent of Mr. Mann's statement was to point out that redevelopment does have benefits such as frontage improvements. Mr. Cohn added that one of the outcomes of the subarea plan could be identifying where the sidewalks and trails should be.

Mr. Tovar suggested the Commission have a discussion about how infrastructure such as sidewalks and streets are funded. He explained that development applications are required to make frontage

improvements, but the primary method of accomplishing larger improvements is via capital improvement. At this time, the City's Capital Improvement Fund is on the decline for a variety of reasons. However, the Federal Government has announced a new commitment to grants for sustainability. There are other funding sources, and the City should talk about the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan as a major focus for the Capital Facilities Element update of the Comprehensive Plan. This would be a good topic of discussion at their joint meeting with the City Council, as well.

Deliberations

Commissioner Behrens asked how the Commission would go about amending the proposed subarea plan document prior to forwarding it to the City Council. Mr. Cohn clarified that the document could be changed as appropriate to represent the Commission's recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Redinger clarified that the Subarea Plan Report was created by the CAC and cannot be amended. The report will be archived for community reference. It will also be provided to the City Council and on the City's website. The Commission should consider the staff's condensed version of the report as their working document. They should make appropriate changes before forwarding it to the City Council.

The Commission agreed to submit their comments and suggestions to staff via Plancom by February 22nd. Staff would collect the comments and prepare a written response for the Commission's information at least a week before their continued deliberations. It was noted that the submitted comments would be made available to the public upon request. Mr. Cohn cautioned the Commissioners against discussing or providing feedback related to the comments outside of the continued hearing. Chair Wagner requested a word document copy of the proposed subarea plan (Exhibit 1). The Commissioners could edit the document and forward their recommended changes back to staff. It was recommended the Commissioners utilize a format that tracks the changes so they are easily identifiable. Mr. Tovar said the Commission could also insert questions and requests for additional information.

Commissioner Kuboi asked staff to provide some interim feedback on the stormwater situation so they are prepared to discuss the issue further at their continued deliberation. Ms. Redinger agreed to contact the City's Surface Water Manager with a request that he prepare a memorandum to the Commission as soon as possible to clarify issues related to stormwater. However, some items, such as maps of the water tables will not likely be available.

Mr. Cohn suggested that the additional public comment be limited to written comments related to the SEPA determination, unless something new is added to the record. Mr. Tovar suggested that once the Commission has created a draft for recommendation to the City Council, they could hold an additional public hearing and invite the public to comment on any changes made since the original hearing. The Commission spent some time discussing the best process for continuing the hearing and perhaps holding an additional public hearing once a final draft has been prepared by the Commission.

Commissioner Behrens summarized that whatever recommendation the Commission comes up with, it is important to make sure it captures the CAC's intent. The best way to do that is to invite them to testify once again prior to making a formal recommendation to the City Council. The remainder of the

Commission concurred that an additional public hearing would be in order once the Commission has completed their review and made their proposed changes.

COMMISSIONER PYLE MOVED THE COMMISSION CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED SOUTHEAST NEIGHBOHROODS SUBAREA PLAN TO THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 2010. COMMISSIONER KAJE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Tovar reported on his attendance at the Smart Growth Conference in Seattle, which continues through Saturday. He said some very interesting materials have been presented on issues such as form-based codes, building a town center with a state highway running through it, etc. Councilmembers Eggen and Hall attended the conference, as well.

Mr. Tovar announced that he sent the Commissioners links to two articles: one from the MRSC website and the other from Crosscut. These links are relevant and will help the Commission think about how to deal with public input. He reminded the Commission that their duty is to consider all the public comments and the staff report to come up with what they think make sense for the community and make a recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Tovar announced that the application period for Planning Commission positions closed last week, and the City received 19 applications. On February 8th the City Council will discuss their process for screening the applicants and conducting the interviews. He alerted the City Councilmembers to the advice provided earlier by the Commission about the need for a balanced diversity, gender, geography, background, ethnicity, etc. and being able to work in a group. The interview questions have been updated to respond to the Commission's suggestions. Appointments should be made by the end of March.

Commissioner Broili asked if the suggestion for Commissioner Piro to sit in on the process was accepted or rejected. Mr. Tovar said the suggestion is being processed, but no decision has been made.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

No unfinished business was scheduled on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Cohn announced that the Planning Commission would continue their deliberations on the CRISTA Master Development Plan on February 18th. In addition, they would discuss design review and the visual preference survey prior to the charrette that is scheduled. They could also briefly discuss the agenda for the joint meeting with the City Council.

Chair Wagner encouraged all Commissioners who are able to participate in the continued deliberations related to the CRISTA Master Development Plan on February 18th to listen to the recording of the public hearing if they were not in attendance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 P.M.

_____	_____
Michelle Linders Wagner	Jessica Simulcik Smith
Chair, Planning Commission	Clerk, Planning Commission