

AGENDA PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING



Thursday, May 20, 2010
7:00 p.m.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber
17500 Midvale Ave N.

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL	7:01 p.m.
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02 p.m.
4. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS	7:03 p.m.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	7:08 p.m.
a. April 22, 2010 Dinner Meeting	
b. April 22, 2010 Joint Meeting	
6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	7:10 p.m.
<i>During the General Public Comment period, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not of a quasi-judicial nature or specifically scheduled later on the agenda. Each member of the public may comment for up to two minutes. However, the General Public Comment period will generally be limited to twenty minutes. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded and must clearly state their first and last name, and city of residence.</i>	
7. STAFF REPORTS	7:15 p.m.
a. Review of Design Review Charrette and Preliminary Concepts for Town Center	
8. PUBLIC COMMENT	8:45 p.m.
9. DIRECTOR'S REPORT	8:50 p.m.
10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	8:55 p.m.
a. Town Center Vision Statement by Planning Commission Subcommittee	
11. NEW BUSINESS	9:15 p.m.
12. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS	9:20 p.m.
13. AGENDA FOR June 3	9:25 p.m.
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 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas call 801-2236.

This page intentionally blank

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES OF SPECIAL DINNER MEETING**

April 22, 2010
6:00 – 7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Conference Room

Commissioners Present

Chair Wagner
Vice Chair Perkowski arrive at 6:14 p.m.
Commissioner Behrens
Commissioner Broili
Commissioner Esselman
Commissioner Moss

Staff Present

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Kaje

Chair Wagner called the special dinner meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Wagner, and Commissioners Behrens, Broili, Esselman, and Moss. Vice Chair Perkowski arrived at 6:14 p.m. Commissioner Kaje was absent.

Director’s Report

Mr. Tovar announced the City Council has held two public hearings on Point Wells. The first public hearing was on the Subarea Plan and Pre-Annexation Zoning, and the second hearing was on the Subarea Plan only. Council adopted the Subarea Plan at the April 19 hearing. The zoning is not moving forward at this time. He reminded the Commission that Snohomish County is working on their own process, having already adopted a comprehensive plan amendment designating the property as urban center and working on zoning to implement that. Mr. Tovar explained the City is closely tracking the Snohomish County discussions on zoning and has submitted several comment letters recommending Snohomish County require the developer to enter into development agreements with Shoreline and Woodway as a condition of development permit. Meanwhile the Shoreline City Council has adopted language encouraging interjurisdictional coordination between Snohomish County and Shoreline. He said staff would provide the Commission a copy of Subarea Plan because it is now part of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan.

Results of April 1, 2010 Design Charrette/Workshop

Mr. Cohen announced the results of the Visual Preference Survey were inserted into the meeting packet. He then passed around a summary he created, where the results were further summarized to help the

Commission's understanding of the result. He said this was his first cut and there is time to further analyze the responses.

Mr. Cohen then noted the amenities, design, and features for the different areas of Town Center that scored high or low enough to be grouped into the categories of "*high priority to desirable*", "*desirable to neutral*", or "*neutral to no way*".

High Priority to Desirable:

- Pedestrian-friendly streets with on-street parking and storefronts (Areas B and C)
- Full or half street closures to protect adjoining neighborhoods (Areas A and D)
- Pedestrian-oriented spaces (Areas Band C)
- Up to 2-story mixed uses in Area B
- Up to 4-Story mixed uses (perhaps up to 6 story) in Area C
- Living buildings

Desirable to Neutral:

- Most streetscapes / connections and amenities
- Step-back buildings with landscape screening in Area A
- Townhome development in Area A and D
- Up to 2-story mixed use buildings in Area D
- Up to 4-story mixed uses in Area B
- Retail/Commercial in Area C

Neutral to No Way:

- Pea-patches
- Drive -Thru Uses
- Curb-less streets with bollards
- Other than townhomes, no other land uses or building types selected for Area A
- Exclusively commercial buildings in Area B
- Skinny tower buildings

Commissioner Broili noted that the choice of what image is provided makes a big difference in the positive or negative response. If the image is a bad choice, people's voting will reflect the specific example and not the concept.

Mr. Cohen then passed around voting results for public amenities priorities for Town Center. He noted that "pedestrian-oriented spaces" was the number one choice by far and "central green" and "covered open space" were the number two and number three choices. "Public art" trailed closely as number four.

Summary of upcoming May 20th Planning Commission Meeting on Design Review and Standards alternatives and concepts

Mr. Cohen announced the consultant, Makers, is coming to the Commission's May 20th meeting to present an outline of what design standards could look like. They have a good deal of experience having worked with other jurisdictions on design standards that deal with everything from store frontage to streets.

Chair Wagner asked that the consultant provide a virtual walkthrough of a completed downtown. She said she struggles with figuring out how to encourage desirable design without having to mandate it.

Commissioner Broili recalled past exercises where several images were flashed up on a screen and a person is asked to record the images they liked and the ones they didn't. This way a pattern is developed and you get a better feel for what resonates with people and what doesn't. Mr. Cohen suggested Makers could present several aspects for town center and then do a tour of a specific town center that incorporates those features. Commissioner Broili said he thought it was a good idea because it would help people vote on the concept, instead of a particular image/example.

Mr. Tovar said there are a number of different ways to get to a particular goal. He suggested code language state the principle we're after, then lay out the options on how to get there. This approach offers developers predictability in the process and allows for some flexibility.

Chair Wagner shared that during a recent trip to Copenhagen, Denmark, she noticed that all streets had bike lanes. She pointed out none of the images in the Visual Preference Survey showed streets that accommodated multiple modes of transportation. She expressed her desire to make this a priority and begin to build it into the regulations. Mr. Cohen said one of the things staff has been talking about is complete streets which include different modes of travel and activities and uses on the sidewalk areas.

Mr. Cohen suggested that design standards focus on four areas: streets, public/private spaces (surrounding development), neighborhood protection (transition areas), and building design. He noted that areas can overlap with each other.

Vice Chair Perkowski said he agreed with comments on the choice of visual images. However, he noted that his table talked more about concept than the image. He cautioned that images will only take us so far, and even if someone really liked a particular image, he questioned what we would do with that.

Commissioner Behrens reiterated Aurora is an auto-oriented strip. He said the City has an opportunity here to redesign the type of transportation that goes through this area. There is the Interurban trail and potentially a bike lane. He said he would like to identify the types of transit going through different areas of town center and then figure out how buildings and spaces will relate to the different types of transit. For example a biking or walking trail should be located near pedestrian areas where people gather or sit. Buildings need to be designed around how people move around them.

Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the design for Aurora has already been decided on, but other streets, like 175th and 185th, Linden, Stone, Fremont, and Midvale, and other smaller streets might benefit from additional street design. He said it would be helpful to figure out what the purpose and life of each street should be, including speeds, parking, biking, etc. and articulate that in the subarea plan. Staff could develop suggestions for each street.

Commissioner Broili cautioned that design needs to be done in an integrated fashion. Streets, buildings and uses need to be looked at together to assure they mesh and complement each other. He noted that typically a building is built and then landscaping occurs as an afterthought. A better approach is to bring everybody to the table during the designing process. He would like to see this happen in the town center subarea planning effort.

Mr. Cohen informed the Commission that on May 20th they will also discuss the design review process. At this point staff is recommending an administrative design review (ADR) process. He said staff is leaning towards ADR instead of a Design Review Board because at this time the City does not have the resources or budget to staff an additional board nor would the likely number of projects coming through the door subsidize it. Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that they discussed this with the City Council at their recent joint meeting. He noted that with an ADR process, standards should be adopted legislatively that articulate a clear direction and illustrate exactly what we want to have happen.

Chair Wagner recalled the Commission's work on the recent Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) and the missed opportunity to connect businesses to the Interurban Trail. She asked the Commission to think about whether or not this is desirable and if so, how it could be achieved in town center. She asked if staff could identify incentives to encourage pathways and plazas. Mr. Tovar answered that offering incentives are a great idea to get to a desired outcome but sometimes you may decide that it is so important that the City should require it.

Chair Wagner shared her concern about people's preferences for shorter building height (2-story) in the town center when the current zoning allows for 6-story buildings right now. She cautioned that staff and the Commission be transparent with what can be built with today's regulations. Mr. Tovar said another way to get people to understand the building height differences and record their reaction is through the Environmental Impact Statement's (EIS) chapter on esthetic impacts. He said that an EIS could compare side-to-side a Sketch-up model of the whole study area as it is currently built out, a model with 2-story, 4-story, and 6-story buildings, and a model with the build-out under the current zonings capacity.

Commissioner Esselman shared that she believed people couldn't accurately visualize what a 4 or 5-story building would look like in the context of Aurora, therefore may have reacted more negatively than if they viewed a Sketch-Up model which shows the context.

Commissioner Behrens asked if property within the town center could be rezoned to a less intense use from what it is currently zoned. Mr. Tovar responded that a subarea plan can say whatever a community wants it to say. It is his understanding that, from a developer's perspective, the most important parts are parking requirements and the predictability of the permitting process. From that information a developer can learn whether or not they'll get the building height they need. A subarea plan makes the process more timely and predictable and those factors are the ones that will attract developers.

The special meeting was adjourned at 6:57 P.M.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT

These Minutes Subject to
May 20th Approval

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION AND PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES BOARD MINUTES OF JOINT MEETING

April 22, 2010
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Planning Commissioners Present

Michelle Wagner, Chair
Ben Perkowski, Vice Chair
John Behrens
Michael Broili
Cynthia Esselman
Donna Moss

Commissioners Absent

Janne Kaje

Parks board Members Present

Bill Clements, Chair
Patty Hale, Vice Chair
Carolyn Ballo
Boni Beiry
Londa Jacques
Kevin McAuliffe
Joe Nieford

Parks board Members Absent

Jesse Sycuro
Ian Fike
Andrew Delgado

Staff Present

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk
Robert Olander, City Manager
Debbie Tarry, Finance Director
Dick Deal, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Robin Lesh, Parks board Clerk
Maureen Colaizzi, Park Project Coordinator
Kirk Peterson, Park Maintenance Superintendent

Consultants Present

Ella Elman, Ecologist, EarthCorps
Bill Brosseau, Field Operations Director, EarthCorps

WELCOME

Chair Clements called the joint meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BEIRY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MEETING AGENDA AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER HALE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

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

LEVY LID LIFT PRESENTATION

Mr. Olander recalled that Shoreline was incorporated nearly 15 years ago, and is now one of the top communities in the Puget Sound Region. He noted that 93% of the respondents to the last Citizen Satisfaction Survey indicated they think Shoreline is a great or excellent place to live. He reviewed a number of improvements that have been made within the City using taxpayer investments. He provided before and after pictures and reviewed each of the following projects: Aurora Avenue North, Bruggers Bog Park, Interurban Trail, Salt Water Park, North City, Boeing Creek Park, Twin Ponds Playfields, Westminster Triangle Garage, Neighborhood Mini Grant Project, Richmond Highlands Park, and the Dayton Avenue Retaining Wall. In addition to the physical improvements, the City has also provided numerous services including the pool, maintenance of curbs and gutters, a new traffic unit, and a program to pay for street lighting from the general fund. In addition, he advised that the City has created a new Community Services Division that incorporates Emergency Planning, Human Services, Customer Response Team, and Planning and Development Services. He also pointed out that the City's criminal justice program takes up about 1/3 of the City's budget, which is typical.

Mr. Olander said that as part of the City's communication outreach program, a number of short service videos were produced. The first video was related to parks and can be viewed on the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services' (PRCS) webpage. The Commission viewed a new service video that was recently completed featuring the King County Sheriff's Office and the Shoreline Police Department.

Mr. Olander advised that the City is facing some serious financial challenges as they move towards the future. He reminded the group that in 2001, the voters approved Initiative 747, which imposed a 1% cap on property tax rate growth in the State of Washington, unless a greater increase is approved by the voters. Typically, the fire district, the library, and the school district have asked voters to approve increases above that 1%, but the City of Shoreline has never done so. He emphasized that property taxes are still the largest revenue source for the City. When the increase is limited to 1%, at some point the City will reach a point of diminishing returns and long-term structural issues will arise. While the recession has made the situation a little worse, the City Council and City administration has been very proactive to place the reserves into a special account in the case of a recession. As a result, the City has actually weathered the recession reasonably well compared to other jurisdictions in the area. However, they have been required to make a number of cutbacks as a result of lower revenues.

DRAFT

Mr. Olander summarized that the recession is not the long-term issue. Looking forward, the community will be faced with some very difficult financial choices: whether to decrease some of the services that have made them a great community or potentially ask the citizens to support an increase in revenues to maintain the quality of life and services they currently enjoy.

Debbie Tarry reviewed the anticipated budget gaps for the next six years, emphasizing that the costs to provide the current level of services are projected to be greater than the available revenue starting in 2011 when the projected budget gap will be nearly \$2 million, which includes repaying approximately \$1 million to the rainy day fund they anticipate using in 2010. If this payment were removed, the estimated budget gap for 2011 would be about \$1 million. Based on assumptions made from the financial projections, the gap would continue to grow in future years. By 2014, the gap would be about \$2.2 million and over \$4 million by 2016.

Ms. Tarry reported that the City is currently spending just \$452.00 per person in 2010 to provide services to the community compared to \$512.00 in 2000. This demonstrates that the City has been very efficient in finding ways to stay within the resources available. During that same time period, they have actually improved the services provided to the community. Examples include:

- The City modified how they provide health benefits to employees, which resulted in a savings of about \$1 million since 2003. The City recognized ahead of time that health costs would go up, and they made the appropriate adjustments.
- Rather than sending their prisoners to King County, which is an expensive option, the City has a contract with Yakima County to use their jails whenever possible. This saved the City about \$300,000 in 2008.
- The City reviewed whether it is better to provide certain services in house or through a contract, and appropriate adjustments were made.
- Since 2005 City departments have taken base budget reductions of about \$1 million, and the 2010 budget eliminated three positions, recognizing the additional financial stress created by the recession.

Ms. Tarry reported that the City is very cost effective in providing both park maintenance and police services to the community. Compared with other cities, the City's park maintenance costs per capita are low (\$24). The amount the City spends for police services is low, as well, at \$168 per person.

Ms. Tarry advised that property taxes provide the City's largest operating revenue source. Since 2001 and the passage of Initiative 747, the City has limited its tax increase to 1%. In 2010 there was no increase, recognizing the financial challenges that existed because of the recession. She provided a graph to illustrate the significant gap over the years between inflation and the 1% increase. She noted that a 1% increase in the property tax levy equals about \$70,000. She reminded the Commission that only about 10% of the property tax revenue collected comes to the City for general operations. The other 90% is used for important services such as the school district, King County, and the fire district. She also provided a graph to illustrate that while sales tax revenue has grown, it has not kept up with inflation, either. Inflation has gone up about 27% over the last 10 years, and sales tax collections have only gone up 22%. She emphasized that it is helpful to shop in Shoreline, and it does make a difference.

DRAFT

Ms. Tarry observed that over the last ten years, the City's costs have gone up. For example, even though they have changed how they provide health benefits to their employees, the cost has still increased about 47% per employee. The cost per therm of natural gas, which is used to heat the City facilities and the pool, has also increased about 49%. In addition, gasoline has increased dramatically over the past 10 years, as has the cost of the asphalt the City uses for the roads and trails. She summarized that while many costs have nearly doubled in the past ten years, the property tax levy has only increased about 10%.

Ms. Tarry recalled that several community meetings were held in 2005, and participants were asked to prioritize the services the City provides. The intent was to collect community input to help the City make choices in the services that are delivered. She referred to a table that was prepared to illustrate the results of the community meetings. The community indicated that the highest priority should be police service and street maintenance and operations. She noted that the services identified as the lowest priority are only a small part of the City's budget. The higher-priority services require a much larger portion of the budget. She summarized that unless something is done to correct the situation, the budget shortfall will really start to impact services that are important to the community. Mr. Olander added that the budget shortfall has some major implications for the quality of life and the services the City is able to provide.

Ms. Tarry advised that in February 2008, the City Council appointed 18 citizens to participate on a citizen-driven Financial Advisory Committee to look at the long-term financial challenges the City is facing. The committee reviewed the City budget and the citizen surveys and conducted three public meetings. In May of 2009 they forwarded a recommendation to the City Council that they maintain its commitment to efficiency, especially if they are going to ask the taxpayers for more. They also stressed the importance of continuing to provide the services that preserve the quality of life in Shoreline. They recommended two revenue strategies. The first was a \$20 vehicle license fee, in which the dollars could be dedicated for pavement management of the City roads. The City Council established a Transportation Benefit District and implemented this fee in July of 2009, and it became effective in February 2010. The committee also recommended the City Council consider a ballot issue in 2010 that would increase the property tax levy above 1%. The City Council is considering the recommendation, but they have not made a final decision. The Financial Advisory Committee recommended the City do a better job of communicating and providing outreach, and staff is in the process of providing information regarding the City's financial picture to a variety of community groups.

Mr. Olander summarized that the Financial Advisory Committee spent over 18 months reviewing each of the City's programs in detail, interviewing department directors, reviewing the budgets, etc. to identify areas of reduction and/or inefficiencies. They concluded that the City is quite efficient with tax dollars. However, they need to do a much better job of communicating this information to the community.

In addition to the recommendations of the Financial Advisory Committee, Mr. Olander said it is also important for the City to expand their economic development program. He recognized the City could

not “grow their way out” of the current economic situation by attracting new businesses in the next several years, but it is essential to consider opportunities for bringing new jobs and income into the City. Ms. Tarry estimates it would take a \$.20 to \$.30 increase in the current property tax rate to adequately address the City’s budget situation. They are currently at about \$1.12, and by state law, the City’s maximum rate can be \$1.60. Even with the increase, the City’s tax levy would still be significantly below that limit. She pointed out that a \$.25 increase for someone who owns a home valued at \$360,000 would result in an increase of about \$9 per month or \$110 per year. Mr. Olander pointed out that the property tax increase would be applied equally to businesses and residential property owners.

Ms. Tarry explained that staff is proposing a six-year levy for two reasons. She explained that it costs about \$100,000 to place a property tax measure on the ballot. In addition, knowing what the revenue stream will look like in the future will allow the City to better determine the services they can provide over a longer period of time. In addition, the community would be able to anticipate what the services will look like. She further explained that the levy proposal must be placed on either the primary election ballot in August or the general election ballot in November. Based on polling information the City recently received, it was recommended the City consider placing the item on the general election. That means the City Council would need to make a final decision by late July or early August. Once this decision is formally made, staff would continue to provide factual information, but a citizens’ campaign would be required to move the issue forward.

Mr. Olander reported that a reliable firm was hired to conduct a citizen survey to determine the community’s support for the proposal, and the results were very strong. Citizens feel the community is good, and they generally trust City government. They also believe the city is spending taxpayer money efficiently and wisely. About 50% of the respondents indicated they would be willing to support a tax increase of \$.30 cents to pay for the services, and the support improved dramatically when the tax increase was reduced to \$.25. He noted that a ballot issue would require the support of more than 50% of the citizens in order to pass. He summarized that the initial polling results indicate that a ballot issue would be supported by about 60% or more of their citizens. He emphasized the importance of getting the appropriate information out to the public if the City Council decides to move ahead with a ballot issue.

Ms. Tarry asked the Board and Commission Members to direct their questions to either her or Julie Underwood, Assistant City Manager. She asked them to also identify additional groups for them to speak with. She invited them to notify her if they are interested in participating on a citizen’s campaign in the future.

Mr. Olander said it is important to stress that the issue is more about the quality of life, which is what attracts and retains citizens and keeps the neighborhoods healthy and safe. He recognized this is a difficult choice for the community to make, but he felt a \$.25 increase would be a reasonable amount. He compared the community to a piece of fabric. If they start pulling on the smallest threads (low-priority programs such as art, trails, neighborhood mini grants), the fabric will start to come undone. The smaller programs help form the fabric of what makes a good community. He expressed his belief that they have a very strong community. While the Initiative 747 was approved statewide, it was voted down by the citizens of Shoreline. They have seen recent community support of the school district’s

DRAFT

bond, and the community offered strong support for the recent library, emergency medical services, and fire district bonds.

Chair Clement said he was a member of the Financial Advisory Committee. In their meetings, they found that many people did not clearly understand that only about 10% of the property tax revenue goes to the City. When this and the potential impact of a levy were explained to the citizens, they appeared to be fairly supportive. The groups that attended the public meetings were among the more engaged citizens, but in order to pass the levy, they must reach the average voters, as well. He recalled that when the parks bond was placed on the ballot, groups readily stepped forward to provide funding for the campaign. He recognized it would be more difficult to find funding from the community to run a campaign to raise taxes, but the effort must be organized quickly. He encouraged Board Members and Commissioners to participate in the campaign process.

Commissioner Broili asked if the additional tax revenue would come entirely to the City of Shoreline, or would they only get 10% of the additional revenue. Mr. Olander answered that the City would receive 100% of the additional tax revenue generated by the increase.

Board Member Jacques said it will be important for the City to provide information about the maximum impact all three levies (parks, school, and levy lift) would have on the citizens. Mr. Olander referred to graph illustrating the average taxing of various jurisdictions throughout the County, which is about \$13 to \$14 per \$1,000 assessed value. Ms. Tarry pointed out that the park bond is a flat assessment, which would not change over the life of the levy (through 2021).

Mr. Olander clarified that the funding that would result from the levy would be targeted for maintaining public safety and parks, which makes up a little over half of the City's budget. Commissioner Behrens asked how the funds would be earmarked for police services and park maintenance if they are placed in the general fund. Ms. Tarry agreed the additional funding would go into the general fund, but it would be earmarked for police and park services. She advised that the police contract increases an average of \$400,000 to \$500,000 per year. At least half of the additional revenue from the levy lid lift would be used to cover these increases. The cost of providing parks maintenance and operation is about \$2 million per year, and the pool costs \$500,000 each year. Just these uses alone would exceed the revenue generated by a \$.25 increase in property taxes, which would equate to about \$1.6 million per year. She summarized that the proposed tax increase would cover the cost of maintaining the current level of services. Mr. Olander observed that if the City uses the levy money to fund the yearly increase in police services and park maintenance, the remainder of the money in the general fund could be used for other services and programs.

Board Member McAuliffe asked how much revenue the City would receive each year from the \$20 vehicle license fee. Ms. Tarry said the City estimates the fee would produce about \$600,000 per year. They are currently spending between \$800,000 and \$900,000 per year for pavement management (overlays), and the Public Works Director has indicated they should be spending \$1.5 million. The additional \$600,000 would at least help the City fund the program at the lower level.

TREE ORDINANCE AND VEGETATION MASTER PLAN

Mr. Deal introduced Bill Brosseau and Ella Elman from EarthCorps, a company the City has contracted with for the last few years. He recalled that Seattle Urban Nature was the group that did the City's initial Urban Forest Assessment, and this last year they combined forces with EarthCorps.

Ella Elman, Ecologist, EarthCorps, said her company is a non-profit environmental organization located in Seattle. Their mission is to create global community through local environmental service. They have a core program that brings together young people from the United States and all over the world to do restoration work throughout the Puget Sound Region. They also work with more than 10,000 volunteers a year and guide them in restoration work. Their professional service, the science program, has been doing mapping and forest inventories in the region for more than 10 years.

Ms. Elman explained that a park would normally have two different types of plans. A master plan provides a template for what a park will look like and what facilities and uses it will have. A vegetation management plan is a more specific plan that focuses more on evaluating the vegetation in contiguous natural areas within the park and providing long-term recommendations on how to manage it. Because the City is in the process of updating their Tree Ordinance, they asked EarthCorps to provide an outline of what should be included in a vegetation management plan. However, there is no such thing as one standard outline. Every city has its own basic ideas for what needs to go into the plan and what the public process should be. However, over the years, EarthCorps has created a template of what kinds of information could be included, and this model was used for the four park studies that were done previously for the City. She briefly reviewed the template, and referred the group to an additional document that provides more specific details about how the different categories of vegetation would be evaluated and what would be considered a healthy forest in the Puget Sound Region.

Ms. Elman reviewed that in 2007, EarthCorps (formerly Seattle Urban Nature) conducted a vegetation inventory in four parks in the City of Shoreline: Boeing Creek, Shoreview, Hamlin, and South Woods. Together these four parks represent about 50% of the forested park lands in the City. As part of the project they delineated and mapped habitats, provided an inventory of current vegetation conditions and created a management plan based on data collected during the inventory. She described the process that was used to study Hamlin Park and shared the following findings:

- There are 10 different forest and habitat types in the park, the majority of which are conifer forest.
- There are 76 different plant species, 44 native and 32 non-native.
- The species span about 62 forested acres within the park, 49 of which are pure conifer forest.
- 15 acres of the conifer forest has no understory growing beneath the trees.
- There are numerous invasive species in the park that are threatening the health of the park.
- A total of 184 native trees per acre were regenerating in the park, which is a good number.
- About 1,000 invasive trees per acre are regenerating, which creates a serious problem in all the City parks.

DRAFT

Ms. Elman said the inventory results were used to identify 10 short-term priorities for the park, and the City has already addressed the following:

- **Create a permanent trail network.** This was really important, especially to keep people from trampling those parts of the park where there is no understory.
- **Look at those areas that have no vegetation and figure out why.** Six plots were placed in the areas of the park where there is no understory. They completed a comprehensive set of soil tests and learned that the soil was extremely acidic. They consulted with a number of soil experts and decided to test 14 different species of acid loving plants in the plots. They also identified different kinds of treatments to use in the plots: compost, mulch, planting directly into the soil, and protecting an area with a fence to keep people off the ground. Each of the plots was densely planted with the same species, except in the controlled area where nothing was planted. She referred to a diagram that identified the various plots and explained that the plots were monitored for two growing seasons, and last winter they found that the plants that were planted right into the soil with no additives did the best. Therefore, they are recommending the City plant acid-loving species right into the soil.

Ms. Elman advised that the remaining priorities have to do with improving the health of the parks and addressing the issue of invasive plants. She cautioned that this effort will require a significant amount of commitment (time and money) and mobilizing the community. Educating the public and encouraging them to become stewards of the parks is key to the process. Other cities in the region have embraced this idea, understanding that the stewards are the people who will help maintain the parks in perpetuity. Implementation of an invasive species program will also require more specific restoration planning and monitoring.

Commissioner Broili questioned how the City would reconcile the extensive amount of work that needs to be done in the parks with their current revenue shortage. Mr. Deal said the first step in the process is to identify the seriousness of the issues and priorities, and the studies have been very helpful in that regard. He recognized the City is losing ground, and they need to identify a much more aggressive strategy. He said he hopes that as the strategy is finalized over the next year, the City can more aggressively address the problems. He noted that one challenge is the City's current structure of contracting the park maintenance work out rather than having a number of maintenance staff on hand. He cautioned that while the City can accomplish this task, it will take a fair amount of time.

Chair Clements referred to the lack of fallen trees and large decaying woody matter on the ground. The current situation consists of a forest of trees that are not as diverse either in age or species as they ought to be. He noted that this is not contained within the scope of the study, and he questioned how the City should go about addressing the problem. Ms. Elman answered that the Vegetation Management Plan addresses the lack of large, woody debris, and there is a direct relationship between the amount of conifers growing in a place and the amount of large rotted wood. A huge problem in all the parks in Shoreline is that there are not large pieces of rotted wood in the park. The Vegetation Management Plan recommends that fallen trees be allowed to remain. In addition, there are opportunities to bring in this type of material when thinning is done in different parts of the City.

DRAFT

Board Member Hale noted that, for whatever reason, invasive species tend to do well under almost any condition. In areas like Hamlin Park, native species do not always succeed because of the dense canopy, lack of light and lack of water. She noted that the current plan does not talk about selective tree removal, thinning, pruning, etc., which is an integral piece to creating an environment where vegetation management is feasible. She cautioned that they should consider “forest management” and not just “vegetation management.” Ms. Elman replied that the studies do a thorough job of documenting the density of the trees (the overstory and regenerating trees) within the parks. She observed that the situation in Shoreline is not much different than the rest of the region. Most of the forests have full canopies, and many of the native species have already adapted to the conditions and thrive in the understory of forests. She recommended the City consider selective thinning in a responsible way if they find there are places that have too many conifers.

Mr. Cohen explained that the City Council agreed in 2009 that the Clearing, Grading and Tree Code Amendments should be overhauled, and they provided nine decision modules for staff to start with. Prior to this direction, the City adopted an Environmental Sustainability Strategy that included a number of principles, directions and objectives that addressed the issue of improving forest health in the City. The Comprehensive Plan also includes policies that show support for tree preservation, enhancement and compatibility with development. Mr. Cohen reviewed the decision modules that are specifically related to parks as follows:

- **Decision Module 1 – Establish a baseline urban forest canopy citywide.** There is a lot of perception that the City is losing more canopy than they are gaining and that regulations only apply to individual properties. To address this issue, staff is proposing a baseline survey of all the canopy every five years to gauge how the City is doing and identify appropriate code adjustments.
- **Decision Module 3 – Change the provision in SMC 20.50.310.B.1 that allows the removal of 6 significant trees every 36 months without a permit.** The intent of this provision was to provide flexibility, and staff does not recommend that flexibility be eliminated. However, the potential impact of the provision citywide is quite large.
- **Decision Module 5 – Amend SMC 20.50.360 to allow for reasonable tree replacement ratios and the possibility to replace trees on other land within the City.** Currently, the tree code requires replacement of all trees that are removed. However, this results in huge replacement ratios for heavily forested properties where there is often insufficient area to replace them all on the same property. It has been suggested the City find a way to allow some of the replacement trees to be placed on other properties, and staff is working out the details of a potential program.
- **Decision Module 7 – Amend SMC 20.50.350.B.1 to remove and replace the flat code provision for 20% preservation of significant trees.** As currently written, anytime there is a development project on a piece of property (public and private), 20% of the significant trees must be preserved. While 20% is easy to calculate, if the same property comes in five years later wanting to do something, they would only be required to preserve 20% of what they saved before. In addition, the current provision is inequitable. Requiring a heavily forested site to preserve 20% would have a much greater impact than the same provision being applied to a site with few trees. Staff is considering language that would be equitable, clear and flexible. The current code has a lot of good intentions, but there is redundancy that results in a lack of clarity for both the public and for City staff to administer. He explained that trees are an extensive City resource, and they must be

regulated without the City becoming heavy handed. Property owners, including the Parks Department, must retain some flexibility in how to best meet the minimum requirements that are best for the properties.

Mr. Cohen reported that the Planning Commission has held approximately five discussions regarding the Tree Ordinance, and they have acknowledged that the City's parks are a large resource for trees and forest habitat. They have expressed concern that in order to set an example, the code should hold the City to the same standards (or above) as for private property owners. He observed that the challenge will be applying the Tree Ordinance to parks in areas that are residentially zoned. He explained that all park land is underlaid by zoning that is single-family residential (R-4 and R-6), and staff is considering whether it would be appropriate for the Tree Ordinance to apply equally to residential and park property with the same zoning. Another question is how to apply the code to parks that vary widely from heavily forested reserves to treeless playfields.

Mr. Cohen announced that the Planning Commission has crafted a purpose statement indicating that the purpose of the code is to preserve and restore trees to promote all the attributes that trees provide and to provide flexibility to allow development, solar access and greater tree protection. He referred the Board and Commission to the draft code language that was prepared by the Planning and Parks Department staff.

Board Member Hale pointed out that the Board did not receive the proposed language in print. She said she assumes the Board would have an opportunity to provide comments at a later date, as well. Mr. Cohen said the draft language was included in the meeting packet materials. He agreed it would be appropriate for the Board to forward their comments and recommendations to staff at a later date.

Mr. Cohen said the draft language would give the Parks Department three options to meet the tree code, and each represents a higher standard than the current code. He explained that the three choices would not only give the Parks Department more flexibility, but they would result in higher tree retention standards than the remainder of the City. He reviewed that, as currently proposed, tree removal on City park property would be allowed if:

- A. A minimum 45% tree canopy coverage is maintained and verified for all City park property.** Mr. Cohen explained that staff used a 2007 aerial survey of the City to calculate that all park property, collectively, has about a 45% canopy coverage. The number would be updated based on the 2009 aerial survey.
- B. Removed trees are replaced within City park properties per table 20.50.350.B.1b.** Mr. Cohen explained that it would not matter how many tree credits exist on a property, the removed trees must still be replaced based on the ratio in the table.
- C. An approved vegetation management plan is implemented.** This plan must be approved and implemented by the City. Rather than treating trees as numbers and canopies as areas, an approved vegetation management plan might be more beneficial for forest enhancement and more complex in terms of all types of plantings.

Board Member Beiry said there seems to be a natural assumption that when talking about trees in parks they are talking about native trees. However, she felt it would be appropriate for the language to use the word “native.” As growth happens in the City, there will be less and less opportunity for the large, native evergreen trees, which provide the greatest services in terms of water retention. She summarized that, for the most part, the trees in the parks are already native, unless they are invasive species.

Board Member Hale disagreed. She said that if the 45% tree canopy coverage requirement is applied to just native trees, the City would be required to replant a native tree for every significant non-native tree that is removed. She suggested that rather than differentiating between native and non-native, a better approach would be to look at size overall. She said she would prefer the vegetation management plan concept, which would be all encompassing and address issues such as native and non-native, value, significance, and other types of vegetation. Requiring that a 45% minimum tree canopy be maintained would mean that when Hamlin Park is thinned to address management issues, the City would be required to find other places to plant trees. The only other places left to plant additional trees in the parks are the active recreation spaces, which would not be appropriate. Mr. Cohen pointed out that another section of the code includes an exemption for the removal of invasive tree species. He agreed to provide the code reference for the Board and Commission’s future reference.

Board Member Nieford noted that most of the street trees are non-native, yet they contribute a lot to the tree canopy in the City. He recalled there is a big effort in Seattle to plant more street trees, and he would like Shoreline to do the same. Allowing only native trees to be planted on City-owned properties would eliminate this positive benefit. However, he agreed it is important to have strong language about encouraging native plants and species, as well.

Board Member Biery asked if the proposed language would apply to street trees within the rights-of-way, as well. Mr. Cohen clarified that the tree code does not address street rights-of-way. However, the City is currently working on engineering guidelines that address the requirements and limitations of street trees. He agreed that rights-of-way can have quite a bit of canopy.

Board Member Nieford said that rather than identifying a specific replacement ratio for trees that are removed, he recommended the City identify a dollar value for the removed trees. For example, a 120-foot Douglas Fir could equate to 1,000, 1-foot Douglas Firs. He noted that arborist societies have already established the value of specific trees.

Commissioner Broili said he likes the vegetation management plan approach, as well. He suggested they consider a citywide vegetation management plan that not only talks about parks, but all city-owned or city-controlled properties. This would not only connect the parks but would allow the City to approach the whole tree issue from a much broader perspective and spread the opportunities across the City. He recommended a citywide urban vegetation management plan that includes street trees, parks, city properties, open spaces, etc. This approach would offer more flexibility for the City to manage their properties.

Board Member Beiry said the language must also address loss of trees as a result of age, disease, or other types of damage. She asked if these trees would also require a replacement value. She also asked

if the language would include a replacement plan for street trees that were improperly planted. She recalled that the Parks Department is currently working on a plan to construct a trail on the 195th Street right-of-way. This would be a Parks Department project on public right-of-way. She agreed with Commissioner Broili that a holistic approach of a vegetative management plan would be a better approach.

Board Member Nieford said that if developers are allowed to plant trees in city parks in lieu of trees removed from private properties, he suggested the proposed language include a requirement for the follow-up maintenance of the trees until they are established.

Vice Chair Perkowski questioned why Option B would be considered a higher standard than the current code. Mr. Cohen said all options, separately, represent a higher standard than what staff is thinking about for the remainder of the proposed Tree Ordinance. He recalled that the tree credit system staff presented to the Planning Commission in 2009 included a tree credit system that would require replacement trees equal to the value of the trees that are removed. He noted that, as proposed, a private property developer would not be required to replace trees if he/she is preserving enough trees on the property. However, the proposed language for public properties would require the City to replace all trees that are removed, regardless of the number of trees that would remain on site.

Vice Chair Perkowski agreed that a citywide vegetation management plan would be a worthwhile approach. He pointed out that Options A and B do not necessarily have to work as an either/or. Option A could be a baseline rather than an option.

Chair Clements said that if the City determines they do not want to reduce their tree canopy, they would need to maintain at least a 45% tree canopy coverage. Therefore Options B and C would never come into effect. He suggested there are cases where the City would want to restrict tree removal for other reasons.

Chair Wagner agreed the Board and Commission must decide if maintaining a minimum 45% tree canopy is sufficient, or if they want to increase the percentage. She summarized that if the Commission and Board determine they want to maintain a minimum 45% tree canopy, then the number in Option A would have to be increased, and Options B and C would be potential other options for increasing the minimum. The Board and Commission agreed the goal should be to increase the tree canopy. Mr. Cohen reminded the Board and Commission that, as proposed, a citywide tree canopy survey would be completed every five years. If they find the tree canopy has increased, the City could adjust the minimum tree canopy number accordingly. Chair Clements asked if it would be possible to address the minimum tree canopy requirement outside of this particular ordinance, so they are not tied together.

Commissioner Behrens suggested the City be required to meet all of the three options in order to remove a tree. This would give the Parks Department the ability to increase the tree canopy in the parks, if they choose to do so. Board Member Beiry concurred. She said that the more she hears the group's discussion, the more genuine value she sees in the idea of a citywide vegetation plan. While she recognized this would be more difficult to establish, in the long run, an overarching plan that guides

everything in the future would be easier to administer and easier for the City to achieve the results they want with less staff intervention.

Commissioner Broili said he was not clear if the options are three different options, or a single approach with three legs. Mr. Cohen said the options represent three choices within the proposed code language, but they would be interrelated.

Board Member Hale observed that the 45% number is just an estimate at this point because the City does not have a tree canopy inventory. She asked for clarification about how staff arrived at the number. She also said the group cannot provide specific direction about the appropriate tree replacement ratio until the replacement table is available for review. Mr. Cohen agreed to provide the table to the Commission and Board as soon as it is finalized. He added that a full draft of the proposed Tree Ordinance would be provided to the Commission two weeks prior to their next discussion on June 3rd. A copy of the document would also be provided to each of the Board Members. He explained that a tree canopy survey was done in 2009 based on 2007 maps, and it is accurate within about 3%. The City could decide to do a more detailed and accurate survey, but it would cost more money. He clarified that the 45% tree canopy applies to just parks. By comparison, the percentage of canopy citywide is estimated to be about 29%. Board Member Hale summarized that City parks would have the burden of creating a greater canopy to pick up the slack where private property does not. Mr. Cohen pointed out that while parks have the highest percentage of tree canopy coverage, they are not the highest majority of the land uses in the City.

COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED TO EXTEND THE MEETING TO 9:30 P.M. BOARD MEMBER BIERY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Cohen reminded the Commission that the proposed language was placed on their joint meeting agenda as an information item. He said the intent was to obtain feedback from the group about their concerns and suggestions. He noted there would be an opportunity for both groups to review the language again near the end of May, and he recommended the Parks Board forward their comments to the staff or Planning Commission.

Chair Clements summarized that there appears to be interest in having a citywide policy that not only restricts tree removal, but also prescribes vegetation management citywide. However, he recognized that this approach might be outside the scope of the ordinance that is currently before the group. Whether or not they pursue a citywide vegetation management plan, the group agreed the proposed language needs to be fine tuned to address specific concerns.

Mr. Cohen announced that staff would prepare the final draft code language to present to the Planning Commission on June 3rd. At that time, the proposal would be available for public review, as well. He suggested the Planning Commission would likely conduct at least two study sessions to review the draft language and prepare for the public hearing. Staff is expecting a final recommendation from the Planning Commission to the City Council by the end of August. Mr. Deal agreed to schedule the draft language on the Parks Board's agenda for additional discussion, as well. Chair Clements asked if it would be possible for the Planning Commission to forward the proposal to the City Council without Parks Board approval. Mr. Deal answered that is possible for the Commission to forward a

DRAFT

recommendation without approval from the Parks Board, but he did not believe that would be the appropriate approach.

Commissioner Broilli proposed that the Parks Board and Planning Commission appoint a joint subcommittee to work on the proposed amendments to the Tree Ordinance. The group agreed that would be an appropriate approach.

Board Member Beiry requested that the Parks Board be notified of all the upcoming Planning Commission Meetings (time, place date) where the tree-related issues will be discussed. This would allow the Parks Board Members to attend the Planning Commission meetings. Mr. Cohen noted that the Commission's agendas are advertised on the City's website, and any further Tree Ordinance discussions would also be advertised under the topic of "tree code." Board Member Ballo asked that staff also send out a group email to the Board Members, notifying them of future Commission discussions related to the Tree Ordinance.

Board Member Ballo cautioned that the subcommittee should not eliminate the opportunity for the Parks Board to address the Tree Ordinance as a group in the future. Mr. Deal explained that the subcommittee would likely meet with staff to come up with thoughts and ideas that could be presented to the Commission and Board for additional input. Board Member Ballo suggested the Parks Board discuss the proposed language further at their May 27th meeting and then appoint subcommittee members. Mr. Deal suggested the subcommittee be formed as soon as possible since there is a fair amount of work to be done.

Chair Wagner observed that significant parts of the Tree Ordinance are not related to park or city-owned property. She expressed the need for getting the most value from the subcommittee as far as the specific regulations that relate to City-owned and City-managed properties. The Commission would like to draw from the Board's expertise to address park-related aspects of the Tree Ordinance. She suggested the Board focus the majority of their attention on the sections related to park property.

Mr. Tovar clarified that while the current discussion was characterized as the "Tree Ordinance," much of the discussion has been about policy, which will be specifically addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan updates. He suggested the overarching policy questions related to City properties and opportunities for the City to partner with other large public property owners will carry on even after adoption of the Tree Ordinance.

Chair Clement cautioned against appointing a subcommittee before the Board has a clear understanding of the scope of the work. He said he is also conscious about committing extra staff time to another subcommittee without more thought about the impact it would have on staff and Commission time. He asked that they postpone the decision. Mr. Tovar suggested staff prepare a recommendation for how a subcommittee might operate, including a time line and action plan to achieve the August 10th deadline for a recommendation to the City Council. The group agreed that would be appropriate.

PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN UPDATE

DRAFT

Shoreline Planning Commission/Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board
Minutes of Joint Meeting
April 22, 2010 Page 14

Mr. Deal announced that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department, in conjunction with the Parks Board, is in the process of updating the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. He said staff would provide updates as the plan moves forward. He summarized that it is a large task, and most of the work would be done in house.

JOINT PRCS/PADS/PW PROJECTS: WAYFINDING SIGNS AND TOWN CENTER PARK

Mr. Cohen reported that staff is in the middle stages of developing a Town Center Subarea Plan. They are currently working on a design review process and standards. He reviewed the following Framework Goals adopted by the City Council a few years ago:

- **Framework Goal 1 – Articulate a community vision for the town center as an early step in the development of detailed provisions for the subarea.** The Planning Commission has drafted a vision for Town Center, and they invite the Parks Board to review and comment on the draft.
- **Framework Goal 3 – Engage Shoreline residents and businesses in detailed design processes for a “heritage park” site on both sides of the Interurban Trail and Midvale Avenue North.** Mr. Deal would talk to the group about the process for designing and developing a Town Center Park.
- **Framework Goal 5 – Prepare a program of civic directional or “wayfinding” signage and evaluate refinements to city sign regulations to reflect the emerging function and visual character of Aurora Avenue.** This goal would affect city locations, as well as larger institutions, including the Parks Department.

Chair Wagner emphasized that the Commission’s draft vision for Town Center is in the preliminary stage, and they welcome comments from the Parks Board. Vice Chair Perkowski clarified that the draft vision was prepared by a subcommittee of the Planning Commission, and has not yet been accepted by the entire Commission.

Mr. Deal said the area north of Walgreens to 185th Street and between Midvale Avenue and Aurora Avenue North has been identified as the future site for the “Interurban Park.” He observed that there is a lot of opportunity in this area, which includes additional property that had to be acquired for right-of-way as part of the second mile of the Aurora Avenue North Project. Staff is in the process of preparing a Request for Qualifications, and they will begin looking for a consultant in June to help prepare a master plan for the site. They intend to start the master plan process in August.

Mr. Tovar announced that the Planning Commission conducted a public design charrette to solicit feedback regarding the Town Center Subarea Plan, and they also met to discuss the comments that were received at the charrette. Future meetings about the Town Center Subarea Plan will look at the future and life of Midvale Avenue North and the properties that front on that street, which is across the street from the park. Coordinated and parallel thinking must occur between the Park Board and Commission as they work on these two projects in the future.

Mr. Tovar announced that the Public Works, Planning and Parks Departments have been working jointly with the City Manager’s Office to come up with way to implement Framework Policy 5. He reviewed

DRAFT

that the purpose of a wayfinding signage program is to increase public awareness of community assets, provide orientation, and create a visually coherent look for all the public signage in the City. He reviewed a list of guidelines that must be considered when establishing a wayfinding sign program, including color, size of letters, shape of sign, fonts, location of signs, etc. He provided an example from the City of Bellevue, which uses white letters on a blue field. The signs are easy to read and are clear and clean. They include a logo and are limited to three destinations per sign. He provided examples of how the signs could be mounted, depending on the need and the speed of the traffic. Mr. Tovar also provided an example of signs used by the City of Olympia, which incorporate more color than Bellevue's design. He also provided examples of how their signs are mounted onto existing hardware in the rights-of-way. He provided pictures to illustrate signs that are currently used in City Parks and other City property. He noted the signs use a wave shape that would make sense for the wayfinding signs, as well. He provided a conceptual design of what the wayfinding signs could look like, incorporating the City's logo, the wave concept, and white letters on a blue field. The size and mounting type would depend on the location of the sign. He said staff plans to review the conceptual designs with other City departments, and they invite comments from the Board and Commission. They hope to start installing the first signs later in the summer.

Board Member Beiry said she lives right behind the Washington Department of Transportation, and she is frequently asked directions on how to find the facility. She said she would love to have a wayfinding sign installed in this location. Mr. Tovar said a map has been created, identifying about 25 locations where staff believes the wayfinding signs would be appropriate. Aurora Avenue North is a logical place for many of the signs, but there are numerous other locations throughout the City.

Board Member Ballo recalled the signs that were placed in some of the City's parks by King County. The fronts look okay, but the backs were not attractive. She suggested that sign finish is important. Mr. Tovar agreed that both sides of the sign need to be painted.

Board Member Jacques asked if the signs would be compliant with ADA requirements, particularly for the pedestrian type signs. Mr. Tovar said they reviewed the MUTC engineering standards, but they should review the ADA requirements, as well.

Board Member Hale asked if signs would also be placed along the Interurban Trail to direct people to public facilities. Mr. Tovar said the Parks Department is working on trail signage. The purpose of the current exercise is to identify a color scheme, shape, and motif. Details such as specific size and placement of the signs still have to be worked out.

Commissioner Broili said Commissioner Kaje (who was not present) asked him to bring forward the issue of future park space and how the City needs to make it a priority to secure available park spaces whenever possible (i.e. Cedar Brook and Aldercrest). He said Commissioner Kaje observed that they are already low on park space, but the population would grow over time. He asked how the Commission could support the goal of adding new park land. He further asked if the Board and Commission should be working together on a Comprehensive Plan amendment that speaks directly to this priority. He also asked if the Board has given thought to smaller pocket parks, possibly in Town Center or some of the existing neighborhood centers that do not have public open space. Commissioner

Kaje observed that this is the type of effort that could be directly supported through actions on the Commission. Commissioner Broili pointed out that Shoreline has one of the lowest park per capita ratios in King County and neighboring areas.

Mr. Deal said that as the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan is updated, the community will have an opportunity to identify properties the City can add to their 20-year vision. He noted the School District has declared the Aldercrest and Cedar Brook sites as surplus, and these are certainly opportunities that are worth exploring. He said the comment about Shoreline being terribly underserved by park property is a little misleading. Other cities being compared to Shoreline have open space that is being identified as park space even though it is not useable, and this skews the numbers. While he wishes they had more, it is important to note that most of the park property in Shoreline is good, useable park space. He summarized that the National Recreational Park Association years ago recommended six to eight acres per thousand of useable, active park space, and the City is at about 7.2.

Commissioner Broili asked if there are Comprehensive Plan amendments that would assist in designating or identifying future park opportunities. Chair Clement asked if there is something the Planning Commission could do to prevent the School District from taking public lands out of public ownership aside from asking the public to pay for them once again.

Mr. Tovar explained that the update of the City's Comprehensive Plan would include an update of the Open Space and Parks Element, which would be coordinated with the Park Board's update of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. There will be an opportunity for the Commission and Board to look at how they are doing and establish some priorities for the future. Their collective recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council, who would decide the City's official policy. He suggested that when the time comes, it would be logical to have work sessions with the two groups.

Chair Clements said he and Commissioner Broili have discussed some of the concepts Richard Louv put forth in his book, *THE LAST CHILD IN THE WILDERNESS*. The subtitle of the book is "Curing our Children of Nature Deficit Disorder." One of the points made in the book is that years ago, kids did not have to go to an urban forest or a park to play in the woods. They went to the woods down the street. As the City grows, the wooded areas are disappearing. One of the goals should be how the City can identify, preserve and grow open and natural spaces, whether they are called parks or not. He summarized his belief that there are opportunities that have not yet been considered.

ADJOURNMENT

BOARD MEMBER HALE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M. BOARD MEMBER McAULIFFE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Michelle Linders Wagner
Chair, Planning Commission

Jessica Simulcik Smith
Clerk, Planning Commission

DRAFT

Shoreline Planning Commission/Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Board
Minutes of Joint Meeting
April 22, 2010 Page 17

This page intentionally blank



Memorandum

DATE: May 13, 2010

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP, Director
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Town Center Project Manager

RE: May 20, 2010 meeting on Town Center and Design Review

At the upcoming Planning Commission meeting, city staff and our consultant, Bob Bengford of Makers, inc., will present for your consideration some draft concepts regarding Town Center and design review and outline possible next steps for both.

First up will be a summary of the Key Findings from the April charrette. As you recall, there were about ten tables of citizens and planning commissioners who identified preferred and less preferred images of building form, site and building design, and then worked in their small groups to locate on maps where in Town Center these choices might be most appropriate. A number of notations were also included on the maps, which together with the visual preference "voting," suggested some patterns about land use, building form and character.

Next will be a slideshow illustrating how several prominent "town centers" in our region (Mill Creek, Burien, and Juanita Village) would "fit" into the context of our Town Center area by superimposing their site plans, to scale, on our setting. Each of these three is an example not only of mixed-use, mid-rise development, but demonstrates ways in public and private spaces can be integrated and circulation needs accommodated for both pedestrian and vehicular movement. These three examples we think will help stimulate your discussion not only of how the various components might look or work independently, but how a plan and development regulations can be crafted to help them work together.

Finally, we then would like to share with you some preliminary maps and graphic illustrations of organizing concepts for the Town Center Subarea Plan and implementing zoning. These maps and illustrations are the staff's first cut at putting onto paper the

Agenda Item 7.a

cumulative direction and preferences articulated so far, by: (1) the Planning Commission's draft Town Center Vision Statement; (2) the past studies and adopted City Strategies reviewed at last October's Open House; (3) the Town Center on-line survey results (over 400 inputs), and (4) the opinions and ideas expressed at the April 2010 charrette. We would like to have a discussion with you about these preliminary maps and graphics, answer questions you have about them and try to reach as much agreement with you as possible about which aspects of these concepts we carry forward into the next iteration of "working draft" subarea plan and zoning.

Last, but not least, we do show as "Unfinished Business" the draft Planning Commission Town Center Vision. We have utilized the draft we have (attached) in formulating some of the concepts described above. However, it would be appropriate for the Commission as a whole to either affirm or amend then affirm this draft before we return with refinements to the concepts for Town Center. It very well may be that after reviewing the materials during the first part of your meeting you may be inspired to add to or in some other way revise the text of the Town Center Vision Statement.

Attachment

Attachment 1 – Draft Town Center Vision Statement prepared by Subcommittee of the Planning Commission



DRAFT

SHORELINE TOWN CENTER VISION

By Planning Commission | April 1, 2010

Shoreline Town Center 2030 is the vibrant cultural and governmental heart of the City with a rich mix of housing and shopping options, thriving businesses, and public spaces for gatherings and events. People from all walks of life enjoy living, working and visiting in this safe, healthy, and walkable urban place.

Once a crossroads on the Interurban that connected Seattle and Everett, Shoreline's Town Center has evolved to become a signature part of the City that stands out as a unique and inviting regional destination while gracefully fitting in with its surrounding landscape and neighborhoods. Citizens, business owners and city officials are all justifiably proud of the many years of effort to create a special and livable place that exemplifies the best of Shoreline past, present and future.

Town Center is anchored on one end by the City Hall complex, Shorewood High School, the Shoreline Museum, and other public facilities. The linear park with the Interurban Trail provides a green thread through the center. City Hall not only is the center of government, but provides an active venue for many other civic functions. On the other end, the revitalized historic five-point interchange again attracts people from throughout the community.

(Note: Paragraph focusing on look, scale, texture of area to be developed here using information/feedback from design review workshop)

Town Center has achieved a strong balance between the three primary sustainability components – *environmental quality, economic vitality* and *social equity*. The City has long been committed to the realization of these three E's, and Town Center has integrated them successfully.

Environmental Quality

While respecting elements of its historic character, Town Center has become a model of environmentally sound building and development practices. The buildings themselves are state-of-the-art energy efficient and green structures, with zero carbon impacts. There is an extensive tree canopy and native vegetation, which is part of a strategic system for capturing and treating stormwater right on site. Major transit stops along the mature boulevard built earlier in the century provide quick and convenient connections to major centers elsewhere in the region. There are walkways and bicycle trails that link Town Center and neighborhoods

throughout the City. Civic spaces and parks have been designed for daily use and special events.

Economic Vitality

Town Center attracts a robust mix of office, service and retail development. The boulevard boasts an inviting choice of shops, restaurants, entertainment, and nightlife. The Center is a model of green industry and economic sustainability that generates the financial resources that support excellent city services, health and living standards. As a result, Shoreline is one of the most profitable cities on the West Coast with a very desirable tax rate.

Social Equity:

The Town Center offers a broad range of housing choices that attract a diversity of household types, ages and incomes. Attention to design allows the public gathering places to be accessible to all. People feel safe here day and night. Festivals, exhibits and performances attract people of all ages and cultural backgrounds.

(Note: Final wrap-up paragraph(s) to be developed here summarizing vision, using information from design review workshop)