CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

July 11, 2012
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chairman Carlson, Commissioners Ferris, Hamlin, Laing, Sheffels, Tebelius, Turner
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	None
STAFF PRESENT:	Paul Inghram, Planning and Community Development; Carol Helland, Heidi Bedwell, Development Service Department
GUEST SPEAKERS:	None
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by ~~Chair Turner~~Chairman Carlson who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Tebelius who arrived at 6:40 p.m.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Comprehensive Planning Manager Paul Inghram shared with the Commissioners printed copies of comments submitted earlier in the day by Mr. Marty Nizlek.

Ms. Anita Skoog-Neil, 9302 SE Shoreland Drive, referred to section 20.25E.065 and noted that several of the subcategories include some unrealistic and potentially unachievable requirements. With regard to the dimensional requirements, some important tweaks are needed, particularly with regard to impervious surface, structure setback, moorage, and nonconformance.

Mr. Jerry Laken, 4847 Lakehurst Lane, spoke as a member of the Meydenbauer Yacht Club. He said the club representatives have reviewed the redraft and are quite pleased with it. He said he has been working with Senior Planner David Pyle regarding a sentence in a paragraph that is not understandable as drafted.

Mr. Scott Sheffield, 2227 West Lake Sammamish Parkway SE, provided the Commissioners with copies of the meeting minutes of a Council study session in which King County discussed the Sammamish River Weir.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Ferris moved to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and the motion carried unanimously.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Deputy Mayor Robertson informed the Commissioners that on July 2 the Council held a public hearing on interim emergency zoning regulations for medical marijuana that were adopted in May. The zoning regulations will be in place until election day and may be renewed. The Council determined that the medical marijuana regulations should be forwarded to the Planning Commission for study and a recommendation regarding appropriate zoning regulations. The interim regulations limit the location of collective gardens to Light Industrial, General Commercial and Medical Office districts.

Deputy Mayor Robertson also informed the Commission that on July 9 the Council kicked off the transit master plan update process. The study work will be done by the Transportation Commission but their recommendation may involve land use. For that reason, the suggestion was made that a representative from the Planning Commission and the Human Services Commission be appointed to serve as liaisons to the Transportation Commission; Deputy Mayor Robertson said she had appointed Planning Commissioner Laing to be the Commission's representative.

The Comprehensive Plan threshold review recommendations of the Commission are currently slated to be before the Council on July 23, though there is the possibility the issue will be get bumped to August 6.

6. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Inghram said a joint Commission workshop regarding the transit master plan is being planned for September 18. The details are still being worked out.

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Shoreline Master Program Update

Mr. Inghram made available to the Commissioners a new letter from the Parks and Community Services Board regarding the Shoreline Master Program.

Chair Carlson said he had heard from several members of the Commission who desired to have a detailed overview of the redraft. He invited Land Use Director Carol Helland to provide the overview.

Ms. Helland said updates were provided to six individual Commissioners. The Parks and Community Services Board was also provided with a briefing on July 10, and to members of the Washington Sensible Shorelines Association on July 9. Staff has answered questions asked by Belfield Office Park as well.

Ms. Helland provided the Commissioners with a quick orientation with regard to each section of the redraft, noting that every attempt was made to delete redundancies and clarify language without changing the direction given by the Commission.

Ms. Helland said during the briefings provided to date, attention was given primarily to those areas around which the Commission had given most of its attention, including the use charts for Meydenbauer Bay, and the residential shoreline regulations in section 20.25E.065. She said

some of the changes had their origins in the conversation that occurred between the public, the Parks and Community Services Board chair and the Commission the night direction was given to staff regarding the creation of a hybrid permit process. The public voiced the desire to incorporate the Meydenbauer Bay Park master plan implementation principles; to place a specific focus on enhanced public involvement; and to develop a requirement for a shoreline conditional use permit as the appropriate process. The Parks and Community Services Board said the public involvement around Meydenbauer Bay should reflect citywide interests, not just the interests of those living adjacent to the park. They also indicated a concern about approval by the Department of Ecology, both from a timing perspective and from the perspective that it could diminish local control over park planning. There was also a concern that the permitting process would simply provide a forum for reevaluation of the plan for the park previously adopted by the Council. The Commission's direction was that the requirement for future development be consistent with the park master plan and implementation principles. Staff also was directed to draft a hybrid permit process with heightened public outreach, but the Commission's direction stopped short of saying that could only be accomplished through a shoreline conditional use. The Commission discussed the need to have consistency in permitting across the park irrespective of the shoreline jurisdiction. The Commission shared the concern of the Parks and Community Services Board regarding retaining local control.

Ms. Helland said the proposed process, based on the direction given, is a hybrid that requires park development to use a conditional use process across the entire park, not a shoreline conditional use. It is the same process that is currently required for beach parks in single family and R-10 districts; the parcels with those zoning designations in the Meydenbauer area already are required to go through the process; for the parcels with a higher multifamily zoning or a commercial zoning, the process would be a heightened process. Sites within the shoreline overlay district would require a shoreline substantial development permit in addition to the general conditional use permit, but a shoreline conditional use would not be required.

The decision criteria require consistency with the Comprehensive Plan; compatibility with the existing or intended character of appearance, quality of development, and physical characteristics of the subject property and immediate vicinity; that the use be served by adequate public facilities; that the use will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property; and that it complies will all applicable requirements of the Land Use Code. Those decision criteria are different from those that apply to a shoreline substantial development permit in that they focus on consistency of a particular use with the master program. The approach involves plenty of public outreach, including mailed notice of application, the posting of a sign, a required public meeting, and a required public hearing by the hearing examiner following the director making a recommendation to the hearing examiner. The local decision maker is the hearing examiner, and the appeal process is to the Council and from there to the superior court.

Ms. Helland pointed out the areas in the redraft where the revisions occurred.

Commissioner Laing asked if the reference to the Land Use Code will present a problem that will draw the Department of Ecology into other parts of the city's code, and asked what will happen if LUC 20.10.440 should be amended, deleted or otherwise recodified. Ms. Helland said the Department of Ecology is not concerned with the process piece; code integration is actually desirable under the guidelines. The linking does not require the Department of Ecology to approve the city's land use charts. Should the Land Use Code section be revised at some point in the future, a review by the Department of Ecology would not be required.

Commissioner Ferris commented that the procedure described for land use for a beach park is the

standard procedure, whereas the letter from the Parks and Community Services Board makes it sound as though the proposed approach is a more rigorous requirement. He asked if they disagree with the process as described. Ms. Helland said the Parks and Community Services Board was briefed by staff on July 10. The comment from the Parks and Community Services Board appears to be in relative to the May 2011 draft which simplified the process where a master plan was already adopted by the Council.

With regard to including the implementation principles, Commissioner Ferris said it was his recollection that they were not going to be called out specifically because they are part of the master plan. Ms. Helland said staff referred back to the Commission's recorded deliberation of the issue and concluded that the Commission had decided to include both a reference to the master plan and the implementation principles. Commissioner Ferris pointed out that unlike the park plan, no notice for public input on the implementation principles was ever published; the principles came in after the Parks and Community Services Board held its public hearing, which was the only public hearing ever held on the plan. He asked how the principles could then be included in the plan. Ms. Helland said the implementation principles were adopted by the Council and were bound into the document as Chapter 9.

There was consensus not to revisit the issue and make changes to the proposed language.

With regard to section 20.25E.065, Ms. Helland noted that the tree retention principles had been deleted from B.2.i in favor of the citywide tree retention policies; reference to the tree retention policies were moved to paragraph F in order to satisfy the Department of Ecology.

Commissioner Laing asked if the Department of Ecology would then be reviewing the city's overall tree protection policies. Ms. Helland said there are three provisions in the residential piece of the code that reach out to general provisions in the Land Use Code by reference. Where there are cross references out, the Department of Ecology will review the referenced sections and attach them to the Shoreline Master Program. The three sections are critical areas, impervious surface standards and tree retention. If the citywide provisions were to subsequently be amended without submitting the changes to the Department of Ecology, the old standards would continue to apply in the shoreline jurisdiction until the Shoreline Master Program was next updated.

Commissioner Tebelius asked if the references to the three sections could simply not be made in the Shoreline Master Program. Mr. Inghram said anything not specifically referenced in the plan would not apply to the shoreline area. Ms. Helland added that vegetation conservation is a requirement under the guidelines, so either the topic must be covered in the document or there must be a reference to the pertinent code section. Mr. Inghram pointed out that should the Department of Ecology object to something in a referenced section, their concerns could only affect the code elements that apply to the shorelines. Some jurisdictions have referenced out to their codes, while others have decided to include the entire relevant code sections in their Shoreline Master Program documents.

Ms. Helland noted that new paragraph B.2.j indicates that the responsibility for water quality and control of stormwater and non-point source pollution is a citywide obligation and is not borne entirely by the shoreline property owners.

The changes directed by the Commission relative to the subdivision and shore subdivision standards to remove the clustering requirements were made in paragraph B.2.k.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius, Ms. Helland allowed that paragraph B.2.k.i could be deleted. She explained that retaining and maintaining at least 30 percent of the

existing diameter inches of significant trees is a platting requirement citywide and is covered by Part 20.45 of the Land Use Code, which is referenced in paragraph B.2.k.

Paragraph C and its associated subparagraphs contains the amendments requested by the Commission relative to removing the 50-foot setback and replacing it with a 25-foot setback.

Commissioner Laing called attention to paragraph B.2.k.ii.a having to do with shared moorage. He said as drafted a person wanting to subdivide property with four lots or more will be required to provide shared moorage with access across private property to other private property owners. The approach rings of micromanagement, and there is nothing in the Shoreline Management Act that requires such a step to be taken. He suggested the paragraph should be deleted. Ms. Helland said the deletions made to B.2.k were those directed by the Commission. She said the subparagraphs not deleted could be deleted in favor of simply relying on the reference out to Part 20.45 of the Land Use Code. The potential for shoreline subdivisions is very limited. There is a preference in the guidelines to limit the number of docks on lakes over time, so the guidelines contain a consolidation provision for shared moorage associated with subdivisions. The language was originally left in to show the Department of Ecology the city was trying to meet the guidelines in a way that would not necessarily have an impact on shoreline property owners. Commissioner Laing agreed that the argument is somewhat academic in that the properties that could subdivide likely never will. He proposed drafting the language to say shared moorage is preferred instead of required.

Commissioner Sheffels commented that shared moorage likely would be required in association with a planned unit development.

Commissioner Ferris said shared docks have lower ecological footprints than individual docks, but while shared docks may be ecologically preferable, they present challenges for individual property owners. The Commission previously determined it would prefer to pick its battles with the Department of Ecology by focusing on items outside the bounds of what the Department of Ecology has allowed in other jurisdictions. The Mercer Island plan, which provided the basis for many of the Commission's comments, has not yet been approved by the Department of Ecology. There is some risk involved in that some provisions in the Mercer Island plan fall outside the fog lines of what the Department of Ecology has previously approved for other jurisdictions. The shared moorage and public access issues fall into the category of being outside the fog lines and may draw the attention of the Department of Ecology.

Commissioner Tebelius voiced her support for the suggestion of Commissioner Laing to use the word "preferred" over "required." Ms. Helland pointed out that words like "preferred" do not carry any weight outside of policy language. If paragraph B.2.k.ii.a were to be deleted in its entirety, the reference to Part 20.45 of the Land Use Code would stand. The provisions of the platting and short platting section requires the staff to make a finding, and then the hearing examiner, that the project is in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, which would reference back to the policy. If the policy language expressed only a preference for shared docks, staff would ask applicants to explain what they had done to consider whether a shared dock is something that could be accommodated by their development.

Commissioner Hamlin indicated a preference for retaining the language of B.2.k.ii as drafted and including it in the Shoreline Master Program.

Commissioner Laing said the requirement for shared moorage triggers a number of questions. He said if one of the few properties on the shoreline that could be subdivided were to be subdivided, there would have to be a determination of whether or not every lot created is entitled

to have access to a shared moorage. Another question would center on the maximum number of slips per dock.

Ms. Helland said the pertinent policy is SH-22, which limits the number of new and in-water and over-water structures to the minimum necessary to support the structures intended use, and encourage shared use of docks and piers to reduce the impacts to shoreline ecological functions. The Corps of Engineers regulates coverage to a certain extent as well as dock construction techniques. The Shoreline Master Program regulates dock size, and the guidelines relate to the types of boats and vessels used given that under the Shoreline Master Program docks are intended to be access points for vessels. She reiterated that leaving out the section and simply relying on the reference to Part 20.45 would suffice.

Commissioner Laing moved to delete all of the subparagraphs of B.2.k and to retain the reference to Part 20.45 of the Land Use Code. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Ferris said he would not support the motion. He said he did not necessarily disagree with the direction but would prefer to put the issue in context with other issues that fall outside the fog line. Commissioner Sheffels concurred.

The motion carried 4-3 with Chair Carlson and Commissioners Tebelius, Laing and Turner voting in favor, and Commissioners Sheffels, Hamlin and Ferris voting against the motion.

Commissioner Sheffels agreed that floating docks on Phantom Lake and the shoreline residential canal environment can and should be used. She said she would like to include language that would allow floating docks on Lake Sammamish and Lake Washington.

Commissioner Ferris said floating docks allow less light under them because they sit right on the water. Elevated docks are better ecologically. He said he would support allowing floating docks as exceptions for purposes of handicapped accessibility.

Commissioner Laing agreed with Commissioner Sheffels. He said Lake Washington does not have the same problems that face Lake Sammamish because the water level is more consistently regulated by the locks. The water fluctuations in Lake Sammamish can be quite radical and fixed docks can literally end up under water. He agreed that floating docks do not allow light under them, but they can be constructed in such a way as to maintain a vertical separation between the bottom of the dock and the top of the water, which does allow for light penetration. He agreed that at a minimum floating docks should be allowed to provide for disability access.

Ms. Helland said staff was not intending a prohibition against floating docks. She allowed that a consistency check with prior Commission direction would be in order. There is a footnote at the top of page 29 that says floating docks may be approved on Phantom Lake and the shoreline residential canal environment, but because the section is so deferential to the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, the footnote could simply be deleted.

Turning to paragraph D, residential impervious surfaces, Ms. Helland noted that in accord with direction from the Commission the entire section was struck except for the reference to section 20.20.460 of the Land Use Code.

Ms. Helland said the residential structure setback provisions contained in paragraph E.1 is where the bulk of the Commission direction to establish a setback of 25 feet occurs. It is also where the point from which to measure the setback is established as a static elevation on Lake Sammamish,

Lake Washington and on Phantom Lake. The elevation for Lake Sammamish mirrors the suggestion of the Washington Sensible Shorelines Association; the elevation for Phantom Lake is what the Phantom Lake homeowners asked for; and the elevation for Lake Washington is the same as for Mercer Island, as directed by the Commission. She said the static elevation approach represents one area of potential uncertainty with the Department of Ecology. A study was done previously to estimate lake level elevations for Lake Sammamish for the purpose of measuring setbacks, and the Department of Ecology accepted that approach. Similar studies have not been done for either Lake Washington or Phantom Lake, so what the reaction of the Department of Ecology will be is unknown. The bigger issue is that the elevations have been added to the authority section for purposes of measuring jurisdiction based on Commission direction.

Commissioner Laing pointed out that policy SH-66 continues to refer to a setback of 50 feet. Ms. Helland said she would make that correction.

Ms. Helland noted that the footprint exception was added in paragraph E.1.c following direction taken from Sammamish. It allows a 200-square-foot expansion of structures located within the setback.

The Commissioners were informed that the rest of section E from page 11 to page 19 contained deletions associated with the menu option to move from 50 feet to 25 feet. Establishing the setback at 25 feet obviated the provisions.

The new vegetation conservation provisions in paragraph F contains the cross reference to the citywide tree preservation standards. The vegetation conservation provisions in the previous draft were deleted from page 20 to 23.

The shoreline stabilization provision in paragraph G is simply a cross reference to section 20.25E.080. Paragraph H contains the residential moorage provisions concerning overwater structures. Ms. Helland said the public has testified that some revisions to the section are still necessary, but the direction from the Commission was to give deference to the federal agencies.

Ms. Helland noted that the nonconforming residential provisions are located in paragraph I. She noted that the only thing made nonconforming in the section is overwater structures in accord with the direction given staff by the Commission. The public may still have some issues with the documentation section, I.3. She explained that the document section was added to create applicant predictability.

Commissioner Sheffels pointed out that policy SH-106 refers to human-powered watercraft, while all other policies refer to non-motorized watercraft. Ms. Helland said she would review the language for consistency. She noted that kayaks and canoes as well as sailboats are non-motorized, but only the first two are human powered.

BREAK

Ms. Helland allowed that the policies are not as well refined and will need to be scrubbed and revised to align with where the Commission lands with respect to the overall draft.

Ms. Helland called attention to Section 20.25E.010 and noted that in paragraph B.2 identifies the components that are required by the guidelines to be included in the Shoreline Master Program, and noted which components are regulatory and which are non-regulatory.

Ms. Helland noted that paragraph C.2 and the subparagraphs include the reference to specific

elevations for purposes of measuring the shoreline jurisdiction and setbacks.

Ms. Helland informed the Commissioners that only a few changes had been made to the shoreline uses section. The Commission expressed concern about usability because the "P" in the box can lead users to believe that when something is permitted nothing more needs to be done, when the reality within the shoreline jurisdiction even permitted uses must meet the requirements of the Shoreline Management Act and the Shoreline Master Program; in many cases it is necessary to obtain a shoreline substantial development permit or an exemption.

It was noted that section 20.25E.040, nonconforming shoreline conditions, does not apply to residential. Ms. Helland said the section is primarily focused on the Belfield Office Park. A separate nonconforming section exists in the residential provisions.

Turning to Section 20.25E.050, Ms. Helland said the charts were changed to reflect the new residential shoreline structure setback. All of the footnotes were revised to remove references to vegetation conservation. Paragraph B.2 includes references to static elevations for each of the lakes from which to measure the shoreline jurisdiction and setbacks.

The regulations in 20.25E.050 mostly relate to non-residential development. There are parallel amendments in the section reflecting the changes made to the residential regulations.

With regard to Section 20.24E.060, Ms. Helland noted that the no net loss provisions in paragraph B were revised by direction of the Commission to remove superfluous language. The mitigation requirements in paragraph D were changed for consistency purposes. The paragraph title was changed from "Mitigation Sequencing" to "Mitigation Requirements and Sequencing" for clarity. Paragraph D.1 outlines when mitigation plans are required, and paragraph D.2 indicates when mitigation sequencing analysis is required.

Commissioner Ferris referred back to paragraph B.2 and asked what rebuttable presumption is. Ms. Helland explained that where all regulations have deemed to have been met, the no net loss requirements are also deemed to have been met.

Ms. Helland said the timing of mitigation installation in paragraph D.5.c included some clarification revisions. Clarifications were also made to paragraph D.5.h, restoration for areas of temporary construction disturbance.

Ms. Helland noted that all references to the "shoreline jurisdiction" were changed in paragraph E to "shoreline overlay district." She said the change was made in order to make the references more understandable.

Ms. Helland pointed out that some majors changes were made to paragraph I, public access. The requirement for public access to be provided in residential development and plats was removed. As redrafted, public access is required with respect to public projects. She said staff has no knowledge of any plan around Lake Washington or Lake Sammamish having been approved without a requirement for the provision of public access for plats of ten or more, so arguably that could be a fog line issue. She reminded the Commission that the guidelines flowed from a negotiated settlement, and there is still a large preference for demonstrating consistency with the guidelines.

Chair Carlson said he was intellectually curious how a requirement for public access could exist in light of the Supreme Court case Nolan vs California Coastal Commission. Ms. Helland said there is a nexus, though the requirement for public access in the guidelines is tied to subdivisions

of ten or more lots; subdivisions with ten or fewer lots are required only to provide community access. The city requires midblock connections and community public benefit for a lot of different types of development. The guidelines view subdivisions of ten or more lots as the threshold beyond which public access should be allowed.

Commissioner Laing said the guidelines anticipated such discussions and provide a fair amount of flexibility. The guidelines in fact include a lot of instances for opting out of providing public access. The fact is Bellevue provides a great deal of access to its shorelines for the public.

Commissioner Ferris said the argument could be made that Bellevue's built environment to some degree makes the guidelines not applicable. All of the fog line issues should be compiled, and the Commission should provide for each one an explanation for the Department of Ecology of how circumstances in Bellevue dictate taking a different approach. Ms. Helland said some of the rationale will be provided in the checklist that is required by the Department of Ecology.

Ms. Helland referred next to paragraph J.2.b and said absent direction from the Commission the staff took it upon themselves to address the issue of floating billboards. She explained that a proposal recently was made to Seattle by an individual to allow floating billboards in Lake Washington. Bellevue's sign code prohibits billboards, and the clarity edit brings forward the prohibition from the sign code. The Commissioners concurred with the change.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Tebelius about the tree retention requirements included in paragraph K.9, Ms. Helland said the Commission directed staff to remove the vegetation conservation area for residentially zoned properties, but did not direct staff to make the same change to the urban conservancy and urban conservancy open space designations, which are predominantly parks properties. Part of the rationale was that using parks almost like a mitigation bank, ensuring they have a higher value of vegetation retained, could help shore up the 25-foot setback applied to residential areas.

Commissioner Laing pointed out that paragraph K.1 makes it clear that the requirements of the section do not apply to residential development located in the shoreline jurisdictions, but paragraph K.2 said the requirements apply to, among other things, subdivisions, short subdivisions and planned unit developments. He also asked if the requirements apply to residential developments in the urban conservancy, urban conservancy open space, and recreational boating environments. Ms. Helland said the requirements are not applicable in the recreation boating environment, only to urban conservancy and urban conservancy open space. Mr. Inghram explained that subdivisions, short subdivisions and planned unit developments can occur in non-residential areas.

Commissioner Tebelius noted that the 20.25E.060 is titled "general requirements applicable to all shoreline development and uses." The implication is that the requirements apply to all development uses within the shoreline overlay district, which would include residential uses. Ms. Helland said the sections that do not apply to residential are specifically identified. She agreed to review each paragraph to make sure there is an indication of whether or not the requirements apply to residential uses or not.

Ms. Helland referred to section 20.25E.070 and said changes were made to paragraph C to allow additional flexibility for minor marina reconfigurations. The changes were made in response to comments received from the Meydenbauer Yacht Club. Changes were also made to paragraph E, utilities, where a clarity edit was made to make it clear the section does not apply to ancillary residential utility connections.

Commissioner Tebelius called attention to paragraph D.3.d and noted the reference to regional light rail alignments. She said it was her understanding that the City Council has retained jurisdiction for all issues relating to light rail. Ms. Helland confirmed that the memorandum of understanding retains for the Council jurisdiction for purposes of holding a public hearing prior to adoption of the ordinance.

Ms. Helland said the shoreline modification section, 20.25E.080, was revised primarily to remove the distinction between major and minor repair of bulkheads.

Commissioner Laing referred to paragraph D.2.a and noted that dredging is allowed to maintain navigability. He asked if the language is broad enough to allow a property owner to dredge in order to maintain their moorage on their dock. Ms. Helland said the intent is to allow dredging to maintain the depth necessary to accommodate a boat's keel. The work to remove sediment from the weir on Phantom Lake is not a navigation issue and is not dredging.

Ms. Helland said paragraph C.2 in 20.25E.100 procedures sections relates to submittal requirements. She said the change made to the paragraph provides clarity about the determination of completeness. No other substantive change were made to the section.

Commissioner Ferris called attention to the letter from the Parks and Community Services Board and the claim that the Commission failed to incorporate policy changes to the May 11 draft. He noted that comments have been received from other stakeholder groups as well and he asked to what extent staff have made applicable modifications based on those comments. Ms. Helland said a comment number was added to each comment received, and a summary of the comments was transmitted to the Commission. She said staff started down the path of looking at the individual comments but staff quickly found themselves overwhelmed. At the Commission retreat, the decision was made to take the issue approach, following which the Commission embarked on that course. The topics identified as the highest concern were reviewed first and specific direction was given to staff as the review progressed. The redraft includes only the direction specifically provided by the Commission, and as a result the document is the Commission's draft. Each person who provided comments was given notice regarding the release of the redraft; the hope is that anyone having a concern will reengage. The Parks and Community Services Board letter is evidence of their reengagement. Many of the original comments submitted no longer apply given the new direction the redraft takes.

Commissioner Ferris suggested the Commission should at least look at the language submitted by the Parks and Community Services Board regarding three specific policies. Ms. Helland said that could be done with a comment balloon when the policies are reviewed.

The Commissioners agreed that an additional Commission meeting on July 18 would not be necessary.

The Commissioners thanked the staff for their hard work.

Commissioner Ferris commented that four years worth of process and thinking have gone into the document, some of which could be lost when the package is handed off to the Council. The fog line issues and the context of the urban environment certainly have influenced the Commission's thinking. The Commission also now has the benefit of other city's having had their Shoreline Master Program's approved by the Department of Ecology, which the Commission did not have when the process began. To the extent the matrix outlines how the Commission supported the individual issues, it could be very helpful to the Council and to the Department of Ecology.

Chairman Carlson agreed that the citations will serve as more than just a good study guide; they will be excellent reference points for the Council and the Department of Ecology staff.

Ms. Helland said in preparing for the next round the draft will be clean but will include the attached comments. It will then be used as a roadmap for the Council to follow.

8. OTHER BUSINESS – None

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Anita Skoog-Neil, 9302 SE Shoreland Drive, said it would be helpful for the public to know the order the subsequent reviews will follow. She said Charlie Klinge will be providing input regarding the hybrid permit process.

10. APPROVAL of MINUTES

After making minor changes to the draft minutes for June 13, 2012 Commissioner Sheffels moved to approve them as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

11. NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

A. July 25, 2012

12. ADJOURN

Commissioner Tebelius moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Carlson adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Paul Inghram
Staff to the Planning Commission

10/10/12
Date

John Carlson
Chairman of the Planning Commission

10-10-12
Date

* Approved and corrected September 12, 2012