



# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, April 19, 2018  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chamber · Shoreline City Hall  
17500 Midvale Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98122

Estimated Time

- |  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>1. CALL TO ORDER</b>  | 7:00 |
| a. Swearing in Ceremony for Re-Appointed Planning Commissioner |      |
| <b>2. ROLL CALL</b>  | 7:07 |
| <b>3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b>                                   | 7:08 |
| <b>4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>                                  | 7:09 |
| a. <a href="#">April 5, 2018 Draft Minutes</a>                 |      |

## **Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission**

*During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the podium to have their comments recorded, state their first and last name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.*

- |  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT</b>   | 7:10 |
| <b>6. STUDY ITEMS:</b>   | 7:15 |
| a. <a href="#">Development Code Amendment – Community Residential Facilities</a> |      |
| <b>7. DIRECTOR’S REPORT</b>  | 8:00 |
| <b>8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>  | 8:11 |
| <b>9. NEW BUSINESS</b>   | 8:12 |
| <b>10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES &amp;<br/>    COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>       | 8:13 |
| <b>11. AGENDA FOR MAY 3, 2018 Public Hearing</b>                                 | 8:14 |
| <b>12. ADJOURNMENT</b>   | 8:15 |

*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*

**DRAFT**  
**CITY OF SHORELINE**

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

April 5, 2018  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

**Commissioners Present**

Chair Craft  
Vice Chair Montero  
Commissioner Davis  
Commissioner Lin  
Commissioner Malek

**Staff Present**

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development  
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney  
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

**Commissioners Absent**

Commissioner Mork  
Commissioner Maul

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Craft called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

**SWEARING IN CEREMONY FOR NEWLY APPOINTED PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Director Markle swore in new Commissioners Davis and Lin and reappointed Commissioner Malek. On behalf of the Commission, Chair Craft thanked them for their willingness to serve the citizens of Shoreline.

**ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by Ms. Hoekzema the following Commissioners were present: Chair Craft, Vice Chair Montero and Commissioners Davis, Lin, and Malek. Commissioners Maul and Mork were absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of March 1, 2018 were approved as submitted.

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Betsy Robertson, Shoreline**, said she lives in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood and is currently serving as chair of the Shoreline Parks Board. She said she and her neighbors are present in response to an application that was filed this week by the Sante Group in reference to four parcels surrounding the Anderson House on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The request is to upzone the parcels to a CB-2 category. The neighborhood is strongly opposed to the proposed rezone, and they do not feel that CB-2 zoning is appropriate for property that is immediately adjacent to a single-family neighborhood. A large number of residents attended a neighborhood meeting hosted by the Sante Group last week. The applicant claims that if the land is not upzoned, it would not be appealing to any developer and would eventually turn to vagrancy. The neighborhood feels there must be some type of “in between” zoning that would be more appropriate. The neighborhood is interested in seeing a very specific plan for their intentions first, which the applicant is not proposing to do until after the upzone has been approved. The neighbors are concerned that there is not enough transparency as to the applicant’s intentions for the property. The applicant appears to be playing on the community’s need for more senior housing. She is aware that the City of Shoreline has a larger number of senior citizens than any other community in King County, and senior housing is an important topic as the City moves forward. However, it should be done wisely. Again, she said the neighbors surrounding the Anderson Home property are very much against the proposed upzone.

**Kristina Kaempfer, Shoreline**, said she also lives in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. She was present to seek clarification about the proposed Ashley House Project that was the topic of discussion at the Commission’s March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. She reviewed that, at the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, it was stated that the purpose of low-density residential (R-4 and R-6) is to provide for a mix of predominately single-family, detached dwelling units and other development types such as accessory dwelling units and community facilities that are compatible with existing development and neighborhood character. She asked if the Ashley House project would be similar to the homes on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue that were constructed by a company called Ambitions. She asked if these businesses would be similar to the building that was constructed east of Walgreens on 15<sup>th</sup> and 175<sup>th</sup>. She noted that this type of building takes up a lot of land with large parking lots. She asked if homes would be removed from neighborhoods to accommodate these uses.

Chair Craft invited Ms. Kaempfer to stay for the study session, which might address the questions she raised. If she has additional questions, he encouraged her to visit the City’s website or contact staff.

**STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT – COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES (STUDY SESSION #2)**

Mr. Cohen advised that this study session is a continuation of the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on the topic of Community Residential Facilities (CRFs). The amendment was initiated by a private property owner to allow CRF-IIs in the R-4 and R-6 zones, with the use of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process. Currently, CRF-Is are permit with a CUP in these zones, but CRF-IIs are not. He reviewed that CRF-IIs are defined as facilities that allow residents to function as a single household to provide support for counseling, rehabilitation and medical supervision with 11 or more residents and staff. They are currently allowed in R-8 and higher zones. The study of this topic has expanded a bit because there are two other land uses that are similar: Adult Family Homes (AFHs) and Nursing Homes (NHs). AFHs are regulated by the State rather than the City. They are single-unit homes that can house up to 6 residents and staff.

**DRAFT**

Because the City does not regulate this use, they do not know the exact number that exist in the City currently, but most of them are in single-family zones. NHs are allowed in zones R-18 and above. A CUP is required for the use to be located in R-18 and R-48, but a CUP is not required for the use to be located in commercial zones.

Mr. Cohen explained that CRF-IIs are not allowed in the R-4 and R-6 zones because they allow an unlimited number of residents, which can have more impact to neighborhoods. A side issue is that CRFs are not that much different than AFHs, except they can have a bit more capacity. CRF-Is can have up to 10 residents and CRF-IIs can have 11 or more.

Mr. Cohen said that, aside from the private amendment, staff found that this code section was in need of updating to provide clearer definitions and criteria, especially as the population is aging and may need more facilities.

Mr. Cohen recalled that, at the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Commission requested additional information, which was provided in the Staff Report. Specifically, staff provided information from other jurisdictions that allow NHs, AFHs, and Residential Care Facilities (RCFs), which is the new name staff is proposing for CRFs. The Staff Report also clarifies that the State allows a maximum of 6 residents plus staff, which is more restrictive than the City's current definition of "family."

Mr. Cohen advised that, at the last meeting, staff presented three options for the Commission to consider:

- **Option 1** is the applicant's proposed amendment, which would change Table 20.40.120 so that CRF-IIs would be allowed in the R-4 and R-6 zones with approval of a CUP.
- **Option 2** is proposed by staff. This option would combine CRF-I and CRF-II into a more limited land use category called Residential Care Facilities (RCFs). As per this option, RCFs would be allowed in the R-4, R-6, R-8 and R-12 zones, but a CUP would be required. This option would also add index criteria to address standards for parking and signage, require a 1,000-foot separation between RCFs, and limit occupancy to a maximum of 15 residents based on bedroom size. In addition, definitions would be added for AFHs and Nursing and Personal Care Facilities (NPCFs), and AFHs would be added as an allowed use in the Land Use Table.
- **Option 3** leaves the Development Code unchanged and addresses the topic of RCFs with other housing issues in the future. The Commission has previously discussed the need to address issue of housing choices in residential zones, and RCFs could be included in that discussion. However, there is no schedule for when this discussion would take place.

Mr. Cohen said staff is recommending Option 2, which would fill the personal care gap, clarify other related uses and provide clearer RCF parameters. However, they are also open to Option 3, which would include the topic as part of a broader discussion of residential zone housing options. He advised that the amendment is currently scheduled for a public hearing on May 3<sup>rd</sup>, at which time the Commission will forward a recommendation to the City Council. In the meantime, staff will further clarify the definition of nursing homes at the Commission's April 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. It is anticipated that the amendment will go before the City Council for discussion and a final decision in early summer.

DRAFT

Vice Chair Montero asked if staff's logic for recommending Option 2 instead of Option 3 is related to the applicant's desire to move forward with the proposed CRF-II use. Mr. Cohen clarified that Option 3 was provided in case the Commission feels the code amendment is not ready or is bigger than they want to make a decision on at this time. Given its potential impact to residential zones, it might be better to fold the proposed amendment into a broader community discussion.

For the benefit of the new Commissioners, Chair Craft reviewed that, as the City worked through the 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Station Area Subarea Plan processes, it was clear that the residents want to be fully included in discussions relative to proposed changes that might impact residential neighborhoods. He asked Mr. Cohen to elaborate on the components of single-family residential zones that the Commission has discussed in the past or plans to discuss at some point in the future.

Mr. Cohen explained that all zones in the City are labeled as either single-family or commercial, and there is a range of uses that are considered compatible within each zone. Other types of uses that are currently permitted in single-family residential zones include utility yards, parks, fire stations, police stations, schools, churches, daycares, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), AFHs, etc. Many of these other uses require a CUP. The CUP criteria is intended to address issues of compatibility with the surrounding uses.

Mr. Cohen reviewed that the staff, City Council and Planning Commission have been compiling a list of the other types of housing choices that should be considered for the residential zones for a number of years. This list includes ADUs, microhousing, cottage housing, tiny homes, etc. The basic intent is to have a broad community discussion about all of the ideas at some point in the future. However, the discussion has not been scheduled yet.

Commissioner Malek said he supports the idea of approaching the community for feedback, but he questioned if it would be appropriate to group all of the different ideas into one discussion. Mr. Cohen said the idea was that all of the options could have impacts on the single-family neighborhoods. Rather than making piecemeal changes one issue at a time, it might be better to discuss all of the potential changes to residential zones at the same time.

Chair Craft noted that a multitude of housing types were addressed as part of the station area subarea planning work, and the question is whether or not this same effort would be appropriate for the single-family residential zones, too. This would provide an opportunity for the City to update the code to better addresses design standards, uses, etc. Feedback the Commission has received from the citizens is that more community outreach is needed before changes are made that impact them. Having a broader discussion about housing options in single-family neighborhoods would be a good way to accomplish this goal.

Commissioner Davis asked about the timeline for moving forward with this broader discussion of housing choices in single-family residential zones. Director Markle answered that it has been included on the 2019 work plan. Commissioner Davis said she assumes this discussion would include all uses that require a CUP. Mr. Cohen said the discussion would focus on housing choices, but the existing conditional uses could also be included in the discussion.

Commissioner Lin asked if the zoning requirements would be different depending on the type of use. Mr. Cohen answered that all of the uses are required to meet the same development standards. However, it may be possible to modify the requirements via a CUP or variance. The idea of a CUP is to mitigate the potential impacts to make the uses more compatible to adjacent uses. Commissioner Lin asked if the residential zones have limitations on the amount of impervious surface allowed, and Mr. Cohen answered affirmatively.

**David Chen, Shoreline**, said he lives in the Echo Lake Neighborhood, about three blocks from the applicant's subject proposal. He is a proponent of the conversation around changing the Land Use Table to allow RCFs in single-family zones. The issue is really about code versus the CUP. He is a proponent of looking at the code and allowing that to be the bare bones of having the conversation to move the CUP. The character of the actual neighborhood would be addressed as part of a CUP, which could mitigate to address impacts such as parking. The applicant's home is located near his. It is a 12-bedroom home with two commercial kitchens. It is not terribly appropriate for a typical single-family use. As residents of the area, he believes it would be appropriate to allow the code change so the home to be occupied rather than vacant.

**Ken Maaz, Fife**, said he was present to represent the applicant, Ashley House. He reviewed that Ashley House is a non-profit organization that has existed for 30 years. During that time, it has provided care for medically-fragile children in residential settings. Its goals are to provide transition from hospitals to family homes by providing respite care, short-term end-of-life care, and long-term care. Ashley House recently entered into an agreement with Seattle Children's Hospital to provide a very unique, one-of-a-kind program that will strictly provide transition for children who have been in the hospital, some for many months, back to their homes. They would work with the families and the doctors at Seattle Children's Hospital to provide this transition. He emphasized that it is important to Ashley House that all work is done in a family, homelike setting. It is not an institution, and it does not look for properties in commercial areas because it is important that families can see themselves caring for the children in homelike settings.

Mr. Maaz said the property in Shoreline is unique, and it took some vision to see that it could meet their needs. The home has 12 large bedrooms and was previously a boarding home for college students. The City's zoning code provides for up to 8 unrelated adults plus their children to reside in a single-family home. If facilities such as this are used as per the current zoning code, they could accommodate up to 24 people. The applicant is asking to participate in a CUP so that the immediate neighborhood can understand what they want to do and express their concerns so they can be mitigated. He expressed his belief that Option 2 would serve the applicant's purpose, as well as the purpose of others who wish to contribute to positive housing in Shoreline. It would also allow for the neighborhood and other neighborhoods in Shoreline to have adequate input into what is in their neighborhoods.

Mr. Maaz said Ashley House understands that the proposed amendment would apply more broadly than just this one property, but time is important to them. He encouraged the Commission to take action now rather than later when the concept might be grouped with a broader discussion of housing options. He expressed his belief that the index criteria included in Option 2 are reasonable and would allow for programs such as Ashley House's proposal to exist in a way that would be congruent with the neighborhood, as well as achieve the efficiencies that are needed in terms of care and finances. He said

the amendment is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and would not be deleterious to neighborhoods. In fact, he suggested it would enhance the opportunity for neighborhoods to be involved.

Chair Craft observed that Option 3 would not address the applicant's request until next year, at the earliest. However, Option 1 is too far reaching in many ways. He suggested the Commission focus on Option 2. He asked Mr. Cohen to compare Option 2 with the current code and point out what the proposed amendment would mean for single-family residential zones.

Mr. Cohen said Option 2 would convert the CRF-I and CRF-II designations into a single designation called Residential Care Facility (RCF). Staff believes that RCF better describes the use. As per Option 2, a CUP would be required for RCFs in R-4 through R-12 zones. Chair Craft asked what is currently allowed in R-4 and R-6 zones. Mr. Cohen said that, currently, AFHs (up to 6 residents plus staff) are allowed by State law and CRF-Is are allowed in R-4 through R-12 zones with CUP. CRF-IIs are not permitted in the R-4 and R-6 zones but are conditionally permitted in the R-8 and R-12 zones. They are outright permitted in all zones above R-12. In addition, the following index criteria would be adopted into code:

- RCFs in the R-4 and R-6 zones would have a maximum occupancy of 15 residents plus staff and occupancy would be based on bedroom size per the Washington Administrative Code.
- Required parking must be located on site and screened from adjacent residential uses through a solid fence or wall. One parking space would be required for every three patients, as well as one space for each staff on duty. If more than 6 parking spaces are required, the spaces above 6 must be located in an enclosed structure.
- RCFs must be separated by at least 1,000 feet.
- Signage for the use must meet the current residential sign standards.

Vice Chair Montero commented that RCF is a broad term for a variety of care types. As currently proposed, a facility with 15 patients would require 5 parking spaces for the patients, as well as additional spaces for staff. He asked if it is feasible to have 7 or 8 spaces on a single property in the R-4 and R-6 zones. Mr. Cohen said the idea is to require adequate parking so that the surrounding residential community is not impacted. It may be necessary to combine lots to obtain the needed space.

Commissioner Davis agreed that the parking requirements are strong, which might motivate someone to join parcels to get enough space for parking. If that were the case, would the CUP process take this into account? Mr. Cohen answered affirmatively. He agreed that a much larger parcel might be required, not only to provide adequate parking, but to meet the single-family development standards, as well.

Chair Craft noted that staff has indicated a desire to continue the study session to April 19 so they can provide additional clarification on the NCPF designation. Mr. Cohen said staff wants to be clear about what this use is to clean up any overlaps with the RCF designation.

Commissioner Malek observed that parking is what will really regulate RCF uses in residential zones, and it is not possible to build condominium style structures in single-family zones. Mr. Cohen agreed that RCFs would have to comply with the dimensional standards for the residential zones, and the parking

standards would be greater. Mr. Cohen said the intent is to allow care facilities in all zones, but the scale of the project would be different based on the zone in which it is located.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Markle presented the presentation that was shown to the Council of Neighborhoods in March. It is an expanded version of her usual development report and focuses primarily on development that occurred in 2017.

#### **Multi-family and mixed-use projects finished or started in 2017.**

- The Commission toured the Aurora Micro Apartments at their retreat.
- The Sunrise 11 Apartments in the Ballinger Neighborhood were completed in 2017. This 6-story development includes 60 units, almost 69,000 square feet and 54 parking spaces.
- The Ronald Commons Project was finished in 2017. It is a 5-story, true affordable housing project serving low to very low-income families. It also has 12,500 square feet of commercial space for Hopelink, foodbank, meeting rooms and services.
- A permit has been issued for High Hill Apartments on Firlands Way, and the project is currently under construction. This will be a 5-story, 33-unit project, with 25 parking spaces.
- A 3-story, 16-unit residential project is currently under construction on 145<sup>th</sup> near Bothell Way in the MUR-45' zone. It has surface as opposed to underground parking.
- The Pace Line Project is currently under construction. It will be a 6-story, 221-unit building, with some commercial space. The building will be oriented towards the Interurban Trail.
- A permit has been issued for the Vale Apartments, which will be a 7-story, mixed-use building where the old Interurban Brick Building was previously located. The project will provide 195 units, with commercial space on the ground floor. This will be the first project in Town Center.
- An application was submitted for the Alexan Project, and permits should be issued soon. The project has been under review for a while and will probably be the first building constructed in the Shoreline Place area. The 5-story building will host 309 units, 300 parking spaces, 199 bike parking spaces, a common courtyard and some retail space. A number of right-of-way improvements leading up to the entry of Shoreline Place are planned and the City is capitalizing on the fact that this project will have to do improvements on Westminster. The City is working closely with the applicant to leverage this opportunity.
- The Ballinger Apartments are currently under construction and will be a 5-story, 72-unit project with some rooftop amenities.
- The building on the old post office site is also under construction. The project will consist of two, 5-story buildings with 243 units. It will have a nice corner orientation and be built to commercial standards along the street front. Although the ground floor space is not currently planned for commercial, it could easily be converted if and when the market changes.
- The Arabella II Project is finally underway with a permit, as is another small-unit apartment on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- The Shoreline Community College has submitted a permit for on-campus dormitories. They are hoping the permit will be issued as soon as possible so the project can get started. The project will be a 5-story, 68-unit building that equates to 216 beds to house students on campus.
- In 2017, 219 multi-family units and 60 single-family units were constructed.



Chair Craft noted that the Alexon Project will provide 309 units and only 297 parking spaces. The expectation is that some residents will use nearby public transportation and not have cars, but that has not necessarily been the case with other projects in the community. He asked how the City will address community concerns that parking will spill out into surrounding neighborhoods if there is insufficient on-site parking. Director Markle said the project meets the Development Code requirements. However, at some point the City will need to look at the parking standards, as a whole, and changes may be needed. There are plans to do a parking study in the station subareas that will identify the current parking situations, as well as what the anticipated parking needs will be once the station is fully operational. At this time, there isn't a parking plan in place for the Alexon Project or Shoreline Place in general. When an applicant requests a parking reduction, even when a project is on a transit route, staff considers the risk associated with residents parking in the adjacent neighborhoods. In many cases, it would be very inconvenient for people to park in the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, the code requires that the cost of parking must be rolled into the rent.

### **Commercial projects finished or started in 2017.**

- Habit Burger and Starbucks were both completed in 2017.
- Several storage facilities were constructed in 2017, including West Coast Self Storage at 145<sup>th</sup> and Bothell Way and West Coast Self Storage at 165<sup>th</sup> and Aurora Avenue North, both of which predated the City's new design standards for storage facilities. Other storage facilities completed in 2017 include Ballinger Self Storage and Shoreline Self Storage.
- Lumber Liquidators was added in the Shoreline Place area.
- An application was received for a Starbucks on Aurora Avenue North at 152<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Director Markle advised that, with the adoption of the 2008 Housing Strategy, the City Council has been interested in diversifying the City's housing stock to include different types of single-family homes, and townhomes are one option for accomplishing this goal. Townhomes allow for a single-family lifestyle and homeownership or rental without as much property to maintain. Shoreline's townhome-supportive zones are closer to urban assets like shopping, entertainment and transportation options. While not affordable, townhomes cost less than most new single-family homes in Shoreline.

### **Townhomes projects finished or started in 2017.**

- Glenwood Homes is the first project to be completed in the station area. It features five, 3-story townhomes that are being offered fee simple. Each unit is almost 2,000 square feet.
- A permit was issued for a 4-townhome project on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and another permit was issued on 185<sup>th</sup> Street for two, 4-unit buildings.
- An application was received for a 6-unit townhome project on 199<sup>th</sup> Street.
- There are 44 other townhomes that are currently in the permit phase.

### **School District projects finished or started in 2017.**

- The City is currently reviewing an application for the Parkwood Elementary School project.
- Remodeling was done at North City Elementary to accommodate students while they are moved out of other elementary schools.
- A permit has been issued for a new Early Learning Center.

## 4a. Draft Minutes from Thursday, April 5, 2018

- Permits were issued to improve Aldercrest Elementary to use while other schools are being rebuilt or remodeled.
- Two new middle schools (Einstein and Kellogg) will be constructed, but the City has not received the applications yet.

Director Markle advised that the School District has paid the City to expedite the permit review for their projects, and the goal is to have an 8-week turn around time. Chair Craft asked when the City expects to start construction on the new buildings. Director Markle said the school district is ready to start the projects as soon as permits have been issued. She expects that the permit for Parkwood Elementary will be issued within the next month, and applications for the two middle schools are expected soon. Mr. Cohen said the school district intends to start construction on Einstein Middle School this fall using a 4-phase approach.

### **Commercial remodel projects finished or started in 2017.**

- Parkwood Plaza is receiving a facelift and some improvements for outdoor seating.
- The King County Housing Authority is continuing to invest money in Shoreline, with permits every year to improve their facilities.
- Half Barrell Brewing Company is coming to the former Spay and Neuter Clinic across from Safeway.
- Fred Meyer is doing an interior remodel and adding a drive-thru at the pharmacy.

### **Other development projects in the pre-application phase.**

- The Shoreline Community College Allied Health Building received state funding to move forward.
- Redevelopment of the Sears building is supposedly coming in for permits in late 2018.
- A 100-unit project has been proposed at 195<sup>th</sup> and Aurora Avenue North.
- A 244-unit mixed use building is also planned at 190<sup>th</sup> and Aurora Avenue North.
- A project with a range of units (163 to 254) has been proposed on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- A project with 101 units is proposed on 145<sup>th</sup> Street.
- A project with 22 townhomes is proposed for 185<sup>th</sup>.
- A project with 84 townhomes has been proposed near the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station.
- There are a smattering of other smaller town home projects in the works, as well.

Director Markle summarized that in 2017, over 2,000 permit applications were processed by the Department of Planning and Community Development, and about 2,000 permits were issued. The Department performed 4,672 inspections and had the largest revenue year ever in the history of Shoreline. The total revenue was \$2,523,154, which equates to an evaluation of new construction of \$120 million.

Director Markle reviewed the subcategory breakdown for additions/remodels and construction, noting that most of the revenue came from new construction. In October, November, and December there is routinely a push for permits to get in, and this is sometimes driven by new codes or impact fees coming on line January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Director Markle provided a handout to illustrate activity that occurred in March of 2018. She noted that the Shoreline Fire Department's new station is moving along. In addition, T. P. Homes, LLC intended to

**DRAFT**

City of Shoreline  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
April 5, 2018 Page 9

build two sets of townhomes, but one was withdrawn. Because of all the overlapping regulations, they weren't able to achieve the desired density. This may be what the regulations were supposed to do, but they will be reviewing how all of these requirements fit together and whether or not they support the City's vision.

Director Markle reported that the City received a rezone application from the Ashley House, and a pre-application meeting was held on March 7<sup>th</sup>. Rezones go before the City Council and not the Planning Commission.

**Erick Merklinghaus, Shoreline**, asked how many parking stalls would be provided for the project at the old post office site. Director Markle did not have that information available but agreed to provide a response to Mr. Merklinghaus.

Commissioner Lin asked what makes Shoreline such a significant attraction for self-storage commercial uses. Director Markle said it appears that the number can be tied to the significant increase in the number of multi-family units. Prior to the recent rush of modern self-storage construction, there were none of these facilities in Shoreline. The industry indicated that the demand was high in Shoreline, Lake Forest Park and Edmonds.

Commissioner Davis asked if any of the multi-family projects came in under the new MUR zones in the 145<sup>th</sup> or 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subareas. Director Markle answered none were in the MUR-70' zone. It was anticipated that it would take longer to get that.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Ms. Hoekzema briefly reviewed the procedure for electing officers and then opened the floor for nominations for Planning Commission Chair.

**COMMISSIONER MALEK NOMINATED COMMISSIONER MONTERO TO SERVE AS PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS AND NOMINATIONS WERE CLOSED. THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY ELECTED COMMISSIONER MONTERO AS CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

Chair Montero opened the floor for nominations for Planning Commission Vice Chair.

**COMMISSIONER CRAFT NOMINATED COMMISSIONER MORK TO SERVE AS PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS AND NOMINATIONS WERE CLOSED. THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY ELECTED COMMISSIONER MORK AS VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

**DRAFT**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Malek reported that the Point Wells Subcommittee attended a Snohomish County Design Review for the Point Wells Project in its current state. The applicant was not prepared to discuss the parking and traffic elements, and these were postponed to a future date. Although the review committee did not find the plan unacceptable, they felt there was insufficient information to make a firm decision. They made several recommendations, but no concrete decisions were made. They reviewed a variety of light standards and potential impacts to existing homes. A number of citizens spoke and most voiced concern about height and traffic impacts. It was discussed that the applicant plans to do multiple heights and designs to create a custom feel. However, the designs were very limited in scope.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor advised that Snohomish County has requested a hearing, which is slated to start on May 16<sup>th</sup> and will last about two weeks. The decision is supposed to be rendered by June 30<sup>th</sup> unless the decision date is extended by the Hearing Examiner. The applicant went before the Hearing Examiner a few weeks ago to challenge the Planning Director’s denial of the request for extension. The Hearing Examiner denied jurisdiction, stating that he didn’t have the authority at this point in time to grant that extension. He did denote that when the project comes to hearing in mid-May, the applicant could request an extension again, and the Hearing Examiner would have jurisdictions because the actual application would be before him.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

It was discussed that the Commission would continue its study session on the Residential Community Facility amendment at their April 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, in preparation for a public hearing on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

---

Easton Craft  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Carla Hoekzema  
Clerk, Planning Commission

**6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities**

Planning Commission Meeting Date: April 19, 2018

Agenda Item: 6a.

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON**

**AGENDA TITLE:** Development Code Amendment – Community Residential Facilities Study Session #3

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning & Community Development

**PRESENTED BY:** Paul Cohen, Planning Manager  
Steven Szafran, AICP, Senior Planner

Public Hearing  
 Discussion

Study Session  
 Update

Recommendation  
 Other

**Introduction**

A non-resident property owner, the Ashley House, has applied for a privately-initiated code amendment to SMC 20.40.120 to allow a Community Residential Facility II (CRF-II) to be located in the R-4 and R-6 zones (low density residential) subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) as provided in SMC 20.30.300.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments to the Community Residential Facilities (CRF-II) on March 1 and April 5, 2018.

The staff report and attachments for the March 1 meeting can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showdocument?id=37315>

The staff report and attachments for the April 5 meeting can be found here:

<http://www.shorelinewa.gov/home/showdocument?id=38517>

With these presentations, Staff presented the Planning Commission with three (3) options:

Option 1 – Permit CFR-II as a conditional use in the R-4 and R-6 zones.

Option 2 - Amend the code to rename the CRF use to Residential Care Facility (RCF); possibly allow RCFs in the R 4 to R-12 zones as a Conditional Use; add index criteria and separation requirements.

Option 3 - Do not amend the code at this time but consider the topic in the future with other housing issues.

Approved By:

Project Manager 

Planning Director 

## 6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

At the above meetings, the Commission heard testimony about Shoreline's need to provide skilled nursing care to a wide variety of people and ages outside of a hospital setting.

At the April 5 meeting, staff acknowledged that they had attempted to provide clear definitions of Adult Family Homes (AFH), Residential Care Facilities (RCF), and Nursing and Personal Care some internal inconsistencies remained. Though Options 1 and 3 remain the same, tonight staff will propose new amendments in Option 2 that update definitions, clarify "personal care", and, as a result, add a new land use category for "Residential Treatment Facilities".

**Option 2** - The key to these changes (grey tones) shown below in the recommended amendments are:

- Change the term of "Nursing and Personal Care" to "Nursing Facility" to remove possible similarities and confusion with RCF, AFH, and the NAICS reference number.
- Modify the RCF definition to clarify that "Residential Treatment Facility" is not included using updated and consistent terminology.
- Add the land use and definition for "Residential Treatment Facility" as a permitted use in Mixed Business (MB) zones since it is not allowed in any of the proposed land uses.

### **Adult Family Home**

A residential home in which a person or persons provide personal care, special care, room, and board to more than one but not more than six adults who are not related by blood or marriage to the person or persons providing the services and licensed by the State pursuant to Chapter 70.128 RCW, as amended.

### **Nursing Homes and Personal Care Facility**

Any place that operates or maintains facilities providing convalescent or chronic care, for 24 consecutive hours for any number of patients not related by blood or marriage to the operator, who by reason of illness or infirmity, are unable properly to care for themselves. Convalescent and chronic care may include but not be limited to any or all procedures commonly employed to people who are sick, such as administration of medicines, preparation of special diets, giving of bedside nursing care, application of dressings and bandages, and carrying out of treatment prescribed by a licensed practitioner of the healing arts. It may also include care of mentally challenged persons. Nothing in this definition shall be construed to include general hospitals or other places which provide care and treatment for the acutely ill and maintain and operate facilities for major surgery or obstetrics, or both. Nothing in this definition shall be construed to include any boarding

**6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities**

home, guest home, hotel or related institution which is held forth to the public as providing, and which is operating to give only board, room and laundry to persons not in need of medical or nursing treatment or supervision except in the case of temporary acute illness. Any place or institution such as a hospital, sanitarium, or any other similar name, which does not provide care for the acutely ill and maintain and operate facilities for major surgery or obstetrics, or both, shall not exclude such place or institution from the provisions of this Code; provided, that any nursing home providing psychiatric treatment shall, with respect to patients receiving such treatment, comply with the provisions of RCW 71.12.560 and 71.12.570.

**Community Residential Facility (CRF)**

~~Living quarters meeting applicable Federal and State standards that function as a single housekeeping unit and provide supportive services, including but not limited to counseling, rehabilitation and medical supervision, excluding drug and alcohol detoxification which is classified as health services. CRFs are further classified as follows:~~

~~A. CRF-I— Nine to 10 residents and staff;~~

~~B. CRCF—Eleven or more residents and staff.~~

~~If staffed by nonresident staff, each 24 staff hours per day equals one full-time staff member for purposes of subclassifying CRFs. CRFs shall not include Secure Community Transitional Facilities (SCTF).~~

**Residential Care Facility (RCF)**

A state licensed facility that provides, on a regular basis, personal care, including dressing and eating and health-related care and services for not more than 15 functionally disabled persons and which is not licensed under RCW Chapter 70.128. A residential care facility shall not provide the degree of care and treatment that a hospital provides.

**Residential Treatment Facility**

A facility in which 24 hour on-site care is provided for the evaluation, stabilization, or treatment of residents for substance use, mental health, or co-occurring disorders. The facility includes rooms for social, educational, and recreational activities, sleeping, treatment, visitation, dining, toileting, and bathing.

**TABLE 20.40.120 Residential Uses**

**6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities**

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
<b>GROUP RESIDENCES</b>									
	<u>Adult Family Home</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>				
	Boarding House	C-i	C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
	<u>Residential Care Facility-Community Residential Facility-I</u>	<u>C-i</u>	<u>C-i</u> <u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
	<u>Community Residential Facility-II</u>		<u>C</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>	<u>P-i</u>

**Table 20.40.140 Other Uses**

NAICS #	SPECIFIC USE	R4-R6	R8-R12	R18-R48	TC-4	NB	CB	MB	TC-1, 2 & 3
<b>HEALTH</b>									
622	Hospital			C-i	C-i	C-i	P-i	P-i	P-i
6215	Medical Lab						P	P	P
6211	Medical Office/Outpatient Clinic			C-i	C-i	P	P	P	P
623	Nursing and Personal Care Facility			C	C	P	P	P	P
	<u>Residential Treatment Facility</u>							<u>P</u>	



**6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities**

**20.40.150 Campus uses.**

NAICS #	SPECIFIC LAND USE	CCZ	FCZ	PHZ	SCZ
623	Nursing Facility and Personal Care Facilities	P-m	P-m		P-m
P-m = Permitted Use with approved Master Development Plan					

**20.40.280 Residential Care Facilities Community residential facilities I and II**

Repealed by Ord. 352.

Residential Care Facilities are permitted in the R-4, R-6, R-8, and R-12 zones with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit and permitted in the R-18, R-24, R-48 and TC-4 zones provided:

1. The number of residents shall be based on bedroom size. Patient bedroom size requirements must comply with WAC 388-97-2440, as amended. In any case, the total number of residents shall not exceed 15.
2. An RCF must be 1,000 feet from an existing RCF (measured in a straight line from property line to property line).
3. Parking must be located onsite, screened from adjacent residential uses through a solid six-foot high fence or wall, and one parking space for every three patients, plus one space for each staff on duty shall be provided.
4. No more than six parking spaces may be located outside. If more than six parking spaces are required or provided, those spaces above six must be located in an enclosed structure.
5. Signs are limited to Residential sign standards in Table 20.50.540(G).

WAC 388-97-2440 provides for a square footage analysis of the minimum usable room space a nursing home should ensure for each bed. To reflect the fact that some residential structures are bigger than others and provides for a maximum total number of residents that may be less than the permitted maximum of 15.

**Staff Recommendation**

The City should provide the possibility for Residential Care Facilities in all zones appropriate to the scale and impacts of each zone. This can be accomplished by allowing Adult Family Homes, Residential Care Facilities, and Nursing Homes with the Development Code amendments proposed in this staff report.

Staff recommends either Option 2 - amend the code as updated above or Option 3 - maintain the status quo for further study, as described in this staff report. The Applicant’s proposed Option 1, the allowance for a CRF-II in the single-family neighborhoods R-4 and R-6 zoning districts with no residency maximums, has the potential to adversely affect health, safety, and general welfare. However, staff proposed Option 2 is timely and tailored to protect the single-family neighborhoods and yet allow Residential Care Facilities in the residential zones with conditions.

## 6a. Staff Report - Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities

---

### Next Steps

The Development Code amendment schedule is as follows:

May 3	Commission Public Hearing
June 2018	Council Discussion
July 2018	Council Adoption

---

### Attachments

Attachment A – Applicant’s Application

Attachment B – Adult Family Homes in Shoreline

Please complete the following: **Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A**

Applicant for Amendment THE ASHLEY HOUSE - KEN MAAZ  
Address 18904 BURKE AVE N. City SHORELINE State WA Zip 98133  
Phone 206-679-4971 Email KMAAZ@ASHLEYHOUSEKIDS.COM

PLEASE SPECIFY: Shoreline Development Code Chapter 2.40 Section 20.40.120

**AMENDMENT PROPOSAL:** Please describe your amendment proposal

To allow Residential-II uses to be considered for appropriateness in R-4-R-6 zones through the Conditional Use process.



**REASON FOR AMENDMENT:** Please describe your amendment proposal

Currently Residential-I facilities are allowed in R-4-R-6 zones through a Conditional Use process. The only difference between Residential-I and Residential-II facilities is the potential number of occupants, Residential-I allows 10 or below and Residential-II allows above 10. Since that is the only difference we would like Residential-II facilities to have the opportunity to be considered in R-4-R-6 zones also. Because the types of inhabitants and their associated impact on the neighborhood can vary widely in both Residential-I and Residential-II facilities, the specific number of inhabitants is less relevant than other actual characteristics of a given program.

A Residential-II facility of one make-up may be far better for a neighborhood than a Residential-I facility of another make-up, yet under the current development code the Residential-II facility cannot be considered.

By allowing Residential-II facilities the opportunity to be considered through the Conditional Use process, no worthwhile and beneficial program will be automatically excluded from a neighborhood and issues that may be of concern such as public safety, traffic, effect on property values, fit with the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood sentiment can be thoroughly examined and if thought to be contrary to the good of the neighborhood, the facility can be denied operation.

This would allow some already existing buildings that might be used for allowable, but deleterious purposes, to be used for more worthwhile and beneficial purposes.

## Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A

### DECISION CRITERIA EXPLANATION:

Please describe how the amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Since the proposal calls for a Conditional Use process any potential uses that would be contrary to the Comprehensive Plan could be identified and prohibited. However, expanding the opportunity for consideration of operation in R-4-R-6 zones to Residential-II facilities could enhance the accomplishment of the following goals and policies from the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan:

Community Design Element, Goal CD1 – Promote community development and redevelopment that is aesthetically pleasing, functional, and consistent with the City’s vision.

Housing Goals and Policies, Goal HVI – Encourage and support a variety of housing opportunities for those with special needs, specifically older adults and people with disabilities.

Address Special Housing Needs, Policy H25 – Encourage, assist and support social and health service organizations that offer housing programs for targeted populations.

Maintain and Enhance Neighborhood Quality, Policy H21 – Initiate and encourage equitable and inclusive community involvement that fosters civic pride and positive neighborhood image.

Economic Development, Goal EDVI – Support employers and new businesses that create more and better jobs.

Economic Development, Policy ED3 – Encourage and support home-based businesses in the City, provided signage, parking, storage, and noise levels are compatible with neighborhoods.

Economic Development, Policy ED11 – Diversify and expand the City’s job base, with a focus on attracting living wage jobs, to allow people to work and shop in the Community.

The current code states that the “Purpose of R-4 and R-6 zones is to provide for a mix of predominantly single detached dwelling units and other development types, such as accessory dwelling units and community facilities that are compatible with existing development and neighborhood character.” The proposed amendment would not lead to the operation of facilities in R-4-R-6 zones that violate this stated purpose. The amendment would provide an opportunity for specific uses of existing buildings that could further promote the stated purpose.

---

**Please describe how the amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety and general welfare.**

The amendment does not automatically allow for any uses that are contrary to the well-being of the neighborhood and it does not allow for a change in the types of activities that can currently be considered for a R-4-R-6 neighborhood. It does allow for consideration of the operation of a facility with more than 10 occupants in R-4-R-6 zones, but the impact of that change would be fully examined in a Conditional Use process and any detriment to the neighborhood could be specifically determined at that time. If the specific use is determined to

RECEIVED  
DEC 28 2017  
PCD

## **Dev. Code Amendment - Community Residential Facilities - Attachment A**

undermine public health, safety and general welfare it can be denied. However, it might be determined that the proposed use promotes more safety and neighborhood well-being than an already permitted use.

---

**Please describe how the amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.**

As stated above the proposed amendment could enhance several elements of the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan. It might also allow for a better use of some existing structures in R-4-R-6 zones with already permitted uses that are more deleterious to a neighborhood than a proposed use exercising the Conditional Use permit process. This amendment does not allow for any new uses of neighborhood buildings without public input and scrutiny. It does allow neighborhoods to have greater say in what facilities are allowed in their midst and it allows them to advocate for the approval of certain Residential-II facilities that they would otherwise not be able to consider as additions to their neighborhoods. The amendment puts more control in the hands of the citizens.

RECEIVED  
DEC 28 2017  
PCD

---

Please attach additional sheets if necessary.

Please submit your request to the City of Shoreline, Planning & Community Development.

**Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B**

contract	FacilityName	LocationAddress	LocationZipCode
Adult Family Home	A LITTLE PIECE OF HEAVEN	17347 DENSMORE AVE NORTH	98133
No Contract	A WATER VIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	19511 23RD AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	AATMA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	14526 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ALIANAS HOME CARE	2152 NORTH 193RD ST	98133
No Contract	All About Seniors Three	1435 NW 188TH ST	98177
No Contract	ALL ABOUT SENIORS TWO	19860 15TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ALLIANCE CARE FAMILY HOME INC	17217 11TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	AMBER CARE ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	16239 8TH AVE NE	98155
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam AMEN AFH	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	20408 WHITMAN AVE N	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam AMEN AFH	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	734 N 204TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ADULT HOME CARE	14514 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ANCAS AFH	204 NW 195TH ST	98177
No Contract	ANDERSON ADULT FAMILY HOME	17127 15TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	ANDERSON ADULT FAMILY HOME II	17051 14TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ANGELINA'S PLACE	1745 NW 193RD STREET	98177
Adult Family Home	Angelina's Place II	14842 Wallingford Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	Applewood Adult Family Home LLC	16621 Stone Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	BCM AFH	18519 STONE AVE N	98133
No Contract	Bella Vita AFH	19538 Burke Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	BEST CARE	15564 8th Ave NE	98155
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam BROADVIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	BROADVIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	738 N 203RD ST	98133
Adult Family Home	CALDERON ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	16909 4TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	CEESAYS ADULT CARE FAMILY HOME	15218 12TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	CHARITY AFH 2	18820 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Crizhtelle Golden Care Inc	15410 12th Ave NE	98155
Adult Family Home	DIAMOND AFH	18570 ASHWORTH AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ECHO LAKE ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	2149 N 194TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	ENGUERRAS ADULT HOME CARE	15535 CORLISS AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	EVANS HOME	17629 8TH LANE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Everest Adult Family Home LLC	912 N 196th Ct	98133
Adult Family Home	Evergreen Haven Senior Care	15402 NE 12th Ave	98155
No Contract	Firland Adult Family Home LLC	19214 Firlands Way N	98133
No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE	20157 6TH AVE NE	98155

**Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B**

No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE INC	19745 10TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	FOR SENIORS SAKE INC NORTH CITY	19605 10TH AVE NE	98155
No Contract	GARDEN VIEW RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES IN 1011 NW 177TH PL		98177
No Contract	GARDEN VIEW RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY	17539 10TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	GENESIS HOMECARE ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	1835 N 200TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	Getch AFH Shoreline	18328 8th Ave NW	98177
Adult Family Home	Gladden Adult Family Home LLC	731 N 204TH ST	98133
No Contract	GOLDEN HILL AFH	16744 ASHWORTH AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	GOOD SHEPHERD HOME INC	200 NW 198TH ST	98177
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	15503 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	18361 DAYTON PLACE NORTH	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	15010 LINDEN AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home Inc	754 N 203RD STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	Good Shepherd Home on 8th	18060 8th Ave NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Grace AFH LLC	19831 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	HAPPY FAMILY ADULT FAMILY HOME #2	1228 NE 181ST PLACE	98155
No Contract	Highland A.F.H. LLC	16505 N Park Ave N	98133
No Contract	HILJAY HOME	111 203RD NW	98177
No Contract	HILLWOOD SENIOR CARE AFH 2 LLC	18319 3RD AVENUE NE	98155
No Contract	HILLWOOD SENIOR CARE AFH LLC	19342 FREMONT AVE N	98133
No Contract	Holloway House LLC	18112 Palatine Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	Holy Living Adult Family Home LLC	914 NE 172nd PL	98155
Adult Family Home	HOME AGAIN	18504 2ND AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	HOME SWEET HOME	16538 25TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	INTAL ADULT FAMILY HOME	16304 25TH PL NE	98155
Adult Family Home	JCB ADULT FAMILY HOME	757 N 200TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	JCB II ADULT FAMILY HOME	19613 LINDEN AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	JIRAH HOME CARE	19831 GREENWOOD PL N	98133
Adult Family Home	JOY ADULT FAMILY HOME	15553 27TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Joy Care Adult Family Home LLC	774 N 204TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	MAPLE LEAF HOME II	1721 NE 146TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	MARVI HOME CARE	729 N 203RD ST	98133
No Contract	MILLCREEK AFH III	17734 2ND PL NE	98155
Adult Family Home	MNB ADULT FAMILY HOME	15804 25TH AVE NE	98155

**Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B**

Adult Family Home	MOUNTFOREST VIEW	15028 25TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	NDEN AFH	19819 FREMONT AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	NEW LIFE AT STONE AVE AFH LLC	18824 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	NEW LIFE HOME CARE	220 NE 175TH ST	98155
No Contract	NICA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	20002 20TH AVE NW	98177
No Contract	NORTH RIDGE HOUSE	20031 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	NORTH RIDGE HOUSE	745 N 180TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	OMNA ADULT FAMILY HOME	17517 19TH CT NE	98155
No Contract	Open Arms AFH Inc	2315 N 194th St	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam Over The Rainbow AFH 2 LLC		16179 MIDVALE AVE N	98133
Specialized Behavior Support, Expanded C OVER THE RAINBOW AFH LLC		16325 N PARK AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	Residence Choice Adult Family Home	17400 17th PI NE	98155
No Contract	RIMAS ADULT FAMILY HOME INC	1812 N 189TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	RIVER OF LIFE HOME CARE	239 NE 178TH ST	98155
Meaningful Home Based Activities, Adult f SAN ANTONIO LTF INC		16747 6TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	SARAUSAD HOMES INC	20203-B 20TH AVENUE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	SARAUSAD HOMES INC.	20203 A 20TH AVENUE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	SHANGRI LA HOME CARE AFH LLC	104 N 177TH STREET	98133
Adult Family Home	SHI'S HOME	16529 8TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	SHORELINE GARDENS SENIOR CARE	1233 NE 168TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	SOUND VIEW ADULT FAMILY HOME	18025 15TH AVE NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ST ANTHONY AFH #1	16108 MIDVALE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	ST ANTHONY AFH II	2200 NW 199th St	98177
Adult Family Home	ST JUDE ADULT FAMILY HOME	1219 NE 152ND ST	98155
Adult Family Home	ST LUKE AFH	19136 8th Ave NW	98177
Adult Family Home	ST MARY'S AFH	19540 7TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	ST MARY'S AFH	339 NE 163RD STREET	98155
Adult Family Home	ST. JOSEPH ADULT FAMILY HOME	1759 NE 148TH ST	98155
Adult Family Home	STELUTA ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC	717 N 184TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	SUM'S ADULT FAMILY HOME	17916 FREMONT AVE N	98133
Specialized Behavior Support, Expanded C SUNRISE ADULT FAMILY HOME		1133 N 166TH ST	98133
Expanded Community Services, Adult Fam SUNRISE ADULT FAMILY HOME II LLC		19121 3RD AVENUE NW	98177
Meaningful Home Based Activities, Adult f TANYAS ADULT FAMILY HOME LLC		16515 N PARK AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	THE BERGS ADULT FAMILY HOME	310 NE 174TH ST	98155



**Dev. Code Amendment - Residential Care Facilities - Attachment B**

Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERD'S AFH 2	14511 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERDS AFH	1658 N 145TH ST	98133
Adult Family Home	THE GREAT SHEPHERDS AFH 1	14519 WALLINGFORD AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	VAN PATTEN AFH	16905 STONE AVE N	98133
Adult Family Home	VILLA AFH	15520 30TH AVE NE	98155
Adult Family Home	Villa Rey Adult Family Home LLC	16748 Corliss Ave N	98133
Adult Family Home	WASHINGTON CARE ADULT FAMILY HOME	147 NW 183RD ST	98177