



Land Use Element Supporting Analysis

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that cities provide a comprehensive plan with a Land Use Element to designate the proposed categories (residential, commercial, etc.) and intensities of uses of land. The Act further specifies that the Land Use Element be the foundation of a comprehensive plan. This process of designating future land uses must account for future population growth, and must be supported by adequate levels of public facilities and services. In this respect, the Land Use Element is an explicit statement of the ultimate vision for the City and determines the capacity of the infrastructure necessary to serve the projected land uses. Additionally, the GMA requires cities to designate and regulate environmentally critical areas to protect public and private property from natural hazards, to maintain significant environmental features and the community's quality of life, and to preserve ecological functions (RCW 36.70A.172).

One of the factors that contribute to Shoreline's high quality of life is attractive and vital residential neighborhoods. Residents often credit this aesthetic appeal to abundant and healthy trees. A variety of housing types add to Shoreline's diversity and allure. Encouraging sustainable practices related to both the environment and social equity will preserve this quality of life for generations to come. Allowing for more retail and commercial development will provide a broader choice of goods and services in the community. Encouraging entertainment and cultural uses will enrich the community and provide activities for all age groups. Increasing opportunities for local businesses will help supply employment for Shoreline's citizens. And finally, suitable locations for industrial and institutional uses will protect the city's neighborhoods, while providing essential facilities needed by every community.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing Land Use

The city is substantially developed, with 56 acres of the total land area remaining vacant. This vacant land is characterized by single lots scattered throughout the city rather than large contiguous tracts of land. Approximately 11% of the city's land area is redevelopable; most of these sites are zoned for commercial or multifamily uses.

Single-family residential development accounts for approximately 55% of land use in the community. Multi-family residential development, approximately 3.4% of land use, is primarily located near the commercial areas along Aurora Avenue N and in neighborhood centers.

Commercial development accounts for approximately 8% of land use in the community. Large commercial uses within the city are located primarily along Aurora Avenue N. Smaller commercial centers are located throughout the city. Four percent of Shoreline's land area is comprised of the Shoreline Community College, Fircrest, CRISTA Ministries and King's Schools, and the Washington State Public Health Lab.

The following table includes estimated acreages for existing land uses within the City of Shoreline.

Figure LUA-1
Inventory of Existing Land Uses

Land Use Type	Acres	% Total
Single-Family	4,061	55
Multi-Family	235	4
Commercial	536	8
Institution	224	3
Parks & Recreation	365	5
Private Open Space/ Water	342	5
Public Facilities	632	9
Right-of-way	797	11
Total	7,192	100.0

Source: City of Shoreline GIS Department 2012

Population

The population of Shoreline remained relatively constant from 2000-2010, after increasing 13% from 1990 to 2000 (About 2/3 of this growth was due to annexation). Shoreline's population was basically stable over the decade, as compared to growth in the county of 11%, and the state of 14%.

Figure LUA-2
City of Shoreline & King County
Historic Population Growth Comparison

	1996	2000	2010	Avg. Annual Growth 2000-2010
King County	1,628,800	1,737,046	1,931,249	14%
Shoreline	48,195	53,296	53,025	0%

Source: Census 2000 and 2010

Residential and Employment Growth Targets and Capacity

The King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) establish residential and employment growth targets for all the municipalities in King County, as well as growth targets for the unincorporated portions of the county. The State Office of Financial Management develops growth targets for each county based on its forecast for statewide growth over the next 20 years. In King County, the County and cities work collaboratively to allocate the targets to smaller areas based on City policies and policies in the CPPs. For the 25 year period 2006-2031, Shoreline has a growth target of 5,000 housing units and 5,000 jobs. This translates to an average growth of 200 new homes and jobs each year. Due to economic fluctuations, over portions of the 25 year period, the city may see more growth or less. Assuming that the county grows by 233,000 new homes and 428,000 new jobs by 2031, Shoreline would be expected to have the zoning and infrastructure in place to accept the 5,000 new jobs and 5,000 new households assumed in its growth target.

Residential and Job Growth Capacity

Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan supports the zoning necessary to accommodate the growth assumed in the adopted 25 year targets. Most of the growth is likely to occur along the Aurora Avenue corridor (either in the Town Center or other parts of the corridor), or within nodes of Transit-Oriented Communities (along Aurora or in Light Rail Station Areas). It is expected that redevelopment in these areas will largely occur in multi-story buildings. Some of these might be mixed-use structures, with commercial uses on the bottom floor and office or residential uses on the upper floors. Some of these will be a mix of uses within several structures (often of varying heights), which might be purely residential, office, retail, or commercial. Redevelopment is also a potential in the smaller mixed use commercial areas located adjacent to several neighborhoods. These areas, developed decades ago, might be redeveloped more intensely as mixed-use areas.

Figure LUA-3
Capacity in Single Family Zones (including vacant and redevelopable properties)

	0-5 du/acre	5-7 du/acre	7-9 du/acre	Total Capacity in SF Zones
Net Acres of Land*	30.9	291.2	0	322.1
Density	4	6	N/A	N/A
Capacity in Units	123	1,747	N/A	1,870
Minus Existing Units on Redevelopable Parcels	(75)	(605)	0	(680)
Net Capacity	48	1,142	0	1,190

Source: King County Buildable Lands Report, 2007

* Net acres of land = Gross Acres of vacant and redevelopable land reduced to account for critical areas, right of way, public purpose lands, and market factors

Figure LUA-4
Capacity in Multi Family Zones (including vacant and redevelopable properties)

	9-13 du/acre	13-31 du/acre	31-48 du/acre	Over 48 du/acre	Total Capacity in MF/MU Zones
Net Acres of Land*	35.2	1.8	24	72.1	N/A
Density	11	24	24-48	65	N/A
Capacity in Units	382	43	838	4,685	N/A
Minus Existing Units on Redevelopable Parcels	(170)	(0)	(116)	(33)	N/A
Net Capacity	212	43	722	4,652	5,629

Source: King County Buildable Lands Report 2007

* Net acres of land = Gross Acres of vacant and redevelopable land reduced to account for critical areas, right of way, public purpose lands, and market factors

Capacity for Commercial & Industrial Growth

Shoreline's commercial/mixed-use areas are largely located along Aurora Avenue N. The 2007 King County Buildable Lands Report estimates that there are approximately 80 net acres of redevelopable land in these commercial/mixed-use areas. They are currently developed at an average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .27. FARs of 1.0 are easily achievable with structured parking. An FAR of 1.0 would result in capacity for almost 7,500 new jobs.

Town Center and Commercial Zoning Consolidation and Design Standards

The Town Center Subarea Plan, adopted in 2011 (See Appendix B) was the culmination of much of the City's thinking with regard to form-based codes, design standards, and placemaking over the past 15 years, and a result of its Vision 2029 process. Vision 2029 described commercial centers that are cohesive and active, and attractive places where people work, live, and shop. The Town Center Subarea Plan created design and transition standards to determine how these centers would provide for intense development, yet function on a human scale, and how they would connect to adjacent single-family neighborhoods, while protecting residents from adverse impacts.

To support the framework goals in Vision 2029, and to implement recommendations from the Southeast Neighborhoods Subarea Plan (Also in Appendix B), it was necessary to develop new goals and policies that support consolidation of the commercial zones that are redundant, and to create new Land Use designations to distinguish areas appropriate for more intensive commercial development (along Aurora and Ballinger Avenues) from areas where commercial development should complement neighborhood scale (15th Avenue, Richmond Beach Shopping Center, and others). It will also be necessary to develop new commercial zoning classifications, and adapt design standards created for Town Center to these areas.

The basic proposal is to *not* change the height or bulk of these commercial areas, but to create appropriate transitions to residential uses, limit densities through the use of form-based standards, and streamline the process of development review. The intention is to support Vision 2029 and other community visioning exercises, and economic development strategies, which encourage revitalization of these commercial centers to attract investment and job growth.

Essential Public Facilities

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the comprehensive plan to include a process for identifying and siting Essential Public Facilities (EPF). According to the GMA, no local comprehensive plan may preclude the siting of EPF.

The GMA defines essential public facilities as those “that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020.” Factors that make these facilities difficult to site include the number of jurisdictions affected or served by the facility; the size of the facility; and the facility's potential adverse impacts, such as noise, odor, traffic, and pollution generation. The facilities can be either desirable or undesirable to jurisdictions. Some of the facilities are privately owned and regulated by public entities. Facilities also can be owned by the State and used by residents from throughout the state, such as universities and their branch campuses.

Establishing an EPF siting process is a mandate of the GMA. Including a process for siting EPF in the comprehensive plan has benefits, including minimizing difficulties in the siting process and addressing local impacts equitably. Shoreline's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element contains goals and policies for siting EPF. These policies are intended to guide the creation of provisions in the Land Use Code to site EPF that are not otherwise regulated by the Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC). EPF that are otherwise regulated by the Shoreline Municipal Code will continue to be regulated as set forth in the SMC without need to use the siting policies set forth in the Land Use Element.

The siting process described in this section is intended as an interim process. The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC), which is made up of the cities in King County and the County, is required by the Countywide

Planning Policies (CPPs) to establish a countywide process for siting essential public facilities (ref. CPP FW-32). That process is to address EPF definitions, inventories, incentives, public involvement, environmental protection, and consideration of alternative siting strategies (ref. CPP S-1). When that process is established, Shoreline may modify this process to reflect the GMPC recommendations.



This page left blank intentionally

CITY OF
SHORELINE

