

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 18, 2013
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Esselman
Commissioner Craft
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Scully (arrived at 7:02)
Commissioner Wagner

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Chair Moss

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Esselman called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Vice Chair Esselman and Commissioners Craft, Maul, Montero and Wagner. Commissioner Scully arrived at 7:02 p.m., and Chair Moss was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 21, 2013 were approved as submitted.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

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

STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran explained that the purpose of his presentation is to introduce the proposed Development Code amendments, discuss and answer Planning Commission questions, and gather public comments. He reminded the Commission that the purpose of the Development Code amendments is to bring the regulations into conformity with the Comprehensive Plan, to respond to changing conditions or needs of the City and/or to comply with state law. He reported that 21 amendments were initially proposed. However, one of the two amendments initiated by a private citizen was withdrawn. He reviewed the proposed amendments (see Attachment 1) as follows:

- **SMC 20.20.048(T)** – This amendment would change the definition for “significant tree” by deleting the words “healthy, windfirm, and nonhazardous.” Although a tree may be unhealthy or hazardous, any significant tree under the current code must be accounted for, and replacement trees will have to be planted.
- **SMC 20.30.085** – This amendment incorporates a notification radius for “early community input meetings. Although records indicate that the City Council wanted the notification radius to be 1,000 feet, this requirement is not included in the current code.
- **SMC 20.30.090(B)(2)** – The current code only requires a 500-foot notification radius for neighborhood meetings, and the proposed amendment would require a 1,000-foot radius for “master development plan permits.”
- **SMC 20.30.180** – This amendment also adds the 1,000-foot notification radius for the notice of public hearing for a master development plan permit.
- **SMC 20.30.280** – Section 20.30.280(C)(2)(c) would be amended to add a reference to SMC 13.12, which outlines the regulations that would apply when repair or reconstruction of a non-conforming structure is necessary in a flood plain. Section 20.30.280(F) would also be amended to add new language that deals with situations where the City creates a non-conformity. For example, if the City takes a right-of-way, any existing use or structure would be considered a lawful non-conforming use or structure.
- **SMC 20.30.353** – Section 20.30.353(E) would be amended to allow any use on a campus-zoned property through an approved master plan. This would be consistent with recent changes in the Comprehensive Plan. A second amendment in SMC 20.30.353(F) would add noticing requirements for early community input meetings by referencing SMC 20.30.085.
- **SMC 20.30.410(C)(2)** – This proposed amendment makes it clear that City staff, and not the City Council, may require dedication of land for public use. This has always been the case.

- **SMC 20.30.730(C)** – This proposed amendment would require the responsible party to pay all penalties and costs before an enforcement case may be closed.
- **SMC 20.30.770** – The proposed amendment to Section 20.30.770(D)(6) would also require the responsible party to pay all penalties before the City can close an enforcement case. In addition, the proposed amendment to Section 20.30.770(D)(7)(b) would allow the Director to approve up to a 20% reduction of accrued penalties if voluntary compliance is achieved and the City is reimbursed its reasonable staff and professional costs.
- **Table 20.40.120** – This amendment would allow community residential facilities as a conditional use in the R-8 and R12 zones. The code currently allows boarding homes and apartments as a conditional use in these zones, and this amendment would treat community residential facilities as a like use.
- **Table 20.40.130** – This amendment was initiated by a private citizen and would allow veterinary clinics and hospitals as conditional uses in multi-family zones. The owners of the Animal Surgical Clinic of Seattle would like to expand their building and parking onto a parcel zoned R-24, but vet clinics are not currently allowed in multi-family zones. However, like uses such as medical offices, nursing and personal care facilities, hospitals and professional offices are allowed as conditional uses in multi-family zones. Staff supports the proposed amendment. Veterinary uses would have to comply with the standard conditions, as well as any additional conditions imposed as part of the conditional use permit.
- **SMC 20.40.240** – This amendment is a staff rewrite of the City’s entire animal code. The old animal code is out of date, vague and does not address most of the questions and concerns of the residents of Shoreline. The rewrite provides a purpose section, allows for chickens, restricts roosters, and supports urban agriculture animals (very small livestock).

Commissioner Craft asked if the code provides noise nuisance provisions that would be applicable to animals. Mr. Szafran answered that there are no noise provisions in the Development Code. These issues would be addressed by the Customer Response Team on a complaint basis.

- **SMC 20.30.340** – The proposed amendment is intended to make this section consistent with the definition for “multi-family,” which was amended last year.
- **Table 20.50.020(1)** – This proposed amendment would delete Note 6, which states that the maximum building coverage shall be 35 percent and the maximum hardscape area shall be 50 percent for single-family detached development located in R-12 zones. This exemption was put in place a number of years ago as a reaction to a single-family subdivision in an R-12 zone. At the time, it was believed that single-family homes on R-12 zoned lots were out of character with the neighborhood and should not be built on smaller lots. Staff believes this exception is out of date and overly restrictive in terms of dictating what sort of housing types may be located on certain parcels.

Commissioner Wagner recalled that the Commission has talked previously about hardscape and building coverage as they relate to surface water runoff and the need to reduce impervious surface area. She suggested that at the public hearing, staff should address how this change would impact the City's ability to address this important issue. Mr. Szafran pointed out that the current provision places stricter requirements on single-family, detached development than for attached units. Commissioner Wagner countered that single-family, detached development is the least environmentally sustainable type of residential unit. Some may argue that this provision could be used as a tool to discourage single-family, detached units in zones where increased density is desirable.

Commissioner Maul noted that eliminating Note 6 would require that the footnotes in the table be renumbered.

- **Exception 20.50.050(3)** – This amendment would allow renewable energy and environmental building features to be constructed above the maximum building heights in residential zones. A similar amendment was recently passed for environmental features over the maximum building height in commercial zones.
- **SMC 20.50.310.** This amendment was initiated by a private citizen, but it has been withdrawn and will likely be included in a future batch of Development Code amendments.
- **Exception 20.50.390(A)** – This proposed amendment would add Item D, which would require that any amount of surface parking lot that is over the minimum required number of stalls must be paved with permeable pavement. The amendment will provide an environmental benefit if a developer proposes to over park a new development.
- **SMC 20.50.400(A)(8)** – The proposed additional language would allow an applicant to use permeable pavement on at least 20% of the area of the parking lot as a criteria for the Director to reduce the overall parking requirement. This amendment will provide greater environmental protection as a way to reduce overall parking spaces.

Commissioner Wagner raised questions about how the 20% would be calculated and asked if the requirement would be additive. She suggested that staff be prepared to address this issue in more detail at the public hearing. Commissioner Craft suggested that the issue could be addressed by requiring permeable pavement for any additional parking.

- **SMC 20.50.410(G)** – This proposed amendment would add a requirement that any parking space abutting a wall shall provide an additional 18 inches above the minimum space width requirement to provide space to exit a vehicle.
- **SMC 20.50.500** – The proposed amendment to Section 20.50.500(E)(5) would allow gaps in curbs to accommodate stormwater runoff. The proposed amendment to Section 20.50.500(E)(6) would allow natural drainage landscapes (rain gardens, bio-filtration swales and bio-retention planters) when designed in compliance with the stormwater design manual.

- **SMC 20.60.040(A)(2)** – The proposed amendment would strike the requirement that the applicant must demonstrate that the existing water supply system available to serve complies with any limitation or condition imposed by the City approved comprehensive plan of the water purveyor. Essential, the current wording allows a district water plan to pre-empt City code and the City’s decision on a permit, and staff would like to change that.

Public Comment

Dr. Russell Patterson, Seattle, said he is co-owner of the animal specialty hospital building located at Northeast 148th Street and 15th Avenue Northeast. He said the hospital has been in the business of providing specialty care, mostly surgery, for the pets of the Seattle area for over 25 years. They were previously located in the Wallingford Neighborhood of Seattle. However, because of business growth and cramped quarters, they moved to Shoreline in the spring of 2009. Their experience in the neighborhood has been very positive, and their new facility has allowed them to grow and they are once again experiencing some lack of space. Looking to the future, they began negotiations a year ago to purchase property immediately to the east. The property is currently developed with a small home that has been abandoned for some time.

Dr. Patterson said they are hoping that through the proposed amendment to **Table 20.40.130**, they will be able to use the property for parking, subject to a conditional use permit. This would allow for future growth of the business. He explained that the existing parking lot to the east of the building was zoned residential when the property was purchased, even though it had functioned as a parking lot to access a prior business for a long time. This gave them some reason to hope they would be allowed to use residentially zoned property to access their commercial building. They believe they are a valued member of the community and have a very good report with the neighbors, several of which have submitted letters of support for the proposed amendment. They hope the City will approve their request so they can grow and continue to provide excellent veterinary care for the pets of Shoreline and the surrounding communities.

Alisha Leviten, Shoreline, said she is pleased to see that that an amendment has been proposed to ban roosters. She said roosters are the equivalent of a neighbor blasting an air horn every 30 to 60 seconds, sometimes all night long. She has nothing against roosters, as animals, but they are not meant to be in an urban setting. They need to be in locations where neighbors are at least a mile away. She said she is also grateful to the Commission for keeping environmental impacts in mind as they discuss the proposed amendments.

Commission Discussion

Vice Chair Esselman referred to **SMC 20.40.240(8)(b)**, which allows animals such as goats for the purpose of vegetation management. She questioned if the term “temporary” should be further defined. Mr. Szafran felt this would be difficult. Commissioner Wagner said the intent of the term “temporary” is that the animals are not kept permanently as pets.

Vice Chair Esselman referred to **SMC 20.50.410(G)**, which would add a requirement that any parking space abutting a wall shall provide an additional 18 inches above the minimum space width requirement

to provide space to exit a vehicle, and **SMC 20.50.500(E)(5)**, which would allow gaps in curbs to accommodate stormwater runoff. She suggested that perhaps a curb should be required for rain catch basins that are located where the parking abuts vegetation areas. Commissioner Maul observed that the language in **SMC 20.50.410(G)** talks about parking strips that abut a wall, but the diagram provided shows the parking up against a planting strip. Mr. Szafran said planter strips have always been required by the code, but the proposed language in **SMC 20.50.410(G)** is specifically related to planter strips next to walls inside parking garages. Commissioner Maul suggested that the words “to provide space to exit the vehicle” should be deleted. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Wagner referenced the proposed amendment to **Exception 20.50.050(3)**, which would allow additional height for renewable energy systems such as solar collectors and small scale wind generators. She cautioned that allowing additional height to enable a building to be retrofitted with a renewable energy system is very different than allowing additional height to accommodate equipment on new structures that were purposefully built to the maximum height allowed. While renewable energy systems are supported by the City’s Environmental Sustainability Strategy, they are typically much larger than chimneys and flag poles. She said she is not convinced that allowing additional height for this equipment would be consistent with the City’s intent in establishing a height limit. On the other hand, the additional height could provide incentive for people to add the equipment. To provide some perspective, she said it would be helpful to have examples of typical solar collectors and small scale wind generators. This will help the Commission gain a better understanding of the benefits and impacts of the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Craft referenced **Table 20.40.120** and asked for more examples of what a facility for “counseling, rehabilitation and medical supervision, excluding drug and alcohol detoxification,” would be. Mr. Szafran advised that the proposed amendment is based on an administrative order that is outlined in Attachment 2. In that case, the facility was a home for more than 11 people with severe brain injuries that would be staffed with caregivers 24 hours per day. Currently, the use would not be allowed.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Markle reported that Jessica Simulcik Smith was recently promoted to be the new Deputy City Clerk, and tonight is her last time to serve as Planning Commission Clerk. She thanked Ms. Simulcik Smith for serving the Commission over the past eight years.

Director Markle referred to the April 2nd press release announcing that the City of Shoreline and the Point Wells developer have signed a Memorandum of Understanding to get the transportation corridor study funded by the developer. As agreed, the developer will participate in the process. She advised that the transportation corridor study will include six community meetings with residents of Shoreline who are directly impacted and other interested parties. One element of the study will focus specifically on Richmond Beach Drive, and consultants will talk with each property owner about potential changes in front of their properties and what the impacts will be. The second element of the study will focus on Richmond Beach Road all the way to Aurora Avenue North, including associated side streets where cut through traffic is anticipated. The goal is to identify impacts and necessary mitigation.

Director Markle emphasized that the transportation corridor study will far exceed any public participation process that would have been required by Snohomish County. Snohomish County would only have required one scoping meeting in Shoreline. In addition, the City of Shoreline would have had to provide funding for the traffic analysis, which the developer has now agreed to pay for. In addition, she advised that the City reached an agreement with Snohomish County to ensure that they will utilize the information that comes out of the Transportation Corridor Study to the extent possible during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) review process. She said staff anticipates that Snohomish County will start the EIS process in late April or early May. To avoid confusion, the City will not start the Transportation Corridor Study until after Snohomish County's first scoping meeting. She noted that the City received the first batch of review comments on three different permits that Snohomish County is currently processing for Point Wells.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Light Rail Station Area Planning – Draft Study Area Boundaries

Ms. Redinger said the primary focus of tonight's discussion will be the study area boundaries, which the Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee has been working on for a few months. She reminded the Commission that the Comprehensive Plan uses circles to identify potential study area boundaries for the Northeast 145th Street and Northeast 185th Street light rail stations. The City Council recently asked the staff and Planning Commission to initiate a public process to further refine the boundaries to be parcel-specific. She advised that the Planning Commission is scheduled to meet jointly with the City Council on May 2nd to discuss multiple issues related to light rail station area planning, including proposed station area boundaries that will be presented at the first community meeting on May 22nd from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

Ms. Redinger advised that the committee has not only identified draft boundaries for the Commission's consideration, but they have also provided criteria for the Commission to use as they delineate the boundaries further in preparation for the public hearing. She provided two hard copy maps of the proposed draft boundaries and reviewed the criteria as follows:

- Existing conditions such as density, arterials and community features (See Attachments A, C, E and G).
- Walk and bike travelsheds (See Attachments B and F)
- Topography (See Attachments D and H)
- Comprehensive Plan policy direction (See Attachment I) such as corridors that connect the station areas to major arterials.
- Jurisdictional to clarify that the City won't be drawing lines on the Seattle side of the map
- Homeowner preference, which does not mean that individual homeowners can opt in or out of being in the study area. However, if a block of neighbors on the edge of the boundary feel strongly about being in or out, this preference may influence decision making.

Ms. Redinger explained that in applying the criteria to the draft boundaries, it became apparent to the committee that it would make sense to do two study area boundaries for each station.

- The **mobility study areas** encompass a broader region and the boundary areas are drawn on existing rights-of-way. The feeder arterials are not necessarily part of the study area, but they are additional areas to consider the type of traffic that would be generated. Clearly there will be users of the transit stations coming into the area, and neighbors along the arterials will be primarily concerned with traffic flow, traffic calming, etc. Because these areas are outside of the half-mile radius around the station, they will not likely undergo zoning transitions, but property owners will want the City to examine certain impacts.
- The **land use study areas** represent smaller geographic regions that are more likely to undergo transition and zoning changes based on policies and expectations around light rail planning and transit-oriented development. The boundaries lines are generally drawn along the backside of parcels fronting on an arterial. The properties in this area may be appropriate for higher densities and additional uses.

Ms. Redinger described the differences between the two study areas. For example, the Northeast 145th Street study area is more straightforward because they only have to identify a boundary for the Shoreline side. In addition, the big opportunity sites in the Northeast 185th Street study area are parcels that are likely to develop, and the larger sites in the Northeast 145th Street study are park boundaries and properties that are less likely to develop. These sites may serve better as buffer areas or amenities for higher density areas.

Commissioner Scully explained that the intent of the draft study area boundaries is to structure discussion, not limit it. Where there was a question, the committee was over-inclusive rather than under-inclusive. Although the committee tried to make the boundaries as large as possible, additional properties can be added as the process goes forward and the Commission continues to gather information through public comment and additional study.

Commissioner Wagner asked how much space an actual station would take up compared to the size of a single-family residential parcel. Ms. Redinger noted that the station locations are not zoned single-family residential. The actual station footprints will be relatively small. She said a good way to gauge the potential size of the new stations is to look at the space available, which is about the size of a single-family residential lot. More information about the station footprints and design will be available when the EIS comes out in June. Commissioner Wagner said she would also like more information about the potential footprint of the parking associated with the station. She suggested it would be helpful to compare this footprint with the footprint of the Mountlake Terrace Park and Ride. Ms. Redinger said more information about the number of parking spaces will also be available in the EIS

The Commission gathered around a table on which two hard copy maps of the draft study areas were displayed. Ms. Redinger briefly described the draft boundaries for both the Northeast 185th Street and Northeast 145th Street study areas.

Ms. Redinger pointed out that Northeast 185th Street is a major arterial, and there are very few through-streets within the Northeast 185th Street Station area boundary. The mobility area study could identify ways to provide additional, easy connections for people who live in the neighborhoods to access the station. It could also address traffic concerns associated with cut through traffic, etc. Although a study

of the North City area has already been done, portions of the area may be reviewed again as part of the station area study. She noted that the Northeast 185th Street study area includes the Shoreline Center, an elementary school, and other large sites that could potentially redevelop.

Vice Chair Esselman asked if “mobility” means the mobility to move from the neighborhood areas to the station, the mobility to move through the neighborhoods, or a combination of both. Ms. Redinger explained that in some areas improving mobility may involve traffic calming measures, but in other areas it may involve additional bicycle and pedestrian connections. She explained that, often, freeway transit stations act as a divider between two neighborhoods. Staff has done a small amount of visioning work with the Northeast 185 Station Area Committee to address this issue. The committee believes that the freeway bisected the neighborhood, and they would like to see additional connections and ways to bridge the large divide. Part of mobility may involve ways to get from one side of the neighborhood to the other.

Commissioner Montero asked if properties in Lake Forest Park and Mountlake Terrace would be included in the Northeast 185th Street station area study, as well. Ms. Redinger said they would not be part of the study area, but staff will figure out a strategy to work with the Cities of Lake Forest Park, Mountlake Terrace and Seattle, as well as Snohomish County.

Commissioner Scully said the Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee did consider the car shed (where cars might come from) when determining how wide the mobility study areas should be. They felt there was a significant potential for people coming up from Lake City Way, but car traffic from Mountlake Terrace seemed unlikely because there is a Mountlake Terrace station.

Ms. Redinger clarified that the area internal to the dash lines is not intended to be studied in terms of zoning or mobility, but the transportation department is very aware that the road is dangerous and unsafe for bicycles and pedestrians. The study will identify ways to make it more safe.

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the City will not know if the Sound Transit Board will include Northeast 145th Street or Northeast 155th Street as a preferred station location. However, because the City Council has expressed a preference for Northeast 145th Street, they asked that the Commission and staff move forward with setting study area boundaries for a Northeast 145th Street station. She emphasized that the Northeast 145th Street study area would not include properties located within the City of Seattle’s jurisdiction. The large sites within the Northeast 145th Street study area are Twin Ponds Park and the Paramount Park and Open Space, both of which are unlikely to change over time.

Ms. Redinger explained that Commissioners Scully and Maul suggested that because the park is a natural boundary, one option would be to draw the study area on the inside. Commissioner Craft thought that because the park is an amenity and has a path system, perhaps the neighborhood would be a candidate for a zoning change and transition. She asked the Commissioners to provide direction as to which boundary line they prefer. It may also be appropriate to extend the boundaries to include properties located further east. She said staff will prepare a walking map of the two study areas so that people can do self-guided or group tours. Along with the map, information will be provided to make it clear that although Northeast 155th Street is a potential location, the City will not do study area

boundaries or station area planning for a station in that area unless Sound Transit moves forward with the location as preferred alternative.

Ms. Redinger advised that the west boundary of the Northeast 145th Street land use study area will be the west side of Paramount Park, and the mobility study's boundary line will extend to include major arterials (15th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 155th Street). The committee walked down Northeast 145th Street and recognized that it is not a pedestrian friendly environment. The study will identify potential changes to improve the situation.

Commissioner Scully said the committee discussed that as the studies move forward, the City may want to sequentially make changes to the zoning. He emphasized that it is not the City's intent that all properties within the land use study areas will suddenly be zoned for high-density development. The study is intended to think 20, 50 or 100 years into the future, and not just what is going to happen when the stations are developed.

Ms. Redinger agreed it is important to emphasize the differences between study area boundary, comprehensive plan designations, and actual zoning designations. The City decided not to include parcel specific boundaries for the study areas in the Comprehensive Plan because they did not want people to think that decision had been made with regard to zoning. The boundaries merely designate the study areas.

Ms. Redinger said that because the Comprehensive Plan policies identify certain densities for the study areas, people have asked when the rezones will take place. She emphasized that the City's plan is to first draw study area boundaries and then talk about potential transitions, appropriate zoning, design standards, etc. The last step will be to create a system to phase in zoning changes over time. This phased-in process will create more certainty and offer reassurance to surrounding property owners. The goal is to structure the station area plans to identify what is likely to redevelop in the next 10 years, 20 years, 40 years, etc. The intent is to figure out what is realistic, what the market will support, and then create expectations for different phases of the plan over time.

Commissioner Montero asked if it would be possible to overlay the environmentally sensitive areas onto the study area maps. Ms. Redinger said that some environmentally sensitive areas were included in the study areas and some were not. The map could be updated to make it clear that environmentally sensitive areas would not be appropriate for redevelopment. She noted that additional coding is needed on the maps to make them more clear and easier to read.

Vice Chair Esselman suggested that because the boundaries simply delineate an area of study, perhaps Twin Ponds Park should be included as an area that could potentially be impacted. Commissioner Wagner agreed that it would make sense to include Twin Ponds Park in the study area to consider through connections. However, including residential sites, as well, could send the message that the City is considering zoning changes to the residential areas. Vice Chair Esselman expressed her belief that the study area should include both sides of the street to reiterate the fact that the boundaries are intended to include all properties that could be impacted by the light rail station. It is the City's responsibility to identify and respond to all the potential impacts.

Commissioner Scully pointed out that the parcels that are currently zoned as high-density residential were included in the potential impact area, but it was not the committee's intent to suggest that the high-density would expand beyond where it is currently located. He said it seems unlikely that pedestrian and bicycle commuters from outside the half mile circle would utilize the transit center because it is too far away and the park acts as a natural barrier.

Commissioner Craft agreed with Vice Chair Esselman that the park offers a great amenity and a tremendous number of opportunities for the surrounding neighborhoods. Including it in the study area would allow the City to consider the opportunities that might exist in the near, medium and long-term from a land-use perspective. Ms. Redinger clarified that the Commission has the opportunity to include the park and residential properties in the mobility study area, but not in the land use study area.

Commissioner Craft pointed out that there are two major arterials near Twin Ponds Park: Northeast 155th Street and Meridian Avenue North. There are also two major schools on the west side of Meridian Avenue North. Given the current uses, he suggested there may be potential for greater densities within this area to take advantage of some of the opportunities that already exist. However, he emphasized that the boundaries identify the study area only, and no zoning changes have been identified.

Commissioner Wagner pointed out that there is no through access from the single-family homes to the station sites. Commissioner Craft noted that access could be provided at some point in the future. Commissioner Wagner agreed but observed that it would be a very big change for the neighborhood. While mobility is important, she does not anticipate significant changes in zoning in this residential area. She suggested it would be appropriate to include the park and the residential properties in the mobility study area, but they should not be included in the land use study area as potential areas for rezone. Once again, Commissioner Craft expressed his belief that the properties should be included in the land use study area because of the major arterials that surround them. This neighborhood could take advantage of existing components and future opportunities from a land use and zoning standpoint. Once mobility issues have been addressed, transportation improvements may beget additional opportunities for zoning.

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that much of the properties within the Northeast 145th Street study area boundaries were recently studied as part of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan. However, she recognized that the context of the station area study will be different and it could be beneficial to discuss the areas again. She also pointed out that the owners of the veterinary clinic also own an adjacent parcel of property. While their comment letter phrases the current zoning as a mistake, it was really a missed opportunity. Had the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan Committee recognized that the properties were all under the ownership of the clinic, they would likely have recommended the zoning change previously. That is why Arthur Peach, a member of the committee, suggested that the property owner should not be charged for a rezone. The committee's general practice was to step down intensity parcel by parcel. She suggested that the property could be included in the study area.

Commissioner Craft pointed out that there is quite a lot of traffic on 148th Street (I think he may have meant 8th Avenue Northeast) because it circumvents 15th Avenue Northeast and connects all the way through to Northeast 155th Street. Beyond that it is difficult to create any through streets, and the chances for change in the near or medium future are very limited given the current uses. That was his

rationale for keeping the boundary at the corner of Northeast 145th Street and 15th Avenue Northeast. However, he would not object to extending the study area boundary further.

Commissioner Montero pointed out that ?? is one of the major connector routes to the Burke Gillman Trail, and a station on Northeast 145th Street will likely cause people to change their routes from going down Northeast 155th Street and 15th Avenue Northeast to coming down ?. This may be a reason to extend the study area, as well.

Commissioner Wagner suggested that the Paramount Park Open Space should be included in the study area because there is commercial development in the area and it is located on an arterial. She reminded the Commission that the station area plans are intended to project into the future up to 100 years, and including the open space in the study area will allow them to review potential impacts to the property within the context of future station area development.

The Commission discussed the need to specifically identify environmentally sensitive areas as properties where redevelopment would not be allowed. Ms. Redinger suggested that perhaps it would be helpful to have a symbol or separate color to identify opportunity sites and environmentally sensitive sites where uses will not likely change.

Commissioner Scully recalled that the committee originally discussed fine tuning the study area boundaries to exclude such things as clusters of large trees. While they agreed that environmentally sensitive areas should be protected, they also agreed not to exclude them from the study areas at this time. If the study areas are too fine-grained, something may be missed. Commissioner Wagner suggested that additional criteria should be added to address environmentally sensitive areas. She also suggested “environmental assets” would be a better term than “environmentally sensitive areas.” Commissioner Scully cautioned against distinguishing between the different types of properties in fine detail without first soliciting input from the public. Ms. Redinger noted that all the properties would be included in the study area boundaries, but staff could come up with a symbol or shading to identify opportunity and environmentally sensitive properties.

The Commission agreed that the boundaries of the 145th Street study areas should be:

Commissioner Maul said he can see where higher density development may want to be located closer to environmental assets, as opposed to across the street from the transit centers. Commissioner Craft agreed. Commissioner Maul suggested that the boundaries for the 185th Street study area should be expand, and the remainder of the Commission concurred.

Commissioner Craft explained that when the committee initially looked at the land use study areas, they tried to determine what is realistic. This area that is sandwiched between Interstate 5 and Northeast 175th Street did not seem to be a candidate for inclusion in the study because of limited accessibility. Given the topography, it is unlikely that this area will change. However, he said he is not concerned about whether the boundary is closer to Northeast 180th Street or Northeast 175th.

Commissioner Craft explained that the committee chose 8th Avenue Northeast as the Northeast 185th Street study area boundary because it is a utility street that is extra wide. It seems appropriate to

concentrate improvements on rights-of-way that can accommodate them. He noted that 10th Avenue Northeast is quite narrow. Ms. Redinger agreed that 8th Avenue Northeast is a utility corridor, which makes it a candidate for additional zoning because there is more right-of-way space for roadway improvements or pedestrian and walkway improvements. Commissioner Wagner suggested that 10th Avenue Northeast may need traffic calming measures to prevent cut-through traffic.

The Commission agreed that the boundaries for the 185th Street study areas should be:

Ms. Redinger said she would prepare an updated version of the map to incorporate the Commission's comments in preparation for the joint Commission/City Council meeting on May 2nd. She would also update the criteria to include environmentally sensitive areas. The staff reports for the May 2nd Meeting should be available by April 23rd. It is anticipated that the City Council will approve the consultant for the study area project on April 22nd.

Discussion on Purpose of Point Wells Committee

Mr. Szafran reviewed that Commissioner Maul would be the Commission's point person for tracking developments related to Point Wells. Vice Chair Esselman would be the backup point person. Vice Chair Esselman advised that the purpose of the committee is to make sure a Commission representative is present at all of the community meetings related to Point Wells. Commissioner Maul said he plans to attend Save Richmond Beach community meetings and be an ear on what is going on in Snohomish County, as well. The committee will report back to the Commission. Vice Chair Esselman added that it is not the committee's intent to duplicate the efforts of staff. Instead, the committee can provide a communication link between the community and the Planning Commission.

Director Markle announced that the Public Works Director is scheduling meetings with neighbors that need more information before the Transportation Corridor Study gets started. For example, he will meet with a group of residents on Apple Tree Lane to provide more information about what is going on and what is coming next, and to answer their questions. He may also meet with Innis Arden residents. She asked Commissioners to notify staff if they know of residents who want to meet with staff to gather more information. Commissioner Maul said two organizations have indicated that they would like to use the Planning Commission as a link to City staff. Perhaps City staff could be invited to attend their meetings and provide additional information.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission of their joint meeting with the City Council on May 2nd at 7:00 p.m. to discuss light rail station area planning. Ms. Simulcik Smith added that Chair Moss will also present the Commission's annual report to the City Council during the last 15 minutes of the joint meeting. Because the City Council will receive a written copy prior to the meeting, the majority of the time could be spent discussing the report.

Mr. Szafran advised that a public hearing for the proposed Development Code amendments is schedule for May 16th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Donna Moss
Chair, Planning Commission

Kate Skone
Clerk, Planning Commission

TIME STAMP
April 18, 2013

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 1:35

STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS:

Staff Presentation: 1:50

Public Comment: 22:51

Commission Discussion: 26:55

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 37:25

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Light Rail Station Area Planning – Draft Study Area Boundaries: 42:56

Discuss Purpose of Point Wells Committee: 1:44:05

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS: 1:47:45

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING: 1:47:56

ADJOURNMENT