

Explanation of Options Considered and Recommended for Preferred Alternative at July 10, 2014 Planning Commission Public Hearing on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 185th Street Station Subarea Plan

This document requires reference to a companion map, entitled "Options Considered during July 10 Public Hearing", which outlines the areas referenced here. Each area is labeled and the corresponding description is below, along with the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council regarding the Preferred Alternative zoning map to be analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan.

- A- The proposal for this area is to change from its current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density consistent with zoning shown to the north and across the street (staff interpreted this to mean R-18 because that designation is proposed for adjacent parcels). This area was the subject of discussion at one of the break-out tables during the February 20 Design Dialogue Workshop. Unfortunately, the resident who made the suggestion did not provide her name. The reason for the proposed change was to have consistent zoning on both sides of 5th Avenue NE.
- Pro of including this recommendation in the Preferred Alternative- the request came from a resident of the area.
 - Con of including this recommendation in the Preferred Alternative- staff has no information about whether others in this area would prefer to retain current zoning or increase development potential.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-6 to R-18 (unanimous).
- B- The proposal for this area is to change from its current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density consistent with zoning shown to the north, east, and west (staff interpreted this to mean R-18 because that designation is proposed for adjacent parcels). The specific request came from a resident of 11th Ave. NE, within the block under consideration.
- Pro- the request came from a resident of the area (see Attachment A).
 - Con- staff has no information about whether others in this area would prefer to retain current zoning or increase development potential.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-6 to R-18 (unanimous).
- C- The proposal for this area is to change from its current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density consistent with zoning shown to the west (staff interpreted this to mean R-18 because that designation is proposed for adjacent parcels). The specific requests came from an owner of 4 properties within the "hook" area of NE Perkins Way and another homeowner who lives off of NE Perkins Way.
- Pro- the request came from more than one property owner in the area. See Attachment A for Mr. Gale and Ms. Pipkin's comments. Minutes from the July 10 public hearing also recorded testimony from 3 residents (including Mr. Gale and Ms. Pipkin) in support of this amendment.

- Con- staff has not received comments directly from other property owners in this area.
- Additional consideration- Comments received to date have stated that this segment of NE Perkins Way will be a popular route for residents from Lake Forest Park to access the 185th Street Station. Traffic is likely to increase on this topographically challenged road section creating a need for multi modal transportation improvements. The character of this area would also likely change if it becomes a well traveled east/west route to and from the 185th Street Station. In recognition of this potential, it makes sense to analyze these impacts further, and possibly amend zoning if land use solutions are required in addition to transportation improvements.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-6 to R-18 (4-3 vote).

D- The proposal for this area is to change from its current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density consistent with zoning shown to the south (staff confirmed that the person who submitted the request meant R-18). The specific request came from a resident of NE 195th Street, within the block under consideration.

- Pro- the request came from a resident of the area. See Attachment A for full comment. Earlier public discussions have suggested that additional density may be appropriate for areas surrounding parks because they provide amenities and visual and sound barriers to mitigate impacts associated with redevelopment.
- Con- staff has no information about whether others in this area would prefer to retain current zoning or increase development potential. Commissioners felt that this area was not appropriate for higher density or a necessary transition to single-family to the north because the North City Park already provides a barrier from potential redevelopment.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to retain R-6 zoning analyzed in Draft EIS. The motion failed by a vote of 2 to 5.

E- The proposal for this area is to change from the R-48 and R-18 zoning analyzed in the Draft EIS to Mixed-Use Residential. The specific request came from Councilmembers Keith McGlashan and Will Hall at the May 19 Council meeting.

- Pro- Councilmembers McGlashan and Hall stated that this area is immediately adjacent to the interstate and could provide more residential units within close proximity to the light rail station. With regard to the area north of 185th Street, the topography is lower than areas to the west, so taller buildings could provide noise barriers to homes to the west.
- Con- Staff has no information about whether property owners in this area would prefer to retain current zoning or increase development potential.
- Additional consideration- With regard to the Final EIS, this change may require additional mitigation, such as sidewalk and roadway improvements, which could be seen as a positive or a negative from the residents' perspective.

- July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-48 and R-18 to MUR (unanimous).

F- The proposal for this area is to change from the Neighborhood Business zoning analyzed in the Draft EIS to R-48. This is a staff recommendation based on an evolving concept of what the revised R-48 zoning designation may be. It has been discussed repeatedly that the current R-48 designation does not meet the intent to create the “station boulevard” or “main street” character envisioned for the 185th Street corridor, and would need to be revised. Additional discussion of this change is included in the July 10 staff report, but as it relates to Area F, the primary reasons for recommending that this area be zoned the revised R-48 instead of Neighborhood Business (NB) are listed as pros below.

- Pro- As staff drafts allowable uses for a revised R-48 zone, there may be little distinction between the new zone and the existing NB zone, so in order to avoid confusion and the potential for split-zoning if parcels are aggregated for redevelopment, zoning should be consistent with neighboring parcels.
- Con- Staff can think of no disadvantage to making this change. The original intent of labeling these parcels NB was to create a distinct opportunity for mixed-use on larger parcels near the Shoreline Center, but current thinking is that zoning consistently with the rest of the block makes more sense. However, if the newly named zone and refined uses and standards proposed to replace R-48 in the 185th Street Station Subarea are not embraced by the Planning Commission, then the NB zone may still be appropriate.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from NB to R-48 (unanimous).

G- The proposal for this area is to change from the R-24 zoning analyzed in the Draft EIS to R-18. This is a staff recommendation similar to Area F. The original intent was to provide additional transition to step down from the R-48 zoning proposed for the 185th Street corridor. However, preliminary discussions about revised standards for both the R-48 and R-18 zones indicate that transition could effectively be covered through design standards, rather than through zoning.

- Pro- Zoning this area R-18 creates consistency with proposed zoning to the north, as well as with the rest of the subarea, which transitions from R-48 to R-18 with no intermediary zoning. It would also reduce the possibility for split-zoning if parcels are aggregated for redevelopment.
- Con- Staff can think of no disadvantage to making this change.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-24 to R-18 (unanimous).

H- This represents another option for zoning along 185th Street with regard to depth of zoning and transitions between R-48, R-18, and R-6. The depth of zoning analyzed in Alternative 3 in the Draft EIS was based on comments from City transportation staff that in order to reduce congestion along the 185th Street

corridor, no new curb cuts (driveways) should be allowed, and instead access through side-streets and internal circulation within developments should be encouraged. In order to promote these design elements, the depth of the R-48 and R-18 zoning was increased. Staff then began hearing from developers and building industry professionals that the R-48 zoning was too deep.

This is one of the reasons that the City contracted with the Clark Design Group to “ground-truth” proposed zoning by sketching up potential scenarios of building footprints and block redevelopment based on their experience working with similar zoning in Seattle, which more closely correlates to the type of redevelopment envisioned along the 185th Street corridor. More discussion of this additional analysis will be provided as the Commission begins considering height and bulk standards, but Area H represents the recommendation of Scott Clark, AIA, NCARB, Partner at the Clark Design Group. This recommendation is based on a 300 foot zoning depth, which allows for walkable blocks while providing sufficient room for internal circulation, creation of alleyways for access, etc.

Mr. Clark also suggested slightly revising the R-18 areas to provide transition to the R-6 zones along the street, rather than mid-block. This means that in the area south of 185th Street, parcels analyzed in the Draft EIS as R-18 would be included in the Preferred Alternative as R-6, while north of 185th Street, the opposite is true, and the R-18 zoning would be extended further north to N 188th, 189th, or 190th Streets moving eastward towards Meridian Avenue N.

- Pro- This recommendation seems to fulfill all intended transition and circulation goals identified, while providing walkable blocks, without extending further than necessary into existing single-family neighborhoods. The City’s Economic Development Manager stated, “The proposed 300’ depth on either side of the station corridor is intended to be right-sized to allow significant area for redevelopment along with a proven pedestrian-friendly street grid. If the area were much deeper, its pedestrian-required focus would be compromised; if the area were much narrower, the corridor as a whole would lack the density needed to be truly energized.”
- Con- Moving forward with the option analyzed in the Draft EIS would not necessarily be detrimental, it just might not be ideal.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation was to accept part of this recommendation and reject the rest. Commissioners did not share Mr. Clark’s concern about deeper zoning compromising walkability since it could promote internal circulation for pedestrians as well as vehicles. Therefore, they chose not to recommend changing the depth of zoning south of 185th. They did concur with Mr. Scott that transition between R-18 and R-6 to the north of 185th should occur at the street rather than mid-block. The motion reflected this change and was approved unanimously.

- I- The proposal for this area is to change from the R-48 and R-18 zoning analyzed in the Draft EIS to MUR. This option was proposed by Commissioner Maul during the July 10 meeting.
- Pro- Commissioner Maul reasoned that this amendment would increase options for redevelopment in an area that is close to the station and Shoreline Center, and bounded by a park to the south and a cemetery to the north. He said that if he were looking to develop or live in a taller building in this area, the area to the east (labeled E on the map) that is directly adjacent to the freeway would be a less desirable location and he would prefer to build or live up on the hill, overlooking the park and Shoreline Center with potential views of Cascade and Olympic mountains.
 - Con- Commissioner Scully countered that if the goal is to create a dense urban core that transitions to single-family neighborhoods, this proposal dilutes that vision.
 - Additional considerations- Proposals I, J, and K were introduced for the first time the night of the public hearing, so staff has no information about whether people in these areas would support additional zoning capacity. It is worth mentioning, however, that for those interested in preserving the single-family character of the neighborhood, a more intensive zoning that includes a minimum density may actually discourage redevelopment until the market is ready to build this style in the more distant future.
 - July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-48 and R-18 to MUR (6-1 vote).
- J- The proposal for this area was change from R-24, R-18, and R-6 designations analyzed in the Draft EIS to R-48. This motion was amended additional times and eventually created separate areas (J and K). This motion amends changes recommended earlier for the eastern half of Area G, changing it from the previously recommended R-18 to R-48 (it was analyzed in the Draft EIS as R-24).
- Pro- This change complements the previous recommendation to add zoning capacity to Area I by creating a transition between proposed higher density to the east and proposed R-18 to the west. Commissioners Maul and Moss mentioned that they heard support for upzoning parcels west of 1st Avenue at multiple public meetings from residents of this area because of proximity to the park and Shoreline Center, and because 1st Avenue will likely be a popular arterial for those accessing the station from the north.
 - Con- Proposals I, J, and K were introduced for the first time the night of the public hearing, so staff has no information (other than previous conversations with residents at public meetings earlier in the process) about whether people in these areas would support additional zoning capacity. A primary concern is that because this area was shown in all alternatives analyzed in the DEIS as retaining single family (R-6) zoning, residents of the area who previously saw any of the published maps may have thought that their homes would be unaffected by zoning change and stopped following the process.

Other R-6 zones within the subarea (A, B, C, and D) were recommended for additional zoning capacity, but these requests were initiated by residents of the area because blocks surrounding them were proposed for higher capacity and they felt “left out”. In contrast, this request came from the Planning Commission and while it is adjacent to areas recommended for additional density to the east and south, it was not surrounded in the same way as other areas. Director Markle expressed concern about piecemeal development in this area, partly because it is further away from the station.

- July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change zoning from R-24, R-18, and R-6 to R-48 (6-1 vote).

K- The proposal for this area was to change from R-6 zoning designation analyzed in the Draft EIS to R-18, and was initiated by Commissioners during the July 10 meeting.

- Pro- If proposed changes in areas to the east (J and I) are included as part of the Preferred Alternative, this would function to transition from higher densities to single-family neighborhoods to the north and west.
- Con- Proposals I, J, and K were introduced for the first time the night of the public hearing, so staff has no information about whether people in these areas would support additional zoning capacity. A primary concern is that because this area was shown in all alternatives analyzed in the DEIS as retaining single family (R-6) zoning, residents of the area who previously saw any of the published maps may have thought that their homes would be unaffected by zoning change and stopped following the process.

Other R-6 zones within the subarea (A, B, C, and D) were recommended for additional zoning capacity, but these requests were initiated by residents of the area because blocks surrounding them were proposed for higher capacity and they felt “left out”. In contrast, this request came from the Planning Commission and while it is adjacent to areas recommended for additional density to the east and south, it was not surrounded in the same way as other areas. Director Markle expressed concern about piecemeal development in this area, partly because it is further away from the station.

- July 10 Planning Commission recommendation for this area was to change proposed zoning from R-6 to R-18 (6-1 vote).

Underlying zoning in parks- The map displaying options for the Preferred Alternative also shows hatch-marks on the parks within the subarea. This is because parks are classified as a use, rather than a zoning designation. Changing the underlying zoning designation would not affect the park use, but zoning should be consistent with adjacent lots. The specific zoning does not need to be determined at this time, but these marks are a place-holder so that this does not get overlooked in the final zoning

recommendation because it is important that uses that may be considered in the future are allowed in underlying zoning. For example, suppose that the Shoreline Center were to redevelop and the City wanted to consider incorporating functions of the Spartan Recreational Center into a redeveloped, more energy-efficient pool site, existing single-family zoning may not allow for proposed uses or necessary height. Also, options for Rotary Park include using it as space for public art or selling it to a developer in conjunction with a larger project. If the latter option were chosen, it would be important to have similar zoning across parcels.