

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Chris Roberts](#)
Cc: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Heidi Costello](#)
Subject: 185th Zoning questions
Date: Friday, August 08, 2014 1:01:58 PM

Chris –

Here are the responses to your questions, with responses being in red. We will add to I-Legislate for Monday's discussion.

- 1) The Planning Commission did not recommend Amendment D as part of the study, correct? **That is correct.**
- 2) MUR 35, 45, and 85 are proposed to be named as such because of the proposed height allowed in each zone? **Yes, along with the MUR for mixed use residential allowing some commercial uses.**
- 3) Is the planning commission considering adoption of allowance for greater height for zones marked Master Use Permit? What are those proposed heights?

This is something we'll be discussing at the Planning Commission on August 7 and 21 (and possibly beyond). In the DEIS, the MUP zones were assumed to have a 140 foot height limit. Discussion since then has yielded some additional considerations:

- **We will likely include language in the regulations pertaining to developer agreements, which are a tool to allow the greater flexibility anticipated for the MUP zone (school district property). Rather than allowing a set height limit of 140 feet, it may be better to zone these properties MUR-85 and say that to get additional heights (potentially greater than 140) a development agreement would be required specifying how amenities desired by the community will be incorporated, such as green building, affordable housing, public access through the site, etc. Should Council choose the Preferred Alternative recommended by the Planning Commission (Alternative 4) to be analyzed in the FEIS, using MUR-85 for the school district property may make the population numbers for the subarea over the next 20 years more reasonable.**
- **We have also heard mixed reviews about whether a 140 height limit will pencil for steel construction. OTAK says this is the height they're building in EastLink subareas. Scott Clark (architect who is "ground-truthing" proposed dimensional standards for 185th) says that builders really need 185 feet. The Heartland Institute (working with the City and Forterra to analyze potential for LCLIP funding) says the number is closer to 240.**

- 4) In order to maximize the usage of property, what are the across the street set back requirements for each zone in the 185th St study area from R6, R8, and R12?

The Planning Commission will be discussing transition standards at their August 7 and 21 (and possibly beyond) meetings.

The proposed zoning regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Subarea Plan will adopt the transition standards already in place. The proposed language is included below:

20.50.021 Transition areas.

Development in commercial zones: NB, CB, MB and TC-1, 2 and 3, and residential zones, MUR45, MUR85, and MUR140 abutting or directly across street rights-of-way from R-4, R-6, or R-8 zones shall minimally meet the following transition area requirements:

A. From abutting property, a 35-foot maximum building height for 25 feet horizontally from the required setback, then an additional 10 feet in height for the next 10 feet horizontally, and an additional 10 feet in height for each additional 10 horizontal feet up to the maximum height of the zone. From across street rights-of-way, a 35-foot maximum building height for 10 feet horizontally from the required building setback, then an additional 10 feet of height for the next 10 feet horizontally, and an additional 10 feet in height for each additional 10 horizontal feet, up to the maximum height allowed in the zone.

5) What is the underlying zoning of the cemetery? R-6

6) What is the proposed sequence of adoption of the zoning map and development code amendments related to the 185st study area?

Ideally, we'll be able to hold a public hearing at the Planning Commission by December for the whole package: Subarea Plan, development code regulations, FEIS, and Planned Action Ordinance and bring all of these to the Council at the first meeting in 2015 for final review, revisions and adoption.

5) Finally, as a question, will the draft or final EIS consider modifications and additional connections to the street grid to improve walkability?

Yes, generally speaking, the FEIS will provide more detail about mitigation measures, which will be included in the Subarea Plan as a prioritized list of potential capital projects. Also, in order to minimize congestion on 185th Street, Transportation Planners recommended restricting access to side streets, and creating internal circulation and ideally alleyways. This recommendation is primarily focused on automobile traffic, but would have benefits for bike traffic in that there would be fewer curb-cuts that can create safety hazards. In terms of pedestrian circulation, requiring access

through large developments can create new paths.

Debbie Tarry
City Manager
City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133