

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 17, 2014
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Scully
Vice Chair Craft
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Strandberg

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Juniper Nammi, Assoc. Planner, Planning and Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Moss

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Scully, Vice Chair Craft, and Commissioners Malek, Maul, Montero and Strandberg. Commissioner Moss was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 20, 2014 and April 3, 2014 were adopted 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: HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND 2013 HISTORIC INVENTORY UPDATE

Staff Presentation

Ms. Nammi explained that the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the City to consider historic and cultural resources, and Vision 2029 and the Comprehensive Plan include goals and policies related to historic preservation. In addition, regulations for “Landmarks Preservation” can be found in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 15.20.

Ms. Nammi explained that the City accomplishes historic review through an interlocal agreement with King County. Properties that might have historic significance are referred to the County, and the County provides feedback on what considerations should be made before a historic property is modified or demolished. The interlocal agreement makes the City eligible for State and County grants that are available for historic preservation. As part of the agreement, the County manages the City’s Landmarks Commission, assists in the preparation of nomination applications, helps conduct surveys and inventories, and maintains inventory data. In other local cities they have helped in implementing design guidelines in historic districts and preservation planning, neither of which the City of Shoreline has done to date.

Ms. Nammi noted that the City does not have its own Landmarks Commission. Instead, Rob Garwood, Planner and Shoreline resident, serves on the County’s Landmarks Commission as a special member. There is a term limit on this position, requiring that the City Council periodically nominate a new representative.

Ms. Nammi announced that the City currently has four historic landmark properties. The Boeing Residence and the Crawford Store were designated before the City incorporated, and the Ronald School and Richmond Masonic Hall were designated after incorporation. She noted that the Masonic Hall is a good example of how historic preservation can open financial opportunities for property owners. Efforts to sell the property were unsuccessful, and the property owner decided to nominate the building for landmark status after learning about the grants and other financial incentives that would be available as a result. Once the property received landmark status, the property owner received grant funding to fix the foundation, replace the siding, redo the roof, and replace some of the original architectural detail that had been removed. The building is now a functional community space. She advised that, in addition to grant funding, properties that are designated as landmarks are also eligible for low-interest loans, special consideration under the building code, technical assistance, special valuation tax programs, etc.

Ms. Nammi said the oldest building in Shoreline is a house in Richmond Beach that was built in 1891. Because it was recently remodeled, it no longer has integrity. She explained that while properties must be at least 40 years old, most of the landmark properties and properties on the inventory are older. In addition to age, properties must also have integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and/or association. Properties must also meet one of the following five criteria:

- Associated with events that reflect broad patterns of national, state or local history.
- Associated with the lives of significant people.

- Embody characteristics of a type, period, style or method of construction.
- Yield information important in prehistory or history.
- Outstanding work of a significant designer or builder.

Ms. Nammi explained that the City's Historic Inventory identifies resources that are considered historically significant and may potentially be eligible for designation as a Shoreline Historic Landmark. The original survey was completed by King County in 1978, and the inventory was updated as part of the Comprehensive Plan process that took place in 1994-1995 as the City was incorporating.

Ms. Nammi briefly explained that historic inventory properties are very different from historic landmark properties. While a small amount of research would be required before inventory properties are demolished or significantly altered, protection would not be mandatory. Landmark properties are protected, but modifications are allowed through the Certificate of Appropriateness process. Only landmark properties are eligible for incentives and tax programs.

Ms. Nammi explained that, through a \$6,000 grant from 4Culture, the City updated its existing inventory to identify the properties that have been demolished or modified. She noted that nearly one-third of the buildings have been demolished since they were identified in the 1994-1995 inventory. In addition, the consultant surveyed 50 properties east of Aurora Avenue North, focusing particularly on the Light Rail Station Study Areas. Of those 50 properties, 25 were added to the inventory. She provided photographs of and brief information about some of the properties that were reviewed and added to the inventory.

Ms. Nammi summarized that five properties from the previous survey had been modified enough to make them ineligible, and 22 properties were revisited and confirmed as still potentially eligible. In addition, the survey corrected errors in the previous inventory and the maps were updated as necessary. She noted that property owners were notified of the project and the status of their properties.

Vice Chair Craft referred to the architecturally-significant homes (mid century modern) on 10th Avenue that might not meet the threshold of 40 years but have significantly relevant architecture. He asked if these structures would be reviewed under the same criteria. Ms. Nammi answered that the City does not conduct a historic review when permits are submitted for properties that are not part of the inventory. Vice Chair Craft asked if the City has given any thought to changing this policy to address these architecturally significant houses. Ms. Nammi explained that the inventory started with properties that were built as early as 1939. While newer properties may have qualified for the inventory, the City did not have the financial resources to include them in the survey; and the City Council indicated that no additional resources should be utilized to expand the inventory at this time.

Public Comment

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission, and the public comment period was closed.

STUDY ITEM: LIGHT RAIL STATION SUBAREA PLANNING UPDATE

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger announced that staff is currently working through the process of contracting with OTAK for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan. She provided a timeline for the project, noting that Part I of the Design Dialogue Workshops is scheduled for June 12th. This workshop would be a high-level brainstorming session, and the consultants will have the summer to develop the computer model for Part II of the Design Dialogue Workshops in September.

Robin Lombard, Shoreline, said she is co-leader of the 145SCC and lives in the Parkwood Neighborhood. The committee first met in August, 2013, to provide feedback on the Sound Transit Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), and they have been meeting monthly since December 2013. Between 10 and 15 people attend each meeting, and the meeting notes are sent to about 70 people on the email list. She said the two greatest concerns expressed so far are related to the environment and how zoning changes would alter the community. The committee is actively working to address these issues, and they look forward to contributing to the process as it moves forward through the Design Dialogue Workshops. Ms. Redinger said members of the committee are working to catalogue pictures of the existing neighborhoods, and staff will assist them with working the pictures into the Design Dialogue Workshops.

Chair Scully asked if the 145SCC and 185SCC have websites. Ms. Redinger said both groups have websites via Futurewise, and she will check to make sure they are up to date. Chair Scully asked how Commissioners could get added to the email list. Ms. Redinger answered that the best way would be to sign up through the Futurewise website or at any of the meetings.

Ms. Redinger reviewed the project timeline for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. She noted that they are currently in the analysis phase, which includes not only the DEIS, but also a lot of the code regulations and other items that will be included in the subarea plan. The Planning Commission will be heavily involved in both the analysis and adoption phases of the project. They are still on schedule to adopt the plan in the fall of 2014.

Ms. Redinger noted that the comments received during Part I of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan Design Dialogue Workshops were incorporated into the design models that were presented at Part II of the workshops in February. She briefly reviewed the comments that were received, noting that participants expressed support for smart growth and transit-oriented development in the station areas and indicated a desire for more east/west connections. Participants also expressed a desire for complete streets, more bicycle connections, connections between North City and Aurora Avenue North, and providing quality housing for all income levels. There were also comments about neighborhood identity and public amenities, and there was a lot of discussion about public art.

Ms. Redinger advised that, as required by the DEIS, the consultants presented three alternative zoning scenarios at Part II of the Design Dialogue Workshops for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. The alternatives were intended to represent what the area could look like if fully build out. She said staff was careful to emphasize that change would happen gradually over many decades, and the City would set the stage by adopting Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations, as well as Development Code regulations. The pace, timing and intensity of development will be up to market forces and property

owner decision making, and public investment in the station area will help incentivize redevelopment. She advised that the market assessment indicated some demand for residential development and that property aggregation would be required. Staff also reminded those in attendance that the plan is intended to be a 20-year vision, and there will be several opportunities to reevaluate the plan as part of future Comprehensive Plan updates. She provided maps and computer models to review each of the following alternatives:

- **Alternative 1** identifies no action, which means the zoning would remain the same (R-6 and R-12 with a 35-foot height limit). However, some changes would still occur. For example, existing homeowners could maximize the development potential currently allowed on their lots by going up to 35 feet in height, adding accessory dwelling units, etc.
- **Alternative 2** identifies some growth that focuses on the key-connecting corridor of 185th Street to 10th Avenue and 180th Street. This alternative sets the stage for key opportunity sites by creating a station boulevard concept.
- **Alternative 3** identifies the most growth and focuses on the corridor with expanded potential for increased densities and filling up the study area further. This alternative represents a type of transit village design that provides for flexibility and innovation at key sites.

Ms. Redinger provided cross sections of 185th Street, noting that the model identifies an 80-foot right-of-way, and there is currently only 60 feet. One of the priorities of the subarea plan will be to expand the setbacks along 185th Street so that future development does not extend into that area. She noted that the three-lane option for 185th Street would not include a dedicated bus lane in each direction. However, buses would have transit priority via signals, etc., and the turning lane in the middle would help with congestion. She provided various examples of how development, amenity zones, bike lanes, pedestrian walkways, green building, stormwater facilities, etc. could be incorporated into the plan. She also shared ideas for the overpass bridge.

Ms. Redinger said the next step for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan process will be a presentation of the DEIS to the City Council on May 19th. Following the presentation, the DEIS will be published and the comment period will start. A community meeting is planned for June 3rd from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. If the Commission wants to make a recommendation via a public hearing on July 10th, the comment period could remain open until the public hearing has been closed. Staff will present the Commission's preferred alternative to the City Council in late July or early August, and the Planned Action EIS will move forward as part of the final subarea plan. In the meantime, the 185SCC will continue to meet on a monthly basis, and staff will personally walk the committee through the process on May 5th.

Ms. Redinger advised that the DEIS will focus on the built environment, but will also incorporate some elements of the natural environment. Noise was analyzed as part of Sound Transit's DEIS, and geotechnical issues will be addressed as part of the geotech report that is required for site development.

Ms. Redinger referred to the summary of Part II of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan Design Dialogue Workshop, which was included in the Commission's desk packet. The summary includes the graphics she reviewed, as well as information about the various elements in the DEIS.

Ms. Redinger explained that after completing its review of the DEIS, the Commission's agenda will focus on Development Code regulations to implement the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. This will include discussions about housing affordability, housing choices and universal design, transition standards, neighborhood character, new or revised zoning standards and incentives versus mandates.

Ms. Redinger said she anticipates that the Commission will conduct a public hearing on the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan and Planned Action EIS in September or October. The final subarea plan will include changes to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, zoning designations, and Development Code regulations. As currently envisioned, the subarea plan and accompanying Development Code and Comprehensive Plan changes will be adopted by the City Council by the end of 2014.

Vice Chair Craft asked if there is a plan to get new leadership on the 185SCC. Ms. Redinger said one co-chair is still leading the group. However, because of his time constraints, Futurewise has agreed to prepare agendas and meeting summaries. Vice Chair Craft questioned the appropriateness of having Futurewise involved in agenda making. Ms. Redinger explained that part of Futurewise's mission is building organizational capacity, which is something the 185SCC lacks. For example, a representative from Futurewise helped the committee organize the "ride the rails" tour that took place last Saturday. Futurewise was a lot more involved in the early phases of both SCC's, and staff talked to the committee leaders about the importance of maintaining a bright line between the self-formed, autonomous, independent citizen committee and an advocacy group. They have done a good job of doing that, and Futurewise is now supporting the committees in appropriate ways. The 185SCC's main focus at this time is to get people to come to the June 3rd DEIS meeting and to act as an informed group of citizens for a neighborhood liaison.

Vice Chair Craft noted that in most of the renderings, the utility corridor would remain intact despite rezone. He asked if there has been any discussion about relocating the utility corridor. Ms. Redinger said Seattle City Light attended Part II of the Design Dialogue Workshop, and comments received from each of the stakeholder groups and large property owners are listed in the appendix of the DEIS. While she initially thought the transmission lines were too large to place underground, Seattle City Light indicated support for undergrounding with the caveat that it would be extremely expensive. Vice Chair Craft expressed his belief that retaining the existing above ground utilities would be a significant deterrent for future redevelopment in the area.

Commissioner Montero asked if the three-lane roadway design in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan would be consistent with the Point Wells Transportation Corridor Study. Ms. Redinger said she does not necessarily anticipate design consistency, but they are working closely with transportation planners. Because both the study and the subarea plan deal with the same corridor, the City will use the same trip generation numbers from the corridor study models in the subarea plan, as well.

Commissioner Malek noted that the Point Wells Transportation Corridor Study and the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan are moving forward simultaneously. He asked if there would be a consistent plan for parking and perhaps accommodations for a park-and-ride to serve the multimodal need that an urban center would bring. Ms. Redinger said that Sound Transit's preferred alternative includes a minimum 500-stall parking garage on the west side of the 185th Street bridge. This would be the primary park-

and-ride, but it is hoped there will be very good bus connections so that people don't have to drive to the station. There would be a similar parking garage at the 145th Street station.

Public Comment

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission, and the public comment period was closed.

Chair Scully summarized that staff is seeking direction on the following items:

- *Does the Commission want to solicit public comment on three alternatives before formulating a recommendation to the City Council? If so, should they conduct an official public hearing on July 10th?* Chair Scully pointed out that the Commission has immersed itself in the topic for the last two years. They know a lot about it and have listened to a lot of public comments that should be applied to their recommendation. He does not see a down side of holding a public hearing, since it would create more publicity. The remainder of the Commission concurred and tentatively scheduled a public hearing at a special meeting on July 10th.
- *Does the Commission want to meet jointly with the City Council for additional direction prior to moving forward on the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan?* The Commission agreed that the last joint meeting with Council to discuss the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan was productive to share information and brainstorm. If the Council is supportive of a joint meeting to discuss the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, the Commissioners indicated they would support the idea, as well. Ms. Redinger said it might also be appropriate for the Commission to meet jointly with the Parks Board since there is more park land located within the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan boundaries. The Parks Board could also meet with the 145SCC.
- *Does the Commission want to change the makeup of their Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee?* Chair Scully said that, currently, the committee members are Commissioners Maul, Craft and himself. Questions were raised about whether Commissioners Scully and Craft could continue to serve on the committee given that they were recently elected as Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission. Ms. Basher answered that they could participate on the committee, but not as voting members. The Commissioners agreed to change the makeup of the committee to include Commissioners Maul, Strandberg and Moss. The committee members agreed to work with Ms. Redinger to schedule their meeting dates and times.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Markle reminded the Commission that the Hearing Examiner would be hearing the Shoreline Community College Master Development Plan Permit on April 22nd at 6:30 p.m. She also announced that former Commissioners Wagner and Esselman would be honored at the April 28th City Council meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discussion of Draft Letter to Council

Chair Scully invited Commissioners to comment on the draft letter to Council, which was prepared by Commissioner Moss. No comments or changes were noted.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business scheduled on the agenda.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Montero announced that both he and Commissioner Malek attended the final Point Wells Transportation Corridor Study meeting on April 16th, at which the consultant presented the options. The meeting was well attended and participants were receptive and engaged. Ms. Redinger advised that one additional meeting would be held to discuss the area identified as the “triangle.” Commissioner Malek was appointed to serve with Commissioner Montero on the Commission’s Point Wells Committee.

At the request of Chair Scully, Commissioner Montero briefly reviewed the options that are being considered. He explained that the study area has been divided into two segments: the lower portion by the beach and Richmond Beach Road to 185th Street. One option is a three-lane road with bicycle paths on both sides a center turn lane. Buses would pull into the bicycle lane to drop off passengers and allow traffic to move through. The second option is two lanes in either direction. Commissioner Malek commented that the three-lane option seems more pedestrian friendly and the four-lane option is geared towards moving traffic faster. He noted that the options also identified additional traffic lights, particularly at the two five-lane intersections (8th Avenue and Richmond Beach Road and 20th Avenue and 196th Street). There has also been some discussion about traffic calming devices to discourage cut-through traffic, which has been a significant public concern.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that the May 1st agenda will include an update on the Point Wells Transportation Corridor Study. At that time, staff will outline the Commission’s future role as the Point Wells Subarea Plan moves forward. The Commission will also have a study session on the 2014 Development Code Amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Keith Scully
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission

