

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

July 10, 2014  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Scully  
Vice Chair Craft (arrived at 7:10)  
Commissioner Malek  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Montero  
Commissioner Moss  
Commissioner Strandberg

### **Staff Present**

Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Ray Allshouse, Building Official  
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney  
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

### **Others Present**

Rob Flaner, CFM, Hazard Mitigation Program Manager, Tetra Tech  
Mandi Roberts, Principal, OTAK

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Planning Commission Chair, Keith Scully, called the Special 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, and Commissioners Malek, Maul, Montero, Moss and Strandberg. Vice Chair Craft arrived at 7:10 p.m.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of June 5, 2014 and June 19, 2014 were adopted as submitted.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Tom Poitras, Shoreline**, said he is against extending the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea to include 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 165<sup>th</sup> Street or even beyond to NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street. Secondly, he said he is against making 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE a commercial boulevard with a focus on smaller, independent, and local businesses. He complimented the Planning Commission for their wise policy statement in 2013 that, “the Planning Commission agrees that the removal of the land use study area along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE was appropriate, given that the focus of land use changes should be in the one-quarter and one-half mile area surrounding the light rail station.” He commented that including 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE above NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street in the study area will require additional resources (monetary and personnel), which could very likely impact the current scheduled deadlines. In addition, the future possibility of needed infrastructure could be costly and drain funds from more important projects such as revitalizing North City and Aurora Square, acquiring and developing NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, upgrading the Aurora Corridor, and the development of both station areas. These projects are crucial to Shoreline’s economic future and should be given priority. It would be more productive to provide a strong link between the 145<sup>th</sup> Station and Aurora Square rather than from the station to the Crest Theater and the few shops around it.

Mr. Poitras summarized that if the City allows small groups of people to add their local projects to the subarea, resources will be spread too thin for more important projects. He expressed his belief that 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should not be exclusively commercial. Instead, it should include high-quality or predominantly residential development. Any commercial buildings should be required to be attractive, sustainable and green architecture rather than the strip mall format or converted, inexpensive homes. If the City wants the 145<sup>th</sup> Station on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to be an impressive gateway to Shoreline, it should have impressive buildings, not helter-skelter urban sprawl and underfunded small businesses. He provided a note describing how a low-density, commercial boulevard on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would hurt home values. He also provided photographs of several businesses in “converted homes” on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street. He expressed concern about zoning that would allow the spread of this type of business architecture from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the freeway on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, as it could become a deterrent to a vital and thriving business community for decades. Allowing it to start on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would have the same detrimental effect.

## **PUBLIC HEARING: HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE**

Chair Scully reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the public hearing.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Allshouse reviewed that the City worked with King County, as well as other jurisdictions in the County on a coordinated effort to update hazardous mitigation plans. This collective effort resulted in a better product for less effort and money.

**Rob Flaner, CFM, Hazard Mitigation Program Manager, Tetra Tech**, explained that the purpose of the Hazard Mitigation Plan is to identify long-term, sustained actions or projects to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to life and property. He advised that if the plan does a good job of loss avoidance and risk reduction (mitigation), then the necessity to prepare, respond and recover should be less. He reminded

the Commission that the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires the state and local governments to develop hazard mitigation plans as a condition of federal disaster grant assistance. In addition to improving opportunities for funding, the Hazard Mitigation Plan allows the City to be proactive rather than reactive by planning for disasters before they occur. The plan is a key element in emergency management and can set the course for response and recovery to impacts from natural disasters.

Mr. Flaner briefly outlined the process, particularly emphasizing the importance of commitment and support from elected officials and their constituents and noting that every step of the process has been conducted in an open public forum. In addition, a 19-member steering committee was formed to help identify a guiding principle, goals and objectives. Although the plan is multi-jurisdictional, there are separate sections pertaining to the specific risks and capabilities of each of the participating jurisdictions. He briefly explained the process that was used to complete the comprehensive risk assessment, which is the foundation of the plan.

Mr. Flaner advised that the plan is divided into two sections. Volume 1 applies to all of the partners, and Volume 2 is jurisdiction specific. Shoreline's plan (Chapter 23) identifies and prioritizes 16 mitigation strategies. He briefly reviewed how the priorities were assigned, noting that they could change over time as funding opportunities are available.

Mr. Flaner reviewed that the public comment period on the proposed plan started on June 27<sup>th</sup> and ends on July 11<sup>th</sup>. The public was invited to submit comments on line or via public meetings. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Planning Board will make a recommendation to the City Council and the document will be sent to the State for a pre-adoption review. Once approved by the State, the document will be presented to the City Council for review and then forwarded to FEMA for final approval. He advised that more information about the proposed plan update is available at <http://www.kingcounty.gov/hazardmitigation.com>, which is where the final plan will be housed in perpetuity. The plan has a five-year shelf life, and yearly progress reports will be posted on the site and made available to the City Council.

### **Public Testimony**

**Susan Chang, Shoreline**, referred to the maps at the end of Chapter 23 (liquefaction zones and landslide hazard areas). Although she recognized that Point Wells is located in Snohomish County, future redevelopment of the site will have an impact on Shoreline and should be addressed in the City's plan, as well. She pointed out that Point Wells is shown as a red zone on the map of liquefaction zones. It is also shown on the soil site class map as being of a higher seismic zone. However, none of the landslide hazard areas at Point Wells have been identified. She suggested this gives the mistaken impression that there are not any landslide hazards north of the County line.

No one else in the audience indicated a desire to address the Commission, and Chair Scully closed the public hearing.

Mr. Flaner commented that the City is bound, by law, to use best available data and science. He pointed out that no land slide hazard areas have been identified north of the County line because no state or

federal agency has mapped the area. He explained that the progress on the plan was tabled by the County Executive after the Oso event to revisit landslide issues, and King County is just getting ready to embark on a very detailed landslide analysis that will become the basis for the King County Critical Areas Regulations. However, this work was not completed in time for inclusion in the plan and would not include properties in Snohomish County. The plan is not meant to imply that because an area is not mapped there is no risk, but there is no credible map from a federal or state agency that shows the area in a risk zone to be reflected on our data. Mr. Allshouse added that there is some Lydar mapping of the southern portion of Snohomish County, but it has not yet been acknowledged at the federal level. He reminded the Commission that the plan is intended to be dynamic. As more information becomes available, necessary adjustments can be made.

Chair Scully recalled that this issue was discussed extensively at a recent study session. Staff clarified that to the extent the data exists, it can be added to the map. However, mitigation strategies cannot be imposed on Snohomish County. Mr. Flaner agreed that, although Point Wells might be within City's sphere of influence, the City does not have any jurisdictional authority over the area until it has been formally incorporated. If and when incorporation occurs, the City's plan could be expanded.

**COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FORWARD THE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS PRESENTED WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: 185<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)**

Chair Scully reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing, noting that the staff report would be divided into two parts: the DEIS and the three zoning alternatives analyzed in the DEIS. Staff would provide a report on the DEIS, as well as a recommendation for the Commission's consideration. Staff would also provide a report on the three zoning alternatives analyzed. The Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee would also provide a brief presentation and recommendation regarding the three zoning alternatives for the Commission's consideration. The public would then be invited to comment prior to the Commission's deliberation.

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the process to date for the 185<sup>th</sup> Station Subarea Plan, which included numerous public visioning and workshop discussions. The DEIS was presented at a community meeting on June 3<sup>rd</sup>, published on June 9<sup>th</sup>, and scheduled for a public hearing tonight. The City Council is scheduled to make a decision on the preferred alternative on August 11<sup>th</sup>, and then staff can begin analyzing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and developing a draft subarea plan and planned action ordinance. Staff will present specific development code regulations to implement the subarea plan to the Planning Commission in August and September. The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on the subarea plan and the FEIS in late October or early November, and it is anticipated the Council will adopt the plan by the end of 2014 or early 2015.

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the DEIS analyzed a number of topics, beginning with an environmental summary followed by a description of the alternatives. It also included an extensive analysis of the affected environment, potential impacts and mitigation measures with regard to:

- Land-use patterns, plans and policies
- Population, housing and employment
- Multi-modal transportation
- Public services
- Utilities.

Ms. Redinger explained that the DEIS analyzed what would be reasonable to prepare for based on a growth rate of 1.5% to 2.5% over the next 20 years, which is the lifespan of the DEIS analysis. She summarized each of the alternatives that were analyzed as part of the DEIS as follows:

- **Alternative 1 (No Action).** This scenario is nearer term but should not be interpreted to mean no change. Even if the City took no action to change zoning, property owners would still be allowed to maximize development potential in the existing single-family zones by adding accessory dwelling units and rebuilding to the maximum current height for the zone, which is 35 feet.
- **Alternate 2 (Moderate Growth).** This is a 50 to 60 year scenario and best illustrates the “station boulevard” concept that came out of the community design dialogue workshops. The scenario connects the station to Aurora Avenue North and North City. Rather than creating another commercial node throughout the boulevard, this scenario focuses on a main street concept that allows a variety of uses.
- **Alternative 3 (Most Growth).** This is a 75 to 100 year scenario that also includes the “station boulevard” concept, but with more intense zoning spread throughout the entire subarea.

Ms. Redinger referred to a memorandum prepared by OTAK (Attachment B) outlining points for the Commission to consider as they decide whether to include additional zoning changes in the preferred alternative. She also referred to a map prepared by OTAK showing where zoning changes beyond those analyzed in the DEIS have been requested. She briefly reviewed each of these changes as follows:

- **Option A** would change the current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density (R-18) consistent with zoning shown to the north and across 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.
- **Option B** would change the current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density (R-18) consistent with zoning shown to the north, east and west.
- **Option C** would change the current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density (R-18) consistent with zoning to the west.
- **Option D** would change the current R-6 zoning designation to a higher density (R-18) consistent with zoning shown to the south.

- **Option E** would change the R-48 and R-18 zoning analyzed in the DEIS to Mixed-Use Residential (MUR).
- **Option F** would change the Neighborhood Business (NB) zoning analyzed in the DEIS to R-48.
- **Option G** would change the R-24 zoning analyzed in the DEIS to R-18.
- **Option H** is another option for zoning along N 185<sup>th</sup> Street with regard to depth and transitions between R-48, R-18 and R-6.

In addition to the above changes, Ms. Redinger said the Commission should discuss the underlying zoning of parks. She noted that Attachment A shows hatch-marks on the parks within the subarea because they are classified as a use rather than a zoning designation. Changing the underlying zoning designation would not affect the park use, but zoning would be consistent with adjacent lots. She emphasized that the specific zoning does not need to be determined at this time, and the marks are intended to be a placeholder. However, it is important that these properties not be overlooked so that the uses that may be considered in the future are allowed in the underlying zoning.

Ms. Redinger advised that, for the purposes of tonight's discussion and hearing, staff will refer to zoning as R-18, R-48 and MUR. However, they will begin using the new zoning names (R-18=MUR-35, R-48=MUR-45, and MUR=MUR-85) as the plan moves forward into the FEIS phase. She explained that, currently, all of the residential categories are based on a zoning density maximum. The new categories represent a more form-based model that defines bulk and other requirements rather than maximum density. For example, the R-18 zone is capped at 18 units per acre and allows a maximum height of 40 feet. The MUR-35 zone would be capped at 35 feet, with no limit on the number of units. The maximum height in an R-48 zone is 40 feet if adjacent to single-family and 50 feet if adjacent to multi-family and commercial. A height of 60 feet is allowed with a conditional use permit. Rather than this graded height allowance, the MUR-45 zone would cap the height at 45 feet. The MUR zone was analyzed in the DEIS. However, because they are now proposing to include additional categories titled Mixed-Use Residential (MUR). This MUR zone will be renamed MUR-85, which will have a maximum height limit of 85 feet.

Ms. Redinger summarized that after the public hearing and Commission deliberation, the Commission can forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding both the DEIS and the preferred alternative zoning. She pointed out that they received numerous comments today. Most are related to transportation, sidewalks, bicycles, etc. and can be addressed through the FEIS. The main thing the Commission must do is make a recommendation to the Council on the preferred alternative zoning map. After a preferred alternative has been adopted by the City Council, the consultant will begin work on the FEIS, subarea plan and planned action ordinance. She noted that the Assistant City Attorney was present to provide direction and answer questions regarding the process. She also noted that the Commission's upcoming meetings will focus on various development code amendments necessary to implement the subarea plan.

Ms. Redinger announced that walking tours of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea are scheduled for the second Friday of each month from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Walking tours for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea are scheduled for the fourth Friday of the month from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. She encouraged Commissioners

and those in the audience to participate. The tour maps are available online, as well. She also encouraged them to visit the light rail website at <http://www.shorelinewa.gov/lightrail> for more information.

Chair Scully pointed out that the potential changes outlined by staff would only apply if the Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the highest growth alternative (Alternative 3). He suggested that if the Commission indicates a preference for Alternative 3, they could review each of the changes in more detail.

### **Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee Report**

Commissioner Maul reported that the Light Rail Station Area Committee has had numerous discussions in open, public meetings over the past two years, and they have also attended a number of workshops and public forums regarding station area planning. He said it is the Committee's recommendation that Option 1 does not meet the goals and policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan. While Option 2 is more consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, it falls short in a few areas. The public input the Committee received led them to Option 3, which does a better job of meeting the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Maul explained that the maps outlining the three alternatives were originally produced in January 2014, and a lot of citizen input has been received since then. The Committee specifically heard requests from property owners and citizens that the properties west of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE between NE 190<sup>th</sup> and NE 195<sup>th</sup> Streets should be up-zoned. The Committee sees value in this request since 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE is a strong north/south connection and is within close proximity to the new station. While it is not listed on either Attachments A or B as a potential change, the public can submit additional changes for the Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Maul referred to proposed Option E that would up-zone property to MUR, which is a greater density than what was originally proposed. Based on input from the City Council and public, the Committee also felt the area west of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, north of the Shoreline Center and Shoreline Park, over to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE might also be a logical area for MUR-85 zoning. This is particularly true given the amenities that would be located close by.

Commissioner Maul summarized that the FEIS will provide another opportunity for the City to analyze any changes the Commission makes tonight. Tonight's meeting offers an opportunity for the Commissioners to take the additional changes under advisement and solicit public input. He further summarized that the Committee is recommending the Commission consider Option 3 as the preferred alternative, along with any additional changes that result from the public hearing and Commission discussion.

Ms. Redinger explained that, as part of the FEIS process, the City is obligated to record each comment that was received during the DEIS comment period and document the City's response to each one.

### **Public Comment**

**Susana Guzman, Shoreline**, said she is a member of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Committee (185SCC) and personally supports the most growth scenario. However, she would like more consideration given to NE Perkins Way. She suggested that NE Perkins Way be made a park with a walking trail, and vehicular access would be limited to local residents. With the additional development happening in Shoreline, this trail could provide a connection to the Burke Gillman Trail. As a resident of the area, she also requested that more consideration be given to pedestrian access, particularly a pedestrian crossing over the freeway.

**Dan Dale, Shoreline**, expressed his wish that the process could be slowed down. He voiced concern that the DEIS was published 10 days later than originally proposed, and the public hearing time identified in the DEIS was initially wrong, as well. As the Commission formulates a recommendation to the City Council regarding the DEIS, he urged them to work to have a balanced, thoughtful approach about what plan is the best and most realistically looks to the future. The plan must also gel with the existing neighborhoods and consider all of the growth that will and should occur in Shoreline. It should focus on connecting all residents of Shoreline to the station.

Mr. Dale said he has spoken to many residents, particularly those surrounding the station, who believe that a moderate or hybrid, though still quite aggressive, zoning plan would make the most sense. They are concerned that the City Council will be transfixed by the big population gain numbers of the most-growth plan, which does not do enough to protect the single-family neighborhoods and will have too great an impact on the utilities, services, and future capital improvement projects. In addition, it does not reflect spreading the impact of future development into the other opportunity areas throughout the city. He asked them to continue to consider the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area as just one piece of the master plan of growth for the city. Even over a long time frame, putting on the order of 30,000 more people in this small area may not be the best thing for the city.

Mr. Dale expressed his belief that the moderate alternative would still allow opportunities for grants, big development, and station and neighborhood improvements within the subarea. He noted that developers may not want to build so close to the freeway and will see better investment opportunities at other sites around the city that are within walking distance of existing amenities but still within striking distance of the light rail stations.

Mr. Dale pointed out that R-18 zoning is proposed for the east side of 10th Avenue NE, which is the transition zoning used throughout the subarea plan. He suggested that the Commission strongly consider changing the zoning on the west side of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (between 180<sup>th</sup> and 190<sup>th</sup>) to R-48 or R-24. This would lessen the “canyon effect,” provide a better height complement to the east side of the street, and provide a better transition to all of the proposed MUR to the east. He also suggested that the MUR zoning should be shifted to the triangular section adjacent to the freeway. He summarized his desire that the more intense development be spread over both sides of the freeway, and then provide better transition to the neighborhoods, particularly along 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Mr. Dale requested that the Committee explain why Option 2 came up short in meeting the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Although considered in the early discussions, no mobility study was done for NE Perkins Way, NE 188<sup>th</sup> Street, etc. It is important to consider how people coming from Kenmore and Lake Forest Park will use these streets.



**Merissa Reed, Shoreline**, questioned why her neighborhood, which is close to the proposed station, was not included in the study. She agreed with Mr. Dale that a mobility study should have been done for NE 188<sup>th</sup> Street and NE Perkins Way to address traffic issues related to cut-through traffic. She noted that NE 188<sup>th</sup> Street has a double blind corner on a hill and crossing 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at NE 188<sup>th</sup> Street can be tricky. She expressed her belief that the “urban village” concept for the area around NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would be ideal. While she recognized that the City has invested heavily in the Aurora Corridor and North City, these investments were made prior to Sound Transit’s decision to put the light rail stations at NE 145<sup>th</sup> and NE 185<sup>th</sup> Streets. These prior investments should not preclude future investments in the immediate subarea. She expressed concern that a lot of density is proposed for the subarea, but it does not appear to transition well with the adjacent single-family neighborhoods. She recommended that the zoning on the west side of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE be changed to R-48.

**Tony Gale** said he owns property on NE Perkins Way, near the “hook area.” He pointed out that there is no sidewalk on the inside corner, and cars coming around the corner create a safety hazard. He said he would like this situation fixed, particularly if the school use is expanded. He said he would also like the City to do a mobility study on NE Perkins Way. He noted that bicycle clubs actually record their times for racing down NE Perkins Way, which creates an additional hazard.

**Donna Pipkin, Shoreline**, said she also lives on NE Perkins Way and is the property owner who requested the change shown in Attachments A and B as Option C. She commented that there was no stop sign at the intersection of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 190<sup>th</sup> Street when she moved into her home 22 years ago, and there was no crosswalk across NE Perkins to 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Both of these dangerous situations have since been addressed. However, NE Perkins Way is still very busy and dangerous. She suggested that rezoning the “hook area” to high density could possibly attract developers that may be interested in helping redo NE Perkins into a safer road. It is currently used for cut-through traffic. With the school across the street and its close proximity to the station, she asked them to consider rezoning her property, as well.

**Debbie Faze, Shoreline**, said she also lives near the “hook area.” She agreed that improvements are needed to address traffic safety. It is dangerous to walk from her house to the park, and sidewalks are needed on both sides. They should also keep in mind that NE Perkins Way is a major bike route, which should have been extended to provide access to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. She agreed that NE Perkins Way should be studied for safety in order to accommodate more development.

**Tom Poitras, Shoreline**, said his comments are related to the concept of homeowners being trapped by zoning. As an example, he referred to a house in an R-6 zone on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE that is across the street from a large building. The house was listed for a reasonable price but did not sell. This R-6 zoned property would have benefited from a rezone to a more intense use. The only option that identified a zoning change for this property was Alternative 3. He observed that, as per Alternative 3, there are properties between 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE that are zoned R-6 but are surrounded by up-zoned areas. If the Commission recommends Alternative 3, he suggested that these properties be up-zoned, as well, so that residential property owners can also benefit from the situation they have been put in.

### **Continued Commission Discussion**

Again, Chair Scully suggested that the Commission start with a main motion regarding the DEIS as a whole, and then review the document chapter by chapter and consider potential amendments.

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) AS PRESENTED. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Scully referred to a comment letter from the Ronald Wastewater District requesting that factual corrections be made in Chapter 3.5.1.a.

**CHAIR SCULLY MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO APPROVE THE CHANGES SUGGESTED BY THE RONALD WASTEWATER DISTRICT. COMMISSIONER MONTERO SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND, WHICH CARRIED 6-0. (Note: Vice Chair Craft was out of the room when this vote was taken.)**

Ms. Redinger referred to citizen comments about additional mobility studies. She clarified that while the Commission defined a mobility study area boundary, there was never an intent to do a distinct and separate mobility study for each street in the study area. She noted that the mobility study is located in the Transportation Multi-Modal Chapter of the DEIS, and the Commission can direct staff to give more attention to mitigation and traffic volumes in the NE Perkins Way area during the FEIS process. Chair Scully added that all of the arterials are supposed to be studied, and his reading of the DEIS is that the mobility study did not stop at the land use border. The DEIS simply identifies what needs to be studied. Ms. Redinger agreed and said more detailed information about mitigation will be provided in the FEIS.

**THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED 6-0, AS AMENDED. (Note: Vice Chair Craft was out of the room when this vote was taken.)**

Commissioner Moss agreed that Alternative 1 (no change) does not mean no change will occur and it does not even come close to meeting the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Although Alternative 2 (moderate growth) addresses more of the issues in the Comprehensive Plan, it does not meet two very fundamental Land Use Goals 25 and 26, which talk about having the most density within a half mile radius of a transit station. An R-48 zone should be the minimum for the 1/4 mile radius, and zoning within the 1/2 mile radius should be at least R-18.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION FOCUS THEIR DISCUSSION ON ALTERNATIVE 3 AND CONSIDER ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS IN PREPARATION FOR A FINAL RECOMMENDATION. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Moss commented that growth will take place over a long period of time, and it is important to give careful thought on how the community is developed so that the best mix of services can be provided around the transit stations to accommodate a larger number of people. She referred to current demographic trends, which indicate that many people want to live closer to services, amenities

and public transportation. She expressed her belief that Alternative 3 is a good place to start to address the needs of the future population, but they need to do even more as outlined in the proposed changes.

Commissioner Maul agreed that Alternative 2 comes up short based on the City's Comprehensive Plan, particularly Land Use Goals 25 and 26, which talk about R-48 zoning within a half mile radius. Option 2 has a lot of R-24 and R-18 zoning located quite close to the station. He said he sees the larger development happening a bit further from the freeway. Alternative 2 is so confined it would not allow enough flexibility for the market to determine what gets built and where. Based on public comments, he felt that Alternative 3 makes a lot more sense as a starting point.

Chair Scully said he supports Alternative 3, as well. Most of Shoreline is developed as single-family, and changes will be needed to accommodate future growth. The City can either have development pressure on them 20 years from now that requires haphazard fixes, or they can make decisions now to plan for the next 100 years to have a dense center that is not just another long strip like Aurora and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. As a previous member of the Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee, he spoke to numerous people. While the neighborhood is by no means united and some people are totally opposed to any change, the vast majority are excited about allowing more density and amenities in the future.

Vice Chair Craft said he also participated earlier on the committee. Based on the comments they received from the community, as well as their investigation, he said he supports Alternative 3, including some of the potential changes presented by staff. He reminded the Commission that the goal is to create an environment that allows for a centralized opportunity for growth in the city over a long period of time to create a more robust city in the future.

Commissioner Moss referenced a comment letter that questioned how the development potential would happen given the built-out environment. She noted that there are numerous constraints at the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station given the freeway, on ramps, golf course, school, etc. Therefore, it seems logical that much of the growth will occur at the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station. While there is no right answer, Alternative 3 offers the most potential. She referred to Comprehensive Plan Land-Use Goal 34, which discusses the feasibility of a light rail area as a destination. If that remains the City's goal, they must recognize that there is not as much opportunity in the area of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station.

Commissioner Montero said he also supports Alternative 3, which offers an incredible, long-range vision. It also addresses that 20 to 30 years from now there will be alternative modes of transportation and working environments. This kind of a community will allow flexibility for establishing a mobile community, as well as support services.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

As the Commission reviewed Alternative 3 and potential amendments, Ms. Redinger clarified that the Commission is not being asked to make a recommendation for the Council to adopt zoning. Instead, they could make a recommendation for them to study additional areas or zoning capacity in the FEIS. She further clarified, that just because the Commission recommends something tonight for additional study does not mean that is what has to be adopted. However, in order to consider it for adoption, it has to be studied. Chair Scully added that the DEIS is a study document. The final Comprehensive Plan

amendment might look like Alternative 3 or it might not; and the Commission cannot presuppose what the actual changes will be until after the study has been completed.

For the Commission's benefit, Ms. Redinger once again reviewed the proposed changes outlined in Attachments A and B, and the Commission discussed them as follows:

- **Option A.** Ms. Redinger explained that this change was suggested by a woman who attended the February 20<sup>th</sup> Design Dialogue Workshop. She recommended that the entire area (indicated on map) should be up-zoned. Because the suggestion was not analyzed in the draft and staff did not have the woman's name to ask follow-up questions, they took a more conservative approach that includes just the rectangle within the study area boundaries where she lives. She recommended that the zoning on the west side of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should be consistent with the zoning on the east side, which is R-18.

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION A AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Montero asked if the library located across the street has shown a preference for Option A. Ms. Redinger said they have not received any feedback from the library. The comment from Ms. McClelland was to engage the library as they do the FEIS and to not assume that the library's capital plan includes being able to service the level of density that may be in the area over time.

Commissioner Maul agreed with Mr. Poitras' concern that leaving R-6-zoned properties that are surrounded by R-18 or higher zones may put property owners in a financial bind. He recalled the rest of the triangle is a gully with only one way in and out, and the Commission did not feel it was appropriate, topographically, to up-zone it. However, he supports up-zoning Area A, recognizing that changing the zoning does not mean the property will be redeveloped in the near future.

Vice Chair Craft recalled that in earlier discussions, a former Commissioner commented that the property owners have value in their single-family homes and would want to be considered as part of the up-zone. Because it is an isolated area, there was concern that it would get unnecessarily neglected. However, he did not believe that was a consensus decision. He agreed that it would make sense to study the area further.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Option B.** Ms. Redinger advised that this proposal is based on a written comment the City received from Judy Parsons on March 25, 2014. She expressed concern that her property would be left in a dead zone. She asked that the City consider having all the property from 175<sup>th</sup> to 180<sup>th</sup> on 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE considered at least multi-family zoned.

**VICE CHAIR CRAFT MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION B AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Although there was initially some concern about the single-family houses being unnecessarily included, Commissioner Craft cautioned that they could inadvertently create a vast amount of isolated single-family homes in that area. This may not be what the residents want, and they would not have the opportunity change if they so desired. The proposed change makes sense from a continuity standpoint, as well as eliminating a potential island effect.

Chair Scully recalled there were issues related to access. Because 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE does not go through, providing access for more intense development would be more challenging than in other areas. In addition, the Commission was worried about up-zoning too much area and not spreading out development which could create compatibility issues. That said, he can understand the concern about a little island of single-family zoning being left in the middle of high-density development.

Commissioner Strandberg noted that some of the adjacent properties along 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE are proposed for R-48 zoning, and everything else would be R-18. She requested an explanation for including R-48 only on the east side of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Ms. Redinger advised that, consistent with Land Use Goal 27, the plan focuses on the corridors that connect the stations to each other and to other commercial areas. Because 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is a utility corridor, it is wider and could perhaps accommodate greater densities. Chair Scully added that the west side of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE has a significant dip by Serpentine making it less amenable to development, and the Commission felt there was already enough R-48 zoning.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Option C.** Ms. Redinger said this change was proposed by Tony Gale and Donna Pipkin, who own property on NE Perkins Way. Mr. Gale requested that the zoning in the “hook area” be increased to the highest housing density possible, but staff proposed R-18 zoning to match the zoning on the east side of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Ms. Pipkin also voiced support for the proposal to rezone the “hook area” to high density, which would give a greater chance of future redesign of NE Perkins Way to create a much safer road.

#### **COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION C AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul agreed that NE Perkins Way is a problem that needs additional work. Including it in the study area would highlight it and get more attention towards solving the issues. Whether it ultimately gets up-zoned or not, it is appropriate to study.

Commissioner Montero said he is not convinced that increasing the density would actually improve the corridor. The City is currently studying cross connection routes for bicyclists, and increasing the density would increase the danger to cyclists and pedestrians. Long term, there must be a different solution than putting more people in that area.

Chair Scully agreed that NE Perkins Way is a mess and mitigation must be considered whether it is up-zoned or not. He appreciates the sense that more development might result in more money to make improvements, but it would also increase the pressure on the road. He is not convinced it could be built to safely accommodate a lot of traffic, and adding more density could make a bad situation worse.

Vice Chair Craft said this issue should be the subject of a larger discussion. He agreed that NE Perkins Way is a hazardous roadway with the current situation. There is cut-through traffic, so a traffic impact analysis and mitigation must be part of the plan. He expressed his belief that, in its current form, the proposal is not sufficient enough to address some of the concerns he has about the area, specifically, and as it relates to other areas to the south and east.

Commissioner Moss pointed out that including Option C would allow the City to study the area. If they do not up-zone it, it will not be studied at all in the FEIS. Just because they recommend that it be part of the preferred alternative and studied in the FEIS does not mean it will be included in the final plan. Chair Scully said he does not believe that excluding Option C from a land-use consideration would exclude it from a traffic-impact consideration. However, he agreed that if they don't include it as a possibility, they won't study the impacts of increasing density. Ms. Redinger said additional mitigation may be needed for the area to be redeveloped.

**Mandi Roberts, OTAK**, pointed out that the “hook area” is currently excluded from the study area, and including it would help a little. There are some major topographic challenges to consider when thinking about transportation solutions, and you must look beyond just the right-of-way to consider possible land use solutions as well.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 4-3, WITH VICE CHAIR CRAFT AND COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MAUL, AND MOSS VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR SCULLY AND COMMISSIONERS MONTERO AND STRANDBERG VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

- **Option D.** Ms. Redinger said this amendment was proposed by Jason Cetina, who lives within the area. He is requesting that the Commission consider rezoning all of the property north of NE 190<sup>th</sup> Street and west of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, including the houses on the west side of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He also requested that they include Sky Acres in any rezone. He commented that this will be the most opportune time to reconnect the neighborhood to the rest of North City from which they are somewhat isolated. Mr. Cetina indicated he has talked with neighbors, and some support the proposed change while others were leery. Mr. Cetina felt that the park would provide a good transition and would allow the area to support additional density.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION D AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Moss said the comments provided by Mr. Cetina warrant further review as part of the FEIS. There is a natural transition in the area; and given that the properties are located close to the freeway, they may not be quite as desirable for low-density housing. This will be particularly true

when the light rail line runs in the vicinity. She felt that R-18 zoning may be more appropriate than R-6.

Chair Scully agreed that North City Park provides a natural barrier, and NE 195<sup>th</sup> Street dead ends at the freeway with a bicycle path going across. The properties below NE 195<sup>th</sup> Street in Area D are in a cul-de-sac. He has a hard time envisioning what high-density residential would look like in this area given all the constraints. He felt it would also put an interesting squeeze on the park to have it surrounded by high-density residential.

Commissioner Moss said if the property is rezoned to R-18/MUR-35, development would be limited to 35 feet in height. This would be more medium-density rather than high-density residential and form-based standards would apply. She felt it would make sense to at least consider the more intense zone, recognizing that may not be what is ultimately approved. Unless they consider it for a possible zoning change, it will not be studied as part of the FEIS.

Commissioner Montero said he does not agree that up-zoning Area D would be helpful. He likes the existing transition, with the child development center, preschools, park, etc. that are totally surrounded by R-6 development. Changing the zoning could result in an ugly intrusion into the neighborhood and a bad transition between the park and the rest of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Maul agreed that the park is a natural transition, and there is not a lot of access in and out. Adding more traffic may not make the most sense. However, because this is a study area, it would be worth at least considering the proposal.

**THE MOTION FAILED 5-2, WITH CHAIR SCULLY, VICE CHAIR CRAFT AND COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MONTERO AND STRANDBERG VOTING IN OPPOSITION AND COMMISSIONERS MAUL AND MOSS VOTING IN FAVOR.**

- **Option E.** Ms. Redinger recalled that this proposed change was brought forward by Council Members Hall and McGlashan at the May 19<sup>th</sup> discussion with the City Council. They felt this area was overlooked when the initial maps were approved in February. Based on the topography and close proximity to the station, they recommended that these properties should have higher zoning. It was noted 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 NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street, the topography is lower than areas to the west. Taller buildings in this area could provide noise barriers for homes to the west.

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION E AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul observed that, as currently proposed, there is a significant amount of MUR-85 zoning on the east side of Interstate 5 and none on the west side. The only dense zoning on the west side is the Shoreline Center. He felt that allowing a greater density to accommodate redevelopment

of a significant size would be appropriate in this location. He said he would even support higher density zoning further north of the Shoreline Center.

Commissioner Malek expressed support for Option E, which would create a sense of symmetry. He also agreed with the comments from Council Members Hall and McGlashan that the area serves as a buffer to the Interstate 5 corridor in terms of light, noise, etc.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Options F and G.** Ms. Redinger said Option F would change the NB zoning analyzed in the DEIS to R-48, which was intended to provide more options for the large church parcels near the Shoreline Center. The recommendation is 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 185<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor and would need to be revised. 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. In order to avoid confusion and the potential for split zoning if parcels are aggregated for redevelopment, zoning should be consistent with the neighboring parcels.

Ms. Redinger further explained that Option G would change the R-24 zoning analyzed in the DEIS to R-18. The original intent was to provide additional transition to step down from the R-48 zoning proposed for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. However, the 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. Zoning the area R-18 would create consistency with the rest of the subarea, which transitions from R-48 to R-18 with no intermediary zoning. It would also reduce the possibility of split zoning.

#### **VICE CHAIR CRAFT MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTIONS F AND G AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Option H** would change the depth of the R-48 zone and move it north so there is a 300-foot swath on either side of N 185<sup>th</sup> Street. It would also slightly revise the R-18 areas to provide transition to the R-6 zones along the street rather than mid block. That means the areas south of N 185<sup>th</sup> Street would be zoned R-6. The opposite would be true for the area north of N 185<sup>th</sup> Street where the R-18 zoning would be extended north on N 188<sup>th</sup>, N 189<sup>th</sup> or N 190<sup>th</sup> Streets moving eastward toward Meridian Avenue N.

The depth of zoning analyzed in Alternative 3 in the EIS was based on comments from City transportation staff that in order to reduce congestion along the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor, no new curb cuts should be allowed. Instead, access through side streets and internal circulation within developments should be encouraged. In order to promote this concept, the depth of the R-48 and R-18 zoning was increased. However, after hearing from developers and building industry professionals, as well as the City’s Economic Development Manager, that the R-48 zoning was too deep, the City contracted with the Clark Design Group to “ground truth” the proposed zoning. The



consultant's 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.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE CHANGES REFLECTED IN OPTION H AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul said he is not sure he agrees 100% with the proposal. He felt the marketplace would probably take care of this aspect on its own. He said he does not necessarily agree that up-zoning too deep would create blocks that are too large.

Chair Scully asked staff to share the basis of the consultant's belief that zoning that deep would be a problem. Ms. Redinger said the City's Economic Development Manager has indicated that the proposed 300 foot depth on either side that represents Option H 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 could be compromised. If the area were much narrower, the corridor as a whole would lack the density needed to be truly energized.

Ms. Roberts said she believes it is insightful and a good idea to make the change to the north and end the R-18 (MUR-35) at a street. However, she is not sure it is necessary to change the zoning to the south. Having R-48 directly across from R-6 seems too severe, and that is why they proposed the R-18 buffer. She agreed that issues related to depth will be worked out over time through the market, and the current map is close to the 300-foot depth anyway.

Commissioner Moss said she does not have a problem changing the zoning for the area to the north. However, Meridian Avenue N. runs through the area to the south, and it is already a very busy road. She does not see that the proposed change will make any difference because they will start seeing development on Meridian Avenue N. in both directions. She does not share the concerns about the zoning to the south being too deep, either. Changing some of it back to R-6 does not make sense because Meridian Avenue N. may be more appropriate for multi-family development in the future.

**CHAIR MAUL MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO ONLY INCLUDE THE CHANGES TO THE NORTHERN PORTION OF AREA H. COMMISSIONER MONTERO SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED TO APPLY ONLY TO THE NORTHERN PORTION OF AREA H, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

In addition to the proposed changes outlined in Attachments A and B, Chair Scully suggested the Commission consider the additional recommendations that were brought forward by the Commission and private citizens during the hearing.

Mr. Dale reviewed his proposal that the zoning on the west side of 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE be scaled down to provide a better transition. Chair Scully noted that the City has transition standards in place to deal with

Mr. Dale's concerns as part of the development code that will be created at a later date to implement the subarea plan.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT R-48 ZONING BE CARRIED ALL THE WAY FROM N 180<sup>TH</sup> AND N 185<sup>TH</sup> STREETS BETWEEN 9<sup>TH</sup> AND 10<sup>TH</sup> AVENUES.**

Commissioner Moss said she is recommending that R-48 go along 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE versus splitting in the middle of the block to allow for large enough lots to accommodate R-48 development and still provide a transition. She also is concerned about issues such as solar access.

**COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Montero expressed his belief that developers of large buildings will likely want to use the entire block and setbacks and a significant amount of design review would be required. He sees this area, as well as the area added on the west side of the freeway, as being the only opportunity to develop substantial facilities close to the station. It does not make sense to eliminate that flexibility.

Commissioner Maul recalled the Commission's desire to create and encourage activity on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. With the station at 185<sup>th</sup> Street, they saw potential connections down 10<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE. Given the topography going up the hill, the proposed R-18 zoning on the east side will lessen the impact that they skipped a zone between the two. The depth between 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE is a nice size for larger buildings and it is close to the station. He is of the mind to retain zoning analyzed in the DEIS and let the market drive future development. They are trying to encourage and support what is already happening on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Chair Scully said that he shares Mr. Dale's concerns about creating a canyon effect on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Even with the hill, residents on the east side may be significantly impacted by 85-foot tall buildings. However, he reminded the Commission that they wanted to include the entire block for sound reasons that are supported by the community and land use best practices. There are a number of parcels in the block that are probably not developable for various reasons, and he hesitates to trim down the zoning. He suggested the solution to the problem lies in adopting development regulations that require step backs and/or setbacks.

Ms. Redinger suggested that instead of thinking of the change as a down zone, they should consider it as a reduction in the development capacity from what was analyzed in the DEIS. Technically, even if it were zoned R-48, it would still be an up-zone from the current R-6 zoning.

**THE MOTION FAILED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

Ms. Redinger requested additional information from Merissa Reed regarding her recommendation. Ms. Reed clarified that she was not proposing a zoning change. Her suggestion was that a mobility study be done for NE Perkins Way to identify potential traffic impacts. It is already dangerous and the changes will only drive more traffic through the area. The Commission agreed it is important to understand the traffic impacts in this area, and they asked staff to review the mobility study to make sure it addresses the concerns raised earlier by Ms. Reed.

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED TO INCREASE THE ZONING FOR THE PROPERTIES BETWEEN 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE AND 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE NE FROM NORTH OF THE SHORELINE CENTER UP TO NE 195<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND INCLUDING SHORELINE PARK, FROM WHAT WAS ANALYZED IN THE DEIS TO MUR-85. COMMISSIONER MOSS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul said it is a big jump to go from R-48/MUR-45 to MUR-85 in terms of cost of construction, type of building, etc. It is not likely a developer will want to construct a building of that size so close to Interstate 5. A better location would be closer to the park or near the Shoreline Center where there is already a lot of public activity and social assets within walking distance, and the transit station would be within walking distance, as well. Changing the zoning could open up possibilities that might be more attractive to people who are putting together a project of that size.

Chair Scully voiced opposition to the proposed change. He reminded the Commission that part of what they are hoping to do is create a dense urban core. Alternative 3 has a 75 to 100 year build out. If the dense area is too big, large developments will be spread out, making it difficult to provide urban services. He agreed there is a lot more development potential associated with some of the subject parcels, but that is something they should expand into rather than establish now.

Commissioner Malek said he was involved in the sale of property near the transit/pedestrian village on Ash Way in Lynnwood. The project was suboptimal to the City, as it was purchased at a low point in the market and was more of a salvage operation than realizing the full robust development potential of the area. Now there is no going back. Just because you zone it to allow greater development potential does not mean it will be developed that way. He expressed his belief that this area is a prime candidate for the type and scale of development the City wants to encourage. He agreed with Mr. Dale about being sensitive to what is happening around the dense cores and having respect for the communities that have helped develop the areas. However, this is an opportunity to concentrate density in a transit-oriented area where it really needs to be.

Again, Chair Scully said he believes the proposed change would play havoc with not only the City's goals for dense areas, but also attempts to create a step down into the residential areas. He does not believe this is the time to be adding massive swaths of the City's highest densities analyzed in the DEIS.

Commissioner Moss said she understands the need for transition, particularly to the west where properties are currently zoned R-6. However, she noted that Holyrood Cemetery to the north of the subject property would provide a substantial buffer. She also pointed out that 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE is already a fairly busy street, particularly with the parking garage that is proposed for the west side of Interstate 5. She sees more vehicular traffic and activity happening in the entire area between the Shoreline Center and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and density is more likely to develop on this block.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH CHAIR SCULLY VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED TO INCREASE THE DENSITY BEING STUDIED IN THE PLAN TO R-48 (MUR-45) FOR THE PROPERTIES LOCATED BETWEEN NE 190<sup>TH</sup> AND NE**

**195<sup>TH</sup> STREETS FROM 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE NE TO MERIDIAN AVENUE NORTH. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul observed that the City has received comments from citizens who live in the area, suggesting they would support increased density. He noted that 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE is a very busy north/south connection, and the properties are located in close proximity to Shoreline Park and the Shoreline Center with numerous public amenities.

**CHAIR SCULLY MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE THE DENSITY TO R-18 RATHER THAN R-48. COMMISSIONER STRANDBERG SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Scully recalled that the Commission has studied this area at length, including significant work by consultants and numerous public meetings. He is hesitant to make these changes at the last minute. If the properties are zoned R-48 as proposed in the main motion, he questioned where the transition to single-family residential would occur. The point of the subarea plan is to have a new, dense urban core built around the light rail station, but now they are considering significant up-zones for properties outside of the half mile radius of the station.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTIES BETWEEN N 195<sup>TH</sup> AND N 185<sup>TH</sup> STREETS FROM 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE NE TO CORLISS AVENUE AS R-48 AND THE PROPERTIES BETWEEN CORLISS AVENUE AND THE STUDY AREA BOUNDARY AS R-18. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE AMENDMENT.**

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED 4-3, WITH COMMISSIONERS MOSS, MALEK, STRANDBERG AND MAUL VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR SCULLY, VICE CHAIR CRAFT AND COMMISSIONER MONTERO VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**THE AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION, CARRIED 4-3 AS AMENDED, WITH COMMISSIONERS MOSS, MALEK, STRANDBERG AND MAUL VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR SCULLY, VICE CHAIR CRAFT AND COMMISSIONER MONTERO VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED 6-1 AS AMENDED, WITH CHAIR SCULLY VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

Chair Scully recalled staff's earlier comments about the need to address the underlying zoning for park properties. Ms. Redinger clarified that she brought up the issue to raise awareness that, at some point, staff will propose that the underlying zoning of the parks match the surrounding zoning, but they don't have a particular proposal at this point.

Chair Scully also recalled staff's earlier comment about changing the names of the zoning designations to reference the maximum height limit rather than the maximum density. Mr. Szafran pointed out that

the zoning designations will be part of upcoming discussion regarding development regulations to implement the subarea plan. Ms. Redinger added that the new names would be used in the FEIS, but they could still be adjusted accordingly based on the Commission's future discussions.

Chair Scully recalled that, throughout the process, the Commission discussed how traffic impacts will affect roadways and pedestrian and bicycle pathways outside the impact zone. When evaluating traffic impacts, the consultant should not only analyze where the trips come from, but the impact on the roadways outside of the land use study area. A map was created to illustrate this concept, but it was not included in the DEIS. That map currently in the DEIS (Figure 1-2) identifies a much smaller mobility study area boundary than what the Commission originally discussed.

**CHAIR SCULLY MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE COUNCIL ADOPT THE INITIAL MOBILITY STUDY BOUNDARIES MAP SINCE THE MAP THAT IS INCLUDED IN THE DEIS (FIGURE 1-2) SEEMS TO INCLUDE LESS AREA THAN THE ORIGINAL ONE. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul observed that they have received a number of citizen comments about specific streets. He questioned how they can track these concerns if they do not have a mobility map that quantifies and identifies the problems. Ms. Roberts reassured the Commissioners that she did not disregard the original mobility study boundaries. The TAZ boundaries (Figure 2-1) actually illustrate a broader boundary than the mobility study boundaries in Figure 1-2. In particular, she noted that TAZ 125, 65 and 67 extend eastward into the areas where citizens have raised concerns. The analysis of each TAZ would include not only vehicular traffic issues, but pedestrian and bicycle concerns, as well. As part of the FEIS, she suggested they take another look at each of the TAZs and provide more detailed information about what mitigation and improvements may be needed once they know what the preferred alternative will be.

Ms. Roberts clarified that the transportation analysis studies what is in each of the TAZs, including where traffic flows both within and outside of the study area. However, she suggested that the findings from the analysis could be described in more detail. Chair Scully indicated that his motion would be unnecessary based on the clarification provided by the consultant that everything within the purple TAZ boundaries would be thoroughly studied as part of the FEIS.

**THE MOTION FAILED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

Commissioner Moss stressed the importance of considering minimum density and tree canopy requirements in the newly created MUR zones. She noted that many of the properties were previously zoned commercial and did not have a tree retention requirement. Ms. Redinger indicated that both of these issues would be addressed as part of the Commission's discussions about development regulations. For example, the Commission's packet for the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting will include recommendations for minimum density requirements.

Ms. Redinger said staff believes that MUR-85 is a longer term development scenario that will require developers to acquire multiple parcels. There is an argument to be made that the character of the single-family neighborhoods could be retained longer with MUR-85 zoning than with MUR-45 or MUR-35

zoning. The MUR-35 and MUR-45 zones are anticipated to redevelop within the next 20 years into town homes, row houses, apartments, etc. Because there is not currently a lot of land available in the City for this type of product, staff believes there is a pent up demand. Chair Scully pointed out that this would only be true if there are minimum density requirements. He commented that the subarea will likely develop differently than anticipated unless there are minimum density requirements.

**Chair Scully closed the public hearing.**

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Cohen did not have any items to report.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no reports or announcements from Commissioners.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Szafran announced that the July 17<sup>th</sup> meeting would be cancelled, and the Development Regulations related to the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan would be introduced on August 7<sup>th</sup>.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

---

Keith Scully  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission

**TIME STAMP**  
**July 10, 2013**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

**ROLL CALL:**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA: 1:24**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: 1:40**

**PUBLIC HEARING: HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE: 6:11**

**Staff Presentation: 6:50**

**Public Testimony: 25:30**

**PUBLIC HEARING: 185<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA DEIS: 31:00**

**Staff Presentation: 32:20**

**Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee Report: 56:15**

**Public Comment: 1:01:47**

**Continued Commission Discussion: 1:25:07**

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 3:14:21**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:**

**ADJOURNMENT:**