

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Heidi Costello](#)
Subject: FW: Questions
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 9:13:12 AM

For green folder on 8/25 – light rail action item

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

From: Debbie Tarry
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2014 9:06 AM
To: Jesse Salomon
Cc: Miranda Redinger; John Norris; Rachael Markle
Subject: RE: Questions

Jesse –

Here are the written response to your questions – response in red. We will send to the entire Council and include in I-Legislate as part of the August 25 packet as part of the action item for Council to select the preferred alternative to be studied in the FEIS for the 185th light rail station. This preferred alternative is just what will be studied – it is not the final decision on the zoning as that will get adopted by Council in early 2015 as part of the adoption of the sub-area plan. We still have the second set of questions that you sent to follow-up on.

Section F.

How would design standards effectively manage the step down between r48 and r18 (rather than a step of r-35 in between)? Why would we give up density here-what's the advantage?

In the rest of the subarea, transition will likely step from MUR-45 (R-48) to MUR-35 (R-18) with no intermediary zoning. Transitions will mostly be accomplished through set-backs and possibly landscaping. Since we're removing density limits, that would less of an issue, although a 10 foot reduction in allowable height would translate to fewer units. Some of the primary reasons staff recommended this change were to reduce the potential for split-zoning when parcels are aggregated for redevelopment, and because in Alternative 3 (some version of which seems to be the initial consensus of most Councilmembers) there are no other areas designated as R-24, so removing this piece means not having to come up with another MUR zone and create additional distinctions.

Section I.

Commissioner Scully countered that if the goal is to create a dense urban core that transitions to single-family neighborhoods, this proposal dilutes that vision. Any thoughts on how that might be the case?

I think the primary debate about this area centers around choice vs. scarcity, both of which have merits. Commissioner Maul's reason for this area to be analyzed for additional development capacity was that this area would be more appealing to both developers and future tenants than Section E, which is immediately adjacent to the interstate (supporting choice). Commissioner Scully's concern about diluting the vision of a compact core was also shared by the P&CD Director and the Economic Development Manager (supporting scarcity). A concern is that if larger areas are rezoned, redevelopment may be piecemeal, creating a more difficult transition for the neighborhood.

As a broad generalization, developers who would be interested in building the MUR-85 need higher rents to justify construction and so would be interested in scarcity. Developers who would be interested in building MUR-35 or -45 may appreciate more options for parcel aggregation because some homeowners will be willing sellers and others will not. To Deputy Mayor Eggen's point at last Monday's meeting, a larger area zoned for mixed-use may create more affordable small business opportunities.

Section J.

The proposal for this area is to change from R-24, R-18, and R-6 designations analyzed in the Draft EIS to MUR-45 (R-48). This motion was amended additional times

A primary concern is that because this area was shown in all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS as retaining single family (R-6) zoning, residents of the area who previously saw any of the published maps may have thought that their homes would be unaffected by zoning change and stopped following the process.

I don't necessarily see a question here, but am happy to provide additional details about the amendments offered for Section J. We mailed nearly 400 post-cards out to single-family residences that were shown on maps of the zoning scenarios analyzed in the Draft EIS as R-6, but may be considered for additional capacity in the Final EIS.

H, J, and K.

These are outlying areas in the zone to be studied. Would it make more sense to keep those down zoned, concentrate up zoning near the station to avoid piecemeal development and up zone H, J, and K sometimes in the future after some development in the closer areas?

This is the flip-side of the answer pertaining to Section I. This is really the policy question at hand. It is important to recognize that the decision by Council on August 25th is to determine the preferred alternative to be studied for the FEIS. This is not the final determination on the zoning as that will come later after the FEIS and be part of the adoption of the sub-area plan scheduled to occur in early 2015. Staff is looking at some alternatives to be included in the August 25th staff report.

If we hold another study session to give time for more public input on the plan com's changes how will this delay of the timeline affect our process? Would it be a significant setback?

Any delay in beginning the Final EIS analysis would likely prolong the process.

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

From: Jesse Salomon
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:43 AM
To: Debbie Tarry
Subject: Questions

Section F.

How would design standards effectively manage the step down between r48 and r18? Why would we give up density here-what's the advantage?

Section I.

Commissioner Scully countered that if the goal is to create a dense urban core that transitions to single-family neighborhoods, this proposal dilutes that vision. Any thoughts on how that might be the case?

Section J.

The proposal for this area is to change from R-24, R-18, and R-6 designations analyzed in the Draft EIS to MUR-45 (R-48). This motion was amended additional times

A primary concern is that because this area was shown in all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS as retaining single family (R-6) zoning, residents of the area who previously saw any of the published maps may have thought that their homes would be unaffected by zoning change and stopped following the process.

H, J, and K.

These are outlying areas in the zone to be studied. Would it make more sense to keep those down zoned, concentrate up zoning near the station to avoid piecemeal development and up zone H, J, and K sometimes in the future after some development in the closer areas?

If we hold another study session to give time for more public input on the plan com's changes how will this delay of the timeline affect our process? Would it be a significant setback?

Jesse Salomon, Councilmember
City of Shoreline
Jsalomon@Shorelinewa.gov
(206) 396-5807

Sent from my iPad