

## Public Comment on the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan:

---

I would like to add some additional comments to the Light Rail rezoning that is being proposed for the Ridgecrest neighborhood and surrounding area.

I understand that change will come but it should not be done with a sledge hammer. This is how it feels to those of us who live in the effected areas. Such blanket proposals fail to take into account the nuances that make for healthy growth and healthy neighborhoods. As proposed there is no room for either environmental concerns nor for accommodating the single family homes that would be attractive to some who might want to live close to light rail and good schools.

While I would like the status quo to be maintained as is, I do understand this won't likely be an option. I believe the city should therefore consider altering the rezone plan to take into account environmentally sensitive corridors that include single family residences that would enhance the overall neighborhood mix and plan and allow more variety to the housing options in the rezone area.

Single family homes as are currently zoned should remain in place along two environmentally sensitive corridors, these are areas where there have been patterns of flooding. I have lived in the area since 1981 at both ends of the proposed rezone and am familiar with the issues regarding the areas I am proposing stay "as is".

### **Single family homes as currently zoned should remain in two environmentally sensitive corridor areas:**

#### **Between 8th and 12th from 145th to 155th and between 10th and 12th from 155th to 175th**

It is important to preserve some single family homes in the light rail rezone area, to do otherwise is to not consider that not everyone who wants to live in the area wants to live in a condo, townhouse, apartment or such. A better choice would be to make a far more nuanced mix of choices available that would also take into account the fact there are areas where denser development is inappropriate.

Thank you,

Cathy Aldrich

---

Dear Miranda,

I appreciate all the hard work on the zoning changes for the area around the proposed light rail station at NE 185th ST and 5th AV NE. Unfortunately I missed your Oct 9th Planning Session

I strongly disagree with the area designated MUR-85. Given the current character of area, putting 8 story condos or apartments next to single family residences is too big a transition in the neighborhood. Although I do not care for MUR-35 or MUR-45, 3-4 story complexes make much more sense in the area given the infrastructure of roads, fire, power, water, sewer, businesses, and other services. It also makes for a more gradual transition to higher density rather than a jarring move to high rise structures.

If nothing else, I propose limiting the MUR-85 to 3 blocks around the light rail station. That way the highest density is adjacent to NE 185th ST and the light rail station itself.

Thanks,

Scott Anderson  
Shoreline Resident

---

Could you please give me one good reason why putting in a rail station requires my property to be rezoned so that I have 4-story apartment buildings built next to my property? I live at 2332 N 186th in a quiet cul-de-sac.

This rezone will impact my property values and is certainly not necessary for you to build your rail station. As far as I'm concerned, the City of Shoreline needs to explain in letter form to all property owners whose property values have been impacted by this rezoning why it is so important to turn our neighborhood into apartment city. I also expect that my taxes will be sufficiently lowered. Now I just need to get my house sold before my neighborhood becomes a war zone.

Hopefully we will be able to vote out all of our city council people in the next several elections. They don't deserve our support.

Karen Anderson  
Shoreline Resident  
(for the moment)

---

In the rush to create new forms of housing the city council seems to have lost sight of the value of the 1500 single family parcels that are being considered for conversion in the 185th st corridor. Where are these middle class working families supposed to go in the New Shoreline? Can families truly live in the structures you are contemplating?

Telling people to shh at council meetings is not going to quiet the slow growing outrage amongst the people of my neighborhood. We will work together to replace council members who are more concerned with politics than the people they represent. Continuing to alienate the people of Shoreline neighborhood by neighborhood is not the way to get reelected.

People are watching.

John Behrens

---

Hi Miranda.

Thank you for the information about the meeting, and explanation for absence of minutes and video. I understand. If the handouts are posted on the website, I will look there for them. I hope they are posted - I really wish I could attend but am not able to. I am asking my neighbor friends if they or someone is going.

I really look forward to light rail services coming to Shoreline, and I think the City is doing a great job in preparing for the future and for the changes that can and will take place as a result. I am a home/property owner in the areas identified to be rezoned; I support the proposed rezones. My hope is that future development eventually spurs more retail and cafes in our neighborhoods. In my opinion, Shoreline sorely lacks variety and abundance of cafes and local restaurants.

Thanks again,

Maaren

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

In my work with homeless individuals in King County, I have multiple clients that want to live in Shoreline because that is where they used to live, or they have family, or their doctors are there, but even with the rental support the program I work for provides, it is still almost impossible to find affordable housing for these folks in Shoreline.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Theresa Curry  
Kenmore Resident

---

### **Comments on the FEIS for 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station:**

When the City Council and Planning Commission first decided to expand the size of the area to be studied, the action was justified by the need to understand the impact of the proposed station over a wide area. How else to understand where traffic would be coming from, and the natural land systems that would be impacted? At the time, we wondered why they did not expand the study area to include as far north as 205<sup>th</sup> and East to 15<sup>th</sup> in North City and West to Aurora Avenue, potentially looking at how traffic from Point Wells would be directed to the station along 185<sup>th</sup>.

Sometime during the process, the "study" area was redefined as a "rezone" area. So instead of just looking at impacts and where traffic would be coming from, the outcome of the "study" meant rezoning a much larger geographic area than originally proposed by City Staff.

This raises additional concerns and increases the impact to the area significantly. Please include all of the following in the record of comment on the 185<sup>th</sup> St Station Area EIS.

### **Will the market support the preferred option?**

Option 4, deemed the "preferred option," calls for 7-story buildings, not just at the station, but as far north as N and NE 195th street and as far south as NE 180<sup>th</sup> Street. Yet on page RG-9 of the review guide says, "It should be noted that this density is unlikely to be supported by current market forces, and as such, it may be some time before this type would be developed in the subarea."

It is suggested on page RG-7 of the Review Guide that full build-out would take place over 80 to 125 years as the market is able to support that density of development.

A projection of how land use patterns will develop over a period as long as 80 to 125 years is not credible. There are far too many variables—population shifts from in- and out-migration, economic changes from the local to global scales, unforeseen and unforeseeable developments in technology, consumer lifestyle preferences, and in transportation choices, and numerous environmental factors—to warrant even speculative guesses as to how land use in the study area will change over the coming century.

Even if such a projection proves to be accurate—which no one can say with any certainty at this point—why does the City Council plan to rezone in February 2015? If you are going to take a sensible, phased, predictable approach to rezoning, then we would suggest starting with rezoning according to Alternative 2, and in 20 to 30 years, after the station is in operation, revisit the whether rezoning additional properties is warranted.

As redevelopment occurs and the City and residents are able to observe the effects of that redevelopment such as traffic and surface water runoff, the City would be better positioned to learn from the experience and apply those lessons to further redevelopment potential with a greater chance of achieving a positive outcome.

### **Employment**

We have a jobs deficit, in that Shoreline exports commuters to jobs all over Puget Sound. According to page RG12, Alternative 3 “Provides most capacity for employment opportunities than other action alternatives and would help meet City’s employment growth targets and balance the jobs-to-housing ratio ..due to potential bonus height and density at the Shoreline Center site rather than spread throughout all MUR-85’ zoning.” Given the persistence of economic weakness, and the possibility that the U.S. employment market is experiencing “secular stagnation” (see The Economist, November 22, 2014 edition, Finance and Economics section), the city should lean toward the alternative that offers the best chance of encouraging jobs growth in the city.

### **Affordable Housing**

There is no reason that we can’t have both more jobs and more low-income housing brought into the area. There is every reason to avoid concentrating low-income housing within the study area. Stable neighborhoods are ones that have a balanced mix of high, middle and low-income housing. Concentrating low-income housing in one area increases the likelihood of higher crime, reductions in property values, and greater difficulty for those living in an area of concentrated low-income housing to escape poverty.

Market rate housing is not the same as affordable housing. To increase the availability of housing low-income households can afford, developers will have to be required to include a certain number of low-income and affordable units ,with “affordable” defined according to Shoreline income levels not those of Seattle or Bellevue.

### **Property Taxes**

If the Council does the rezone in February 2015 as proposed, there is a risk of taxing people out of their homes. We understand that zoning alone does not determine the tax rate and that properties are supposed to be taxed according to current use. There is some evidence, however, that such an assurance is not a guarantee. There are parking lots in Shoreline that, after being rezoned R150,

experienced tripling of their tax rates even though the land is still being used only for parking. What credible assurances can the city offer that households in stable, single-family neighborhoods to be rezoned for much higher density will not experience sharply increased property taxes that would inflict economic harm on families and force distress sales of their homes?

### **Traffic**

Proposed Alternative 4 includes 2 lanes of traffic plus a center left turn lane for N and NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street. Would this truly be adequate for handling 20,000-plus cars daily, which is more than double current traffic flow? To accommodate much higher traffic volumes, the City would need to build more lanes of traffic in addition to the proposed intersection turn lanes. The construction of traffic lanes along N and NE 185<sup>th</sup> between Aurora and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue needs to take place while the Transit station and parking garage are being built, while there is ongoing construction disruption anyway. Add the capacity you know the street will need during station construction, in order to avoid repeated disruption later.

Meridian Ave N – on Page RG-18 it suggests increasing capacity by providing two lanes of traffic plus a center left turn lane. We question whether that will be adequate given the anticipated increase in number of vehicles. During morning and evening commute times currently, the difficulty of turning onto Meridian from intersecting residential streets can be acute, increasing the possibility of collisions when drivers tire of waiting for a break between long lines of cars on Meridian. Imposing higher traffic volumes on Meridian as a result of higher density likely will necessitate installation of many more traffic signals on Meridian.

### **Bike Infrastructure**

The proposed addition of bike lanes throughout the area, particularly those that are separated from auto traffic will help to make the area more livable. Part of the bike parking at the station needs to include enclosed bike lockers, provided by Sound Transit or third-party vendors. Currently, bikes on open bike racks are frequently stolen and/or vandalized, discouraging use.

### **Surface Water Runoff**

In response to our expressed concerns at a recent Echo Lake neighborhood meeting about increased stormwater runoff resulting from altered hydrology caused by higher-density development, we were told by Miranda Redinger that developers are required to follow regulations preventing any stormwater from leaving the properties they develop.

According to page RG-31 of the Review guide, under alternative 4 there is an expected 37 percent increase in surface water runoff at full build-out. That is assuming the regulations are enforced fully and consistently in all cases. It further assumes under other sections of the guide requirement of Low Impact Development standards higher than those required by the Department of Ecology. So in a “perfect world,” expect a 37 percent increase in surface water runoff.

So what can we expect in the “real” world? What if regulations are not fully and consistently enforced on all developments all the time? What if the LID technology does not work as anticipated? What would a 37 percent increase in surface water runoff going do to those properties that already have standing water on their property every time it rains?

### **Orphaned Properties**

There are quite a few properties within the study area that have steep slopes, high water tables and or wetlands that will not be developed. If surrounded by 3-, 4-, or 7-story buildings, many of them will become repositories for flood water and orphaned. Vacant lots mean a decrease in property values,

increased reluctance by developers to site structures nearby and increased chances of nuisance activities and crime on abandoned properties.

It would not be difficult to identify the lots that have a high potential of becoming orphaned with the help of local residents and a willingness of city planners to take a few walks with those local residents. The City needs to identify those individual properties now, before any rezone decisions are made.

The FEIS needs to address what will be done with these properties. It is possible that several properties lie adjacent to each other and could be converted to the 9 or 10 parks that will be needed by the increased population. Any plans would need to include increasing the capacity of the land to accommodate the increased surface water by incorporating planned streambeds, wetlands and ponds.

Where will the revenue come from to purchase the properties, remove the structures and complete the landscaping? What kind of market value can the current property owners expect and what kind of time line can they count on?

### **Wildlife**

The presence of wildlife increases the quality of life in Shoreline. In our backyard, we have observed pileated woodpeckers, hawks and bald eagles in addition to the more common downy woodpeckers, flickers, ground feeders like juncos, a wide variety of finches and hummingbirds. In low-lying areas within the study area, salamanders have been found. We are concerned that higher density development would drive away wildlife that thrive in neighborhoods with many trees and diverse backyard habitats. A more uniform habitat characteristic of higher density would likely drive away many of these species, reducing diversity and leaving niches largely to human-habituated wildlife such as crows and raccoons. This change would reduce the attractiveness and desirability of the Echo Lake neighborhood.

### **Cost of City infrastructure**

Alternative 4 includes a considerable increase in the size of the city payroll vs. the other alternatives. We believe citizens are more interested in increasing employment in the city overall, than in increasing the size of the city payroll and the higher fees and taxes that would be needed to support a larger city staff.

### **Conclusion**

The sweeping extent of the rezone the city is considering raises many serious issues. We do not understand why the city seems to be in a rush to impose a sweeping zoning change on neighborhoods all at once that would likely disrupt the lives of thousands of citizens who enjoy living in stable, pleasant neighborhoods. A better approach would be to phase in the zone change over a longer period of time, with a smaller footprint, as detailed in Alternative 2. A zone change that is less rushed and taking place over a smaller area would allow for incorporation of lessons learned from actual experience and give people living in the affected neighborhoods more time to adjust.

### **Jim and Wendy DiPeso - Shoreline Residents**

In reference to the above letter (no name submitted: jebwa52@aol.com)

I believe you have very completely covered the majority of my concerns. I would add sending this message directly to the city council with an indication that you will be voting based on their actions in

the next city council elections.

Thanks for spending your time trying to stop the destruction of our neighborhood.

Sent via the HTC Vivid™, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

---

Hello,

My name is Matthew Gemmill, and I am a North King County Subarea resident. I'm writing to express my support for the updated zoning regarding the Sound Transit N 185th St Link Rail Station.

Part of the Subarea plan includes upzoning the surrounding residential area to MUR- 85, and I feel that this upzoning should continue unimpeded. Shoreline isn't deserving of a Link rail station if they're not going to allow more people to live near it. R6 zoning isn't nearly dense enough, and the Shoreline Center (while lovely) isn't significant enough for it's own station.

Please include these comments to the Shoreline City Council when they meet on this issue on January 15th.

Thank you kindly,

M. Gemmill  
North King

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

I live in Shoreline and now provide a home for my sister as well. She moved here from another state and hoped to live near family, but has not been able to find an affordable apartment to do so. As a single person who always had her own place, she is frustrated by this area's housing situation. As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people such as my sister will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Anne Guthrie  
Shoreline Resident

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

As a resident of Shoreline I want to ensure that future development adjacent to the light rail stations is inclusive of affordable housing options. It is important that Shoreline remains a city where residents of diverse incomes, cultural roots and in all areas of life..from young families, senior citizens, and young adults just starting out on their life's path..all find a welcome home in the Shoreline of the future.

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Barbara Guthrie  
Shoreline Resident

---

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to comment on the 185th St FEIS. For the most part I am excited about the future of the neighborhood. I am sure that many of the comments submitted about this project are negative or anxious, but I look forward to the day when I can walk down my street to the station and ride to work, shopping, sports, and more.

But I do have concerns to share, and many of these are based on the fact that my daughter will be turning 14 the year the station opens. I want to make sure that the safety of pedestrians is a priority within the subarea, and many of the items in the review guide show that there has been a lot of thought put into this subject. Yet the cover of the review guide shows a conceptual drawing of 185th and 8th Ave, an intersection has been left left out of the outlined changes... I feel that this intersection in particular is dangerous and will only become more so with the increased traffic. I ask that this intersection receive more attention. There is also a lot of potential with the entire length of 8th Ave between 175th and 185th, as there is a very wide easement/right-of-way that could be developed into sidewalks and bike paths, creating a pedestrian boulevard that will pull foot and bike traffic off of the more congested 10th Ave, which I understand will be heavy with auto and bus traffic.

I would also ask that the idea of phasing in the zoning changes be disregarded. As a resident of the subarea outside of the Phase 1 boundary, I don't want to be left out of the improvements to streets, utilities, and other infrastructure. I feel that the Phase 1 model only restricts the ability to improve the entire subarea when it really needs it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

David Hughes  
Shoreline Resident

---

Hello:

I had hoped to attend the 11/20/14 Planning Commission Meeting tonight and read the following but



## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

unfortunately my family, work and life commitments cannot be arranged for this to happen. Hopefully I will be able to attend the next applicable City Council meeting to read a similar version during the Public Comment period. I am hoping my thoughts will still be considered and be part of the record. Thank you.

My husband and I bought a home in Shoreline a little over a year ago. It took 8 long months to find the perfect place to raise a family. This was much longer than we had planned and so our son was born while we were still living in a one bedroom condo in Seattle. His nursery was our dining room. Trust me, living in a three bedroom single family home is much nicer than having a family in a small unit albeit in a high density building with surrounding amenities. I am sure many other millennials will come to a similar conclusion once they have recovered from the tough economy and can financially start thinking about having a family too. Thank goodness for Shoreline's current affordable housing that enabled us to buy.

Anyway, when we bought I knew light rail would be going in approximately 0.7 miles from my home which is just off 185th<sup>th</sup> Street. I tried to do my research and read the market assessment and other materials online. I would like to read some examples from the market assessment which said:

“Retail should be limited to a small amount of convenience oriented retail serving residents and transit riders and located at the transit station. The station area lacks existing retail uses, with the nearest neighborhood retail area located just over one-half mile away on 15th Avenue NE, and the City's primary commercial corridor on Aurora Avenue North a mile away. However, the station area is too far from either of these areas, or Interstate-5 access, to benefit from existing retail activity, making it unlikely that a significant number of retailers could be attracted. Convenience-oriented retail (e.g. coffee shop/café, sundries, personal services, etc.) located at the station, or within a direct sight line between the station and any parking structure, would maximize access to transit riders and immediate area residents and have the greatest potential.”  
and

“New transit stations often spur new development in their immediate vicinities when there is market support for new types of denser, mixed-use transit-oriented development, as well as supporting city actions such as rezoning to accommodate market demand. These effects are generally limited to a ½-mile radius around stations, or the “station area”, that represents the outer limit of how far most persons are willing to walk between a residence and a station.”

also looked at the no change, some growth and most growth maps. Based on the available data I came to a conclusion that I believe most reasonable people would have. I knew that there would be some zoning changes close to the station but since people do not generally walk a distance more than ½ miles to use public transit that the changes would be compactly located around the station (similar to the 145<sup>th</sup> compact communities map) and that it would be mostly residential zoning changes since the area doesn't have freeway access and has other challenges that would not attract commercial interests. I expected an area similar to Columbia City with row homes, town homes and cottage homes and maybe a few larger apartment or condo buildings next to the station.

I have no idea how this same data could be used to create the extreme preferred alternative zoning map that is currently being studied. This map has significant zoning changes to approximately a 1 mile radius from the station. I am clueless what the basis or factual research was used when designing the preferred alternative.

I have tried to read everything I could and listen to the meetings regarding the 185th<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station. I have read several times in the available materials that since one person suggested something an area was upzoned. I have never seen the opposite that since 1 person didn't like something that the zoning was decreased (and let's face it much more than 1 person has shown opposition).

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

I want to know why and with what logic this preferred alternative map was created. I object and want it scaled back to something reasonable and based on actual data and research and with the community's desire and feedback.

Also, on a side note, I noticed on the draft development regulations that attachment C under Chapter 20.10 the statement "avoid excessive concentration of population" was struck out. I do not feel this should be deleted. It seems like a valid and important regulation. No one wants to live in a slum.

Furthermore, I do not think developers should get property tax exemptions as incentives. They need to pay their fair share for the needed improvements to streets, schools, parks, utilities, police, etc. that are a result of their projects. They will develop when they can make a ton of money and that should be incentive enough.

Thank you.

Sarah Jaynes

Concerned Citizen and Registered Voter of the City of Shoreline

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

Greetings from Ronald United Methodist Church.

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, we are asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

We have mentioned in the past the RUMC member who is a disabled veteran living on a fixed income. She wanted very much to remain in Shoreline when her health declined and she needed a ground floor apartment. Unfortunately, she and her case manager were unable to find anything suitable here and she has had to move to Auburn, farther from the VA and her support network.

The faith community of Ronald wants Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. We fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

We urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Phyllis - Johnson Ronald United Methodist Church

shoreline, WA 98133

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

As someone who works with the homeless population of Shoreline on a daily basis, I urge you to support affordable housing in our community. So many families are being priced out and there must be a balance brought to this situation.

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Pamela Kinnaird  
Shoreline Resident

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

We see each week at the doorsteps of Ronald United Methodist church many who struggle to find affordable housing in Shoreline. We have so appreciated all the efforts and accomplishments so far by the Shoreline Planning Commission and the City Council to bring affordable housing into our community. The

situation has only gotten worse as people still struggle to find work and to find homes which they can afford to rent let alone to buy. We have a wonderful and accessible community. Let's make it one where people of all income levels will be able to live.

Thank you,  
Pastor Paula Rae McCutcheon

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Kevin Osborn  
Shoreline Resident

---

Dear Shoreline Planning Commissioners and City Councilors,

I am an architect who has lived in Shoreline (North City to be precise) for the past 15 years and has worked on projects in the city, such as restoration of the Shoreline Historical Museum (before it went back to the school). My main professional focus is on community-oriented projects including affordable housing. I did not write the following, but agree with it whole-heartedly, because I've seen how the inclusion of affordable housing really does benefit the community it is built in.

As you consider development regulations for the 185th Street Light Rail Station Area, I am asking you to support strong affordable housing policies that require development to contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

I want Shoreline to be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs, public transit, and the many other important amenities light rail areas will offer. However, new development, growth, and the coming light rail will make Shoreline more expensive. I fear low-income people will struggle even more to find affordable housing. The proposed housing policies

offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers.

I urge you to act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue. Working together, we can make sure that Shoreline retains its character as a welcome and inclusive city for all.

Christopher Palms  
Shoreline Resident

---

I am shocked at the amount of space that is potentially being devoted to 85' buildings. It seems the business interests are using the light rail as an excuse to ram through massive development. Why is the town going along with this? The builders, developers, and real estate people will reap enormous profits while the public pays the costs in terms of increased taxes and congestion.

Patricia Panitz

---

**Liz Poitras, Shoreline resident**

**Comment on the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan:**

I have read much of the documents pertaining to the 185<sup>th</sup> St. Station Subarea Plan and the proposed zoning and development regulations and did not notice anything related to solar access. Are there any plans for identifying and managing solar access in the station area?

What if a developer builds a nice 3-story apartment building in an MUR-45 zone? He decides to go "green" and puts solar panels on the roof. Good. Two years later another developer wants to build a 6 story apartment building across the street in an MUR-85 zone. His building will block solar access to the first building for part of the day, depriving the 1st developer of some of the free power that was expected. How does the city plan on handling this type of problem?

And then the third developer plans an 85' building (or taller) in the same MUR-85 zone next to the second building. He will block even more of the solar access to the first building and possibly block some solar access to the second building if that building had solar panels.

Solar panels are expensive and those installing them project how many years before the panels will have paid for themselves. There have already been lawsuits in other parts of the country due to diminished solar access in cities that have no rules governing this aspect of development.

---

As you consider development regulations for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Station, I ask that you:

1. Support strong affordable housing policies that require development contribute to meeting Shoreline's affordable housing needs;

2. Support the policies proposed by staff, which are a critical step toward building an equitable and inclusionary Shoreline and

3. Support that Shoreline be a place where people of all incomes can afford to live near their jobs with access to public transit.

I have been a resident of Shoreline for over 50 years. I served on the first Planning Commission. This is an opportunity to make a statement for the future that we are a community that cares.

Sis Polin

---

Hi Miranda and happy new year!

Here are my thoughts on the FEIS-

First and foremost, thanks to the city for all the hard work they have put into coming up with a comprehensive plan. As closely as I have followed this conversation, I still am not sure I understand what the city's vision is for the area. In my field (education), we practice backward design-where we envision/describe/identify outcomes and then plan backwards to achieve them- Ideally, I would like to see a passive energy/net zero urban village with plenty of green space and walkability that promotes community living and an investment in being "Shoreline", rather than just a place for Seattle people to sleep. We have an opportunity to attract developers who can build this kind of community- and need to make sure that the groundwork we are laying sets the stage for the kind of neighborhood we hope for. As I have been involved in this process, it seems clear that the planning commission as well as the council is learning as they go- while this is understandable, I want to be confident that despite mostly living West of 1-5 they are doing due diligence to be sure what develops is a place where we still want to live. Its always a little awkward when there is the perception that the few of means are making decisions for the working class Shorelinians on the East side.

In terms of the FEIS:

Yes to phased zoning. I just don't think that there is any other way to try to channel the growth and avoid sprawl. I hope for an urban village to be developed, and although I feel for those on the border, they could just as easily have been left out entirely, as we have all agreed the scope of the rezone is much bigger than we anticipated. Height limits: I also think that 85 should be the cap with developer agreements being possible only in the Shoreline center area or the densest part of the subarea around the lightrail with required setbacks to blend more seamlessly into the area.

As much as possible the new buildings should use Solar power.

If at all possible, underground the powerlines. This may seem like too much of an expense at this point- but in the long term, totally worth it. Any possibility of federal funding? The area under where the lines are currently should remain green.

I think single family use should NOT continue to be permitted in the subarea. Highest and best use. Single family designations could result in a lack of affordable housing and seems to be incongruent with the purpose of the rezone (to get more people out of their cars and using mass transit), if a single family house is taking up or blocking the potential for a much larger structure that houses many families, it seems that should take priority.

Additionally- The more greenspace the better. NO concrete jungle. Yes to more parks.

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

The city still has not addressed my neighborhood's concerns about the 188th st. cut-through and traffic mitigations. We have brought this up at multiple meetings and this is one of the major concerns of those of us that live on the top of motorcycle hill.

Lastly, I think that the city needs to continue to look at more ways to improve the walkability of the area, and as I have said before- I would like to see a "motorcycle" hill climb up 185th that connects to the existing footpath (which needs to be developed) to tie North City to the Subarea. I know there are concerns about accessibility, but is it not possible to have the accessible path go around, via 180th and have the hill climb be just that?

Thanks!

Merissa Reed

---

December 15, 2014

To: Shoreline Planning Commission and Shoreline City Council

As a long-time resident of the City of Shoreline, I have watched as the city has developed as a more and more desirable place to live. Now that light rail will be coming to the city, that desirability factor will be increasing. I am especially concerned that issues of affordable housing be kept at the forefront during the planning stages for the 185<sup>th</sup> St. Light Rail Station Area. Although having more expensive housing will be a positive thing for the community, it is also imperative that those with fewer financial resources not be priced out of the market. This is particularly important since much of the land that will be developed currently has housing that is at the lower end of the spectrum. It should be replaced with at least an equitable amount of affordable housing after the station is completed. The policies proposed by staff are a critical step toward building an equitable Shoreline.

The proposed housing policies offer Shoreline an opportunity to meet the needs of its residents and workforce efficiently in partnership with developers. The strength of a community is built on having a diverse population of people who are able to live and work in that community. Please do not price working class people out of the market for affordable housing in the process of building the Light Rail Station. Shoreline needs to be a city where many diverse groups of people can live side by side and learn from one another.

Using inclusionary zoning, you can act now to preserve and create affordability in Shoreline. I appreciate the efforts that the Planning Commission and the Council are making to ensure that our city retains its character as a welcome and inclusive community for the many categories of families and individuals who would like to live here.

Karen Thielke  
Shoreline Resident

---

Steven:

In order for the Light Rail system to be worth building, people will have to use it.  
In order for people to use it, convenient free parking must be provided.

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

As a northern terminus, we should expect a lot of users, not only from Shoreline, but also Snohomish County.

That will require a HUGE parking facility, with a lot of traffic.

185th is currently a good East West arterial that is not clogged with traffic to and from the I5 freeway. The city should try to impede through traffic as little as possible, in addition to accommodating traffic to the station and surrounding shops.

This will require additional traffic lanes, with dedicated right and left hand turn lanes, as well as through lanes, since we would expect development north and south of 185th and east and west of I5.

Thank you for the diligence that you apply to your work,

John Tucker  
Shoreline Resident

---

My name is Peter Watters,

I recently moved to Shoreline -18805 wallingford ave N. My wife and I love the single family neighborhood that has evolved over half a century. It is a friendly diverse neighborhood. I recently saw the rezoning plans for the development of the light rail station and was appalled to see the drastic changes envisaged no doubt by people with agendas and monetary interests that live elsewhere. Concentrating density in one of the last unblighted areas in Shoreline where there are middle class single family homes is not progress. Creating a retail corridor on 185 will only further undermine the struggling existing retail real-estate- look around Central Market and Haggen - the median strip on Aurora that used to have small business but now only has grass to mow and you will understand my extreme skepticism on Shoreline's city planning competence.

Thank you

---

Dear Council and Planning Commission:

I would like to call your attention to this article from The Weekly in reference to the upcoming rezones being proposed for Light Rail Stations.

Please include this article into the record of comment on the 185th St Station Area EIS and 145th St upcoming Draft EIS.

Please note that the Beacon Hill and Columbia City Station Areas have been under development or completed in the last 10 years or more. I am concerned that this area described of "orphaned properties" remaining undeveloped or abandoned is a possibility in our Light Rail Rezone future.

I'm sure you will insist that this wouldn't happen here. Maybe not, but I have not seen any convincing evidence of why it should be any different.

My neighborhood near the 145th St Station Area is not "blighted" as Aurora was termed before that project began. It is a very nice neighborhood, with diversity and thousands of proud homeowners or renters who care about it.

Also, a subject that is mentioned in the article is a wetland associated with the vacant lot pictured. The wetland and steep slope is blamed for the City's inability to get a developer to take it on. And a "variance" is suggested so



that the bothersome wetland is dispensed with.

As you know, Paramount Park is the largest wetland in Shoreline and the surrounding properties may have high water tables too. Needless to say, I believe this issue is not something to be dismissed lightly.

And, I am certain that those of us who live here do not want orphaned properties left abandoned or vacant waiting for developers or Sound Transit to build Transit Oriented Developments.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Janet Way  
Shoreline Preservation Society

<http://www.seattleweekly.com/home/955334-129/where-development-is-not-happening-in>

Where Development Is Not Happening in Seattle and Why

Despite hyper-development in much of Seattle—and the intentions of city leaders— land is still begging for a buyer on the South End.  
By Nina Shapiro Tue., Nov 18 2014 at 05:13PM

One bright day last week, people making their way to the Columbia City light-rail station might have noticed a “For Sale” sign on a vacant, litter-strewn parcel of land that climbs up Beacon Hill from Martin Luther King Way South. Or they might not have. The sign had been knocked to the ground, with the placard bearing the real-estate agent’s name unhinged from the post.

Photo by Nina Shapiro

Passersby might have overlooked the sign for another reason too: It’s been there before, and to no avail. That piece of property has been vacant at least since 2009, when light rail started running in Seattle’s South End.

What’s more, this is not the only such parcel around there. The station is surrounded by seemingly unwanted land, much of it fenced off, waiting to be developed.

For much of the city, this would be an odd sight. In neighborhoods like Ballard and Capitol Hill, developers are maximizing construction on every inch of land they can find. So fast and fierce is the development that some residents say they scarcely recognize their neighborhoods anymore.

The contrast with the unused land around the Columbia City station is even more striking because it’s precisely this corridor that was supposed to see an economic boom when light rail came in. In fact, that’s why city leaders decided to start light-rail development in the South End first. “The hope was that if you got light rail in, everything would follow,” says longtime

Columbia City booster and former Deputy Mayor Darryl Smith. “That’s not always the case.” Sometimes, he adds, it takes a pioneering project to get things going.

That may be happening now—finally—but the vacant properties serve as a glaring reminder that underdevelopment still exists in many parts of the Rainier Valley, the most economically and racially diverse area of town.

Listing agent Scott Goodrich of Remax explains that the litter-strewn property that’s long gone begging for a buyer has some unique problems. Part of the 18,000-square-foot parcel is wetlands, and the city requires that part of it be kept as a buffer to those wetlands. The rest of it lies on a steep slope. Between that and the city restrictions, Goodrich bemoans, “it’s virtually unbuildable.”

He says the city has indicated it would be willing to consider a variance on its restrictions to allow for development. But the four or five potential buyers who initially expressed interest decided such a variance wasn’t worth the time, effort, and application fee. You have to wonder, though, whether a developer wouldn’t have decided differently were the property in, say, red-hot Ballard, especially given that its price is just \$149,000.

The nearby fenced-in area is even more puzzling. That’s because all 39,000 square feet of it—including a little sliver across a side street on the west side of the station and a much larger section on the east side—belongs to Sound Transit, an agency committed to fostering economic development along the tracks it has laid down.

Those parcels, Smith recounts, “have been a bone of contention for a long time.” Vacant land makes a neighborhood seem unwanted and unwatched, and local residents worry that the property might be a magnet for crime. “In my time in the mayor’s office, myself and a colleague at DPD [the city Department of Planning and Development] began the process of reaching out to Sound Transit,” Smith says. “Our feeling was that they should start either marketing the properties or doing something with it.” Instead, he says, the agency was “sitting around waiting.”

What was it waiting for? The recession to end, for one thing. “I think you’re familiar with the real-estate market in the valley,” says Sound Transit spokesperson Bruce Gray. “It’s just now starting to come around.”

Sound Transit is dedicated to using its property for public benefit. So say Gray, Transit-Oriented Development manager Sarah Lovell, and Brooke Belman, who oversees the disposition of the agency’s surplus property, all of them speaking on a conference call with Seattle Weekly. But the agency is also determined to achieve “fair market value” for its properties.

That goal was reviewed a year ago by the Sound Transit board, chaired by King County Executive Dow Constantine. Belman says the board felt “very strongly that property purchased with transit dollars” should be used to generate revenue that can be plowed back into transit.

“Fair market value, I think, is not the way to go,” counters newly re-elected

state Speaker of the House Frank Chopp. Hammered on the issue of affordable housing by challenger Jess Spear, he told the Weekly during the campaign that he had been “pushing” Sound Transit “very hard” to sell its land cheaply or even donate it to the cause.

Belman and Lovell say they haven’t heard of this proposal, and Chopp clarifies that talks are just beginning. But he says he’s already helped achieve one such deal on Capitol Hill, where Sound Transit recently issued an Request for Proposals that would create affordable housing around its soon-to-be completed station there.

That deal is actually quite complicated, and involves recouping lost value on that discounted parcel with revenue gained from adjacent Sound Transit properties, Lovell and Belman explain. It’s also in an already hyper-developed neighborhood, not the Rainier Valley.

Still, they stress that things are happening on the South End. In Mount Baker, Sound Transit knocked \$600,000 off the price of land adjacent to its station there, partly to account for poor soil and slope conditions and partly to encourage an affordable live/work complex that was built by the nonprofit Artspace. The four-story, 57-unit complex opened in October and pitches itself as “jump-starting an urban village.”

Meanwhile, nonprofit Mercy Housing Northwest is slated to build an affordable-housing complex around the Othello station, which will also house the organization’s headquarters.

As for the land around the Columbia City station, Lovell says Sound Transit is engaged in “predevelopment work,” which includes figuring out “what the neighborhood wants as well as what the neighborhood can support.” That process takes about 18 months, she says, and will result in the land going on the market probably sometime next year.

Sound Transit is not a pioneer in this area. Already an incubator of charming small businesses, Columbia City has become a magnet for bigger development over the past couple of years. A stylish apartment complex called Green House, boasting granite countertops and a rooftop garden, opened in late 2012 just off the business district’s main drag. A few blocks north, on the site of a once-derelict little strip mall that Smith says used to draw laughs when he and others proposed it as a site for development, Security Properties is building a complex the order of which Columbia City has not yet seen. Due to open next summer, it will hold 193 apartments above what will be one of PCC’s biggest stores, complete with a smoothie bar and space for cooking classes.

Even on the western edge of Columbia City, which includes the light-rail station but an otherwise neglected stretch of Martin Luther King Way, a massive new development is on the way. The Arizona-based Wolff Company has just broken ground on six acres it bought from Zion Preparatory Academy. A six-building, 244-unit apartment complex will go in there, featuring “high-end interior finishes and outdoor amenity spaces,” according to Chris Rossman, the company’s vice-president for development.

Wolff tends to build in Seattle’s hottest neighborhoods, including South Lake

Union and Capitol Hill, and its pick of Columbia City was well-considered, according to Rossman. "We've been keeping a close eye on the neighborhood," he says. He calls the area "evolving," adding that he expects Wolff's own project to serve as a "catalyst."

Rob Mohn, a smaller-scale Columbia City developer who runs an extended-stay hotel, says he thinks so too. In fact, despite trying to drum up more development in the area for years, he worries about it. "There's a fine line between trying to get something happening and too much happening," he says.

The valley has always been conflicted about development. On the one hand, residents want more amenities and are resentful about being overlooked by the city, developers, and many Seattleites in general. "Look," Smith says, "a lot of people in Seattle have never been south of Jackson Street . . . I think there's still a little racism out there."

On the other hand, Smith, Mohn and others worry about gentrification and the effect of rising rents on beloved small businesses. "My hope is that there will be a homegrown type of redevelopment," Smith says.

That conversation has gone on even while "For Sale" signs have hung for years on the same properties. Is this time different? One indication will be whether Goodrich's listing ever gets sold.

In the meantime, the Weekly's inquiries last week about whether the city's restrictions on the lot might be too stringent, as Goodrich suggested, prompted DPD to reach out to the agent, according to department spokesperson Bryan Stevens. He says the city offered help in "activating the space with different uses or activities" until a buyer comes along. No word yet on what those might be.

nshapiro@seattleweekly.com

---

Dear Jessica,

Please add the following article to the record on the 185th and 145th Rezone EIS. And provide this article (below) to the City Council and Planning Commission.

We believe that incessant warnings by "experts and planners" stated to promote the highest density alternatives for Rezone, are at best an exaggeration. While there may be a need and desire for some new development and some change will happen, the constant cry of "population growth" as if it is an emergency is not a realistic threat.

Indeed care and planning should be taken to avoid rash decisions which will cause more harm than good to our community.

Thank you.

Janet Way  
Shoreline Preservation Society

## The baby bust: U.S. births at record low

Thursday, December 4, 2014 - 14:00

- [Story](#)

In terms of things to worry about, the U.S. economy already has its share of concerns. Well, add one more to that list: not enough babies.

The U.S. fertility rate is at an all-time low and doesn't show signs of rebounding any time soon. In fact, women have never had so few children in the history of the U.S. The tipping point is contained within the term "replacement level fertility" — demographer-speak for the number necessary to replace you and your partner. That would be two babies.

And for the longest time that rate was sitting comfortably at about 2.1.

"That's kind of the magic number, and over the past several years we've actually dipped below that 2.1. We're now at around 1.9 births per woman," says Mark Mather, a demographer at the [Population Reference Bureau](#).

Many young people might still be feeling the pinch of the Great Recession and have just stopped having children, Mather says.

Another factor holding down birth rates could be the simple fact that many more women are primary bread-winners, and are unwilling to pay the opportunity cost of dropping out to have children. "As more and more women are entering the workforce, we'd expect fertility rates to stay at pretty low levels, and I don't see any signs of that slowing down in the future," Mather says.

An aging work force, a drop-off in consumer spending that spans from Onesies to college tuition — these just a few negative economic impacts of the baby bust.

But how much should we really worry?

"I don't think it's an economic disaster, but it does create challenges," says David Lam, an Economist at the [University of Michigan Population Studies Center](#). The theory, says Lam, is that as economic conditions improve, people will start having more babies. But even if we don't, many other wealthy economies are doing just fine.

"You know, Germany is doing quite well right now economically, relatively speaking, with a lower fertility rate than we have," he says.

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

And if economic incentives to get in a family don't come about, [immigration](#) is a button policymakers might consider pushing to help drive the recovery.

---

Anonymous:

I fully support the rezone proposals... We have a long way to go to make Shoreline a place deserving of good public transit. Looking forward to a 185th street station and a walkable neighborhood in and around it.



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Mayor Winstead and City Councilmembers

FROM: Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DATE: December 9, 2014

RE: Documents received at 12/08/14 Council Meeting

CC: Debbie Tarry, City Manager  
John Norris, Assistant City Manager

---

Attached hereto are documents received from the public at the December 8, 2014 City Council Business Meeting.

- 1) Written comments regarding mixing residential and commercial activity submitted by Tom Poitras.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING 12-8-14  
RIDGECREST

TOM AND LIZ POITRAS

ISSUES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN MIXING RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN CLOSE PROXIMITY.

It is my desire to maximize the quality of life for the future residents of Shoreline's station areas, and equally important, the future quality of life for the current residents of those areas. There appears to be a problem looming on arterials inside station subareas. That is, if they are up zoned to MUR 35 or MUR 45, arterials will be subject to commercial development with little or no restrictions on the type of businesses or the impacts they may have on the neighborhood. Those areas are now almost exclusively single family residential and enjoy the protections of a residential zone, which requires standards to keep the neighborhood looking good and also prohibiting nuisance activities. We have been told that transition from single family residential will be slow and could take decades. Although Home Occupation businesses are allowed now, they are highly regulated and restricted by code so the residential character and quality of life in the area is maintained. When the residential areas are rezoned MUR 35 or 45, there doesn't seem to be any code to similarly protect the residents from full blown businesses. Those businesses will be more likely to negatively impact the neighborhood than the smaller Home Occupations, both for current homeowners and future apartment and condo dwellers. The attached Home Occupation zoning regulations for Shoreline, Pasadena, and Monterey demonstrate how they try to protect neighborhoods. The stated purposes of those documents is usually to protect surrounding areas from adverse impacts generated by business activities. Those goals should also apply to businesses allowed after a MUR 35 or 45 rezone because those areas may remain single or multifamily residential for decades. Of course, the methods for achieving those goals will have to change. If these areas are moving toward Multifamily Residential mixed with some commercial, rules can be devised that facilitate keeping the area an attractive place to live. For example, some businesses should not be allowed because of their nature.

Using the same criterion for what types of businesses are acceptable in a Commercial zone does not seem appropriate in a MUR 35 or MUR 45 zone. Many Commercial zone business types would degrade a residential area. For that reason, I believe all businesses mixed with residential, on an arterial, should need a Conditional Use permit to guarantee its appropriateness in that setting. In addition, on the attached pages I have included some concerns and solutions that other cities have addressed in their code. It is not suggested that these methods are the only way to solve this very important problem, but they would be helpful in lieu of better solutions. I hope you will give it serious consideration. Thank you.



ISSUES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN MIXING RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN CLOSE PROXIMITY.

The expected clientele of a business should also be considered because it is a residential area and the clientele may not be appropriate if children are nearby. Businesses that have a high potential of being a nuisance should not be allowed. If these nuisances can be reduced via mitigations, these mitigations should be enforceable and there should be realistic expectations that they'll work.

I have suggested to the Planning Commission that Home Conversions to businesses should be more regulated than they currently are in Shoreline to insure they are attractive, are good neighbors, and meet the same standards required of new construction. That should be done. See Home Conversions below in the table of Pasadena Code.

Since in the MUR-35 and MUR 45 zones we are allowing retail and residences to mix in the same block on arterials, we need to be aware of what might not mix well and restrict that. The designation in the zoning code of "General Retail Trade/Services" is a very broad category. There may be some retail trade/services that may not be appropriate and should outright not be allowed and there may be others that could be allowed but should not be close to sensitive areas.

Some items to be considered in identifying these two groups are:

- excessive noise normally generated by the type of business
- excessive traffic
- excessive odors
- hours normally open
- adult only activities
- sexually-oriented activities
- outdoor activities
- lighting (glare or light trespassing)
- excessive parking requirements
- potential for increased crime

Some restrictions that should be required on businesses in MUR-35 are:

- no outside display or storage of merchandise or supplies
- restrictions on hours for acceptable truck loading, unloading and trash pick-up
- specific locations for dumpsters
- specific locations for on-site parking for customers
- no outdoor preparation of food or beverages
- no outdoor storage for customer pickup

These restrictions might naturally preclude some businesses from locating in the area.

For these reasons, I would suggest that the MUR-35 zones not allow:

- sexually-oriented businesses
- drive-thru businesses
- firearm sales

Also, I would suggest that the following businesses have restrictions:

- taverns and restaurants
- liquor stores
- dry cleaning processing (as opposed to receive and delivery)
- pawnshops
- medical marijuana sales
- tobacco sales
- massage establishments
- tattoo parlors
- any other sales or services restricted to adults only
- live/work situations

Restrictions should aim to make it *tolerable* to live near the business, to protect children, and to protect property values.

There can be many ways to restrict such businesses. Probably the easiest is by location. For example, some businesses would not be allowed if they abut existing residential. Some would not be allowed within so many feet of residential even if the residential is not on the arterial. Some would not be allowed within so many feet of a school, park, playground, daycare or any other area designated for children.

In some cases the restrictions should apply to all businesses in the zone such as hours of operation, noise levels, lighting, etc.

An example of a city that has such restrictions is Pasadena and their code is located at [ww2.cityofpasadena.net/zoning/P-5.html#17.50.110](http://ww2.cityofpasadena.net/zoning/P-5.html#17.50.110).

The following table points to the sections of the Pasadena code where they handle some of these situations.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Massage Establishments  | 17.50.155 - Massage Establishments                                       |
| Tobacco Sales   | 17.50.330 - Tobacco Retail Sales   |
| restrictions on hours for acceptable truck loading, unloading and trash pick-up | 17.40.170 - Truck Trip Limitations                                       |
| Hours normally open   | 17.40.070 - Limited Hours of Operation                                   |
| Liquor stores   | 17.40.070 - Limited Hours of Operation<br>17.50.160 - Mixed-Use Projects |
| Home Conversions  | 17.50.040 - Alcohol Sales  |
|   | 17.50.070 - Conversion of a Residential Structure to a Commercial Use    |

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| pawnshops       | 17.50.200 - <u>Personal Services</u> - Restricted and Pawnshops |
| lighting        | 17.50.160 - <u>Mixed-Use Projects</u>                           |
| Live/work units | 17.50.370 - <u>Work/Live Units</u>                              |
| Tattoo parlors  | 17.50.200 - <u>Personal Services</u> - Restricted and Pawnshops |

**20.40.400 Home occupation.**

---

Intent/Purpose: The City of Shoreline recognizes the desire and/or need of some citizens to use their residence for business activities. The City also recognizes the need to protect the surrounding areas from adverse impacts generated by these business activities.

Residents of a dwelling unit may conduct one or more home occupations as an accessory use(s), provided:

- A. The total area devoted to all home occupation(s) shall not exceed 25 percent of the floor area of the dwelling unit. Areas with garages and storage buildings shall not be considered in these calculations, but may be used for storage of goods associated with the home occupation.
- B. In residential zones, all the activities of the home occupation(s) (including storage of goods associated with the home occupation) shall be conducted indoors, except for those related to growing or storing of plants used by the home occupation(s).
- C. No more than two nonresident FTEs working on site shall be employed by the home occupation(s).
- D. The following activities shall be prohibited in residential zones:
  1. Automobile, truck and heavy equipment repair;
  2. Auto body work or painting;
  3. Parking and storage of heavy equipment; and
  4. On-site metals and scrap recycling.
- E. In addition to required parking for the dwelling unit, on-site parking shall be provided as follows:
  1. One stall for each nonresident FTE employed by the home occupation(s); and
  2. One stall for patrons when services are rendered on site.
- F. Sales shall be by appointment or limited to:
  1. Mail order sales; and
  2. Telephone or electronic sales with off-site delivery.

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

G. Services to patrons shall be arranged by appointment or provided off site.

H. The home occupation(s) may use or store a vehicle for pickup of materials used by the home occupation(s) or the distribution of products from the site, provided:

1. No more than two such vehicles shall be allowed;
2. Such vehicles shall not exceed gross weight of 14,000 pounds, a height of nine feet and a length of 22 feet.

I. The home occupation(s) shall not use electrical or mechanical equipment that results in:

1. A change to the fire rating of the structure(s) used for the home occupation(s), unless appropriate changes are made under a valid building permit; or
2. Visual or audible interference in radio or television receivers, or electronic equipment located off premises; or
3. Fluctuations in line voltage off premises; or
4. Emissions such as dust, odor, fumes, bright lighting or noises greater than what is typically found in a neighborhood setting.

J. One sign not exceeding four square feet may be installed without a sign permit. It may be mounted on the house, fence or freestanding on the property (monument style). Any additional signage is subject to permit under Chapter 20.50 SMC.

K. All home occupations must obtain a business license, consistent with Chapter 5.05 SMC.

Note: Daycares, community residential facilities, animal keeping, bed and breakfasts, and boarding houses are regulated elsewhere in the Code. (Ord. 631 § 1 (Exh. 1), 2012; Ord. 581 § 1 (Exh. 1), 2010; Ord. 352 § 1, 2004; Ord. 299 § 1, 2002; Ord. 238 Ch. IV § 3(B), 2000).

**38-26 Supplemental Regulations Applicable in R Districts**

G. Home Occupations.

1. Purpose. A home occupation is a business activity conducted in a residential unit that is clearly subordinate and secondary to the primary residential use of the unit. The purpose of the home occupation provision is to allow for minor business activities in residences in such a manner as to be compatible with their neighborhood.
2. Procedure. The procedure for processing of home occupations shall include:
  - a. Application by the property owner or agent of the owner to the Department of Plans and Public Works on a form prescribed for that purpose by the City of Monterey that includes submittal requirements developed, maintained, and adopted by the Department of Plans and Public Works and made available to the public at City Hall.
  - b. Payment of a filing fee as established by resolution of the City Council.
  - c. Review by the Department of Plans and Public Works to determine if the application is complete and appropriate. If deemed incomplete, the Department of Plans and Public Works shall notify the applicant what additional information is required.
  - d. A decision by the Department of Plans and Public Works to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application within 14 days of the application being deemed complete.
  - e. The Department of Plans and Public Works will mail notice to adjacent property owners and tenants indicating the action taken and providing 10 days from the date the notice was mailed for filing an appeal of the decision.
  - f. The decision may be appealed to the Planning Commission. The notice of appeal shall be in writing and shall be filed in the Department of Plans and Public Works on forms provided by the City.
3. Restrictions. The following restrictions shall apply to the conduct of any home occupation unless specific modifications are made at the time approval is granted. Such modifications shall be made only on the basis of unusual or special circumstances associated with the intended use.
  - a. No person other than a resident of the dwelling unit shall be engaged or employed in the home occupation and the number of residents employed in the home occupation shall not exceed two.
  - b. A home occupation shall not create significant additional vehicular or pedestrian traffic to the residence.

## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

- c. No sign for the home occupation shall be displayed on the house or property.
- d. No advertisement shall be placed in any media (newspaper, magazine, telephone directory, radio, television) containing the address of the property.
- e. There shall be no visible storage or display of materials or products.
- f. There shall be no exterior evidence of the conduct of a home occupation. A home occupation shall be conducted only within the dwelling unit or any accessory structure. Home occupations shall not be permitted out of doors on the property.
- g. The conduct of any home occupation shall not reduce or render unusable areas provided for the required off-street parking for the residents nor prevent the number of cars intended to be parked in the garage from being parked.
- h. There shall be no process used in the home occupation which is hazardous to public health, safety, or welfare. No toxic, explosive, radioactive, or other restrictive materials not normally used in a single-family dwelling shall be used or stored on the site.
- i. There shall be no significant increase in use of utilities such as water, sewer, gas, and electricity beyond that normal to the use of the property for residential purposes.
- j. If at any time the home occupation becomes a nuisance to the neighborhood or the City of Monterey, the permit shall be reopened for review and possible revocation pursuant to Section 38-219.
- k. The property owner must agree in writing to all proposed uses, if the applicant is a renter and not a property owner. **(Ord. 3429 § 3, 2009)**

**17.50.110 - Home Occupations**

- A. **Purpose.**
  - 1. The purpose of this Section is to allow for a home occupation business from a residential use while ensuring that the home occupation does not detract from nor is incompatible with the surrounding residential uses.
  - 2. The uses are intended to be clearly incidental to a residential use.
- B. **Permit requirement.** A Home Occupation Permit shall be required before the establishment of a home occupation use. After receiving an application, a permit shall be issued by the Director upon the determination that the proposed home occupation use complies with this Section.
- C. **Permit is nontransferable.** A Home Occupation Permit shall not be transferable.
- D. **Property owner's authorization required.** For rental property, the property owner's written authorization for the proposed use shall be obtained and submitted with the application for a Home Occupation Permit.
- E. **Business License required.**
  - 1. Upon approval of the Home Occupation Permit, a Business License shall be obtained.
  - 2. If a Business License is not renewed, the Home Occupation Permit shall become void.
- F. **Location and size.** A home occupation use shall be conducted entirely within a structure and shall occupy no more than 500 square feet of floor area. The maximum floor area shall include on-site storage areas, and any portion of the home occupation that is located within an accessory structure.
- G. **Limitation on activities.**
  - 1. There shall be no items other than products crafted on the premises. Items manufactured off-site may be sold through mail order or through the internet as long as the home occupation use (including storage area) does not exceed 500 square feet of floor area. The floor area maximum can be exceeded if the storage area is located off-site.
  - 2. Guns and ammunition shall not be sold as part of a Home Occupation Permit except that a home occupation for a gunsmith or firearms collector licensed by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms as a gunsmith or firearm collector is allowed.
- H. **Employees, volunteers or independent contractors.** Only a resident of the dwelling unit shall be employed in the operation of home occupation use. No volunteers, interns or independent contractors shall be part of a home occupation permit.
- I. **Commercial vehicles.**
  - 1. Not more than one truck, equivalent in size to a truck marketed by the major vehicle manufacturer's as a 350 or 3500 series, incidental to a home occupation use shall be kept on the site.
  - 2. The truck shall not exceed a height of seven feet nor larger than that able to easily fit within the universal stall dimension of eight and one-half feet wide by 18 feet long.
  - 3. The number of off-street parking spaces accessory to a dwelling unit housing a home occupation shall not be reduced to less than that required in compliance with Chapter 17.46 (Parking and Loading).
- J. **Client/customer visits.** A home occupation use shall not allow any clients or customers without prior appointments. Client/customer appointments are limited to the hours of 7 A.M. to 10 P.M., Monday through Friday.
- K. **Changes to dwelling or premises prohibited.**



## Comments Received as of 5 p.m. Tuesday, January 13

1. There shall be no alteration to the residential character of the premises as a result of the home occupation use.
  2. The existence of a home occupation use shall not be apparent beyond the boundaries of the subject site.
- L. **Outdoor uses.** No outdoor storage or display of equipment, appliances, materials, or supplies shall be allowed.
- M. **Signs and advertising.** On-site signs advertising a home occupation use shall not be allowed. Paper and electronic advertisements are allowed (including business cards) as long as they do not include the address of the home occupation permit.
- N. **Additional standards.** A home occupation use shall be in compliance with Section 17.40.090 (Performance Standards), Chapter 9.36 (Noise Restrictions) and Chapter 8.80 (Handling and Disclosure of Hazardous Materials).
- O. **Revocation.** The Zoning Administrator may revoke a Home Occupation Permit that is not in compliance with these regulations as provided by Section 17.78.090 (Permit Revocation or Modification) after 15 days' written notice, unless the home occupation is altered to comply with these standards.