

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 5, 2015  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

#### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Scully  
Vice Chair Craft  
Commissioner Malek  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Mork  
Commissioner Moss

#### **Staff Present**

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning and Community Development  
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development  
Julie Ainsworth Taylor, Assistant City Attorney  
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

#### **Commissioners Absent**

Commissioner Montero

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

#### **ROLL CALL**

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

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of January 29, 2015 were not available for approval.

#### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Brian Derdowski, Issaquah**, said he was present to speak on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society, the Sensible Growth Alliance, and the Public Interest Associates. He observed that, often, a

planning commission works in a parallel path with a city council, and they can serve them best by providing options for their consideration rather than forwarding a single recommendation. Planning commissions can also ask staff for additional information that might be helpful to their city councils. He encouraged the Commissioners to think more broadly of their role, as servants of a good decision-making process.

Mr. Derdowski said he has been committed to the public participation process his entire life. Having conducted hundreds of meetings and public hearings, he has always used a soft rather than a hard clock. While it is important to not abuse the Commission's time, it is also important to hear from everyone. This reduces the tension in the room and allows people to feel heard. He noted that the current tendency is to use open houses, advisory groups and other mechanisms to conduct the public process, but this fatigues the public. He emphasized that public hearings are critical and provide the only opportunity for citizens to establish their legal standing. He suggested that, rather than an afterthought, public hearings should be the focus; and the public should be coached on how they can most effectively participate.

Mr. Derdowski pointed out that because the public hearing for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Planning DEIS is an open record hearing with no appeal, the Commission should be more lenient in terms of public input. He said he has read hundreds of pages of documents, trying to catch up with the process; and many property owners are doing the same. He also suggested that citizens who are particularly well organized and have a lot to say should be allowed a block of time (30-45 minutes) to have an open dialogue with the Commission. He encouraged the Commissioners to create an atmosphere where they are empowered to ask questions of citizens who speak, and he cautioned that the City's subarea plans will not be successful without broad public support. The process will be better served if the Commission is flexible and open minded and takes the time to incorporate the public comments into the plans.

Chair Scully agreed that he would use a soft clock and would not cut people off mid sentence. However, he asked that they watch the time and wrap up their comments as soon as possible after the time is up.

**Dan Dale, Shoreline**, cautioned that one of the biggest pieces missing from the processes for both of the station subarea plans is Sound Transit's Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), which will be released in April. He suggested that decision making related to the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan should be postponed until after Sound Transit's FEIS has been released. In addition, the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan FEIS should also be intertwined with the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan DEIS as it moves forward. He emphasized the need to work together to get as close to the best situation as possible.

**Tom McCormick, Shoreline**, voiced concern about the potential traffic problems associated with the proposed development at Point Wells. The proposed development at Point Wells would increase the number of vehicles crossing the county line via Richmond Beach Drive from 300 to 12,000. This will have a significant impact on the people who live on the street who are used to a very quiet neighborhood. He said the same concern holds true for those living near 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Streets, where traffic is expected to increase dramatically. These traffic increases are not something the community wants or should tolerate. He said he has proposed a Comprehensive Plan Amendment that would add

the following provision: *“The following average trip limits will apply to local streets and collector streets. The default average daily trip limit would be 1,500 vehicles per day, but Council would have authority to go up to 3,000.”* This would be a hard limit, and future development proposals that create traffic beyond the limit would be rejected. The citizens want to take back their streets. They need certainty that traffic will not significantly increase over time.

**John Behrens, Shoreline**, referred to a letter the Commission received earlier regarding affordable housing. The letter referenced a newspaper article written a decade earlier and criticized the 10-year plan that was launched in 2005 to end homelessness. The plan committed to a dramatic increase in spending of low-income and homeless assistance programs. A committee to end homelessness was established to implement the plan and was primarily run by elected city and county officials, as well as big shots in the non-profit sector and corporate giving world. While the letter indicated an appreciation for the increased attention and dollars pledged to the growing problem, it said the plan lacked any commitment or policies to prevent the continued loss of the existing stock of low-income housing. For example, Mr. Behrens pointed out that two trailer parks were recently replaced with new apartment complexes. These trailer parks provided opportunities for affordable housing that are now gone.

Mr. Behrens said the letter points out that even if the plan fulfilled its goal to add 9,000 low-cost units countywide over the period; for every one unit created, three to four units would be lost to demolition, condo conversion and increased rents. Given that committee membership included many with ties to developer interests, the letter suggests it was unlikely that the plan would ever address the issue of displacement. Since 2005, the 10-year plan takes credit for adding about 6,000 housing units countywide; but in Seattle alone, over the same period, over 6,500 low-income apartments have been demolished, another 3,000 were lost to condominium conversion, and at least 6,000 were lost to speculative sale and rent increases. Thousands more were lost in the rest of the county due to these forces. The letter emphasizes that today homelessness has reached record levels (up 13% in 2013 and 20% in 2014). County and city leaders won't acknowledge that the plan has failed and refuse to link the problem to the continuing loss of existing units and gentrification. Instead, they've extended their plans out indefinitely.

Mr. Behrens commented that in just one year, King County and Seattle spends \$45 million on homeless issues; which is enough to give each homeless person \$15,000 per year. He suggested that the county and cities need to use the funds smarter, and he shared the following ideas:

- Require developers who demolish low-income housing to replace 1 for 1 the units they remove at a comparable price, and impose a citywide moratorium on demotions until this provision is adopted.
- Create a housing preservation commission to inventory the remaining stock of privately owned, low-income buildings at risk of being lost, and recommend strategies for quick acquisition of these buildings. Include existing single-family homes, which rent at affordable rates.
- Inventory unused public lands and make them available for low-income housing development. This gives people free land to build on.
- Establish a growth-related housing fund and dedicated 20% of the incremental increase in property tax revenues from new construction citywide to development of low-income housing.
- Adopt developer impact fees to replace tax subsidies granted to developers.

**Tom Jamieson, Shoreline**, commented that the City's impact fee ordinance went into effect on January 1, 2015, but all development permit applications submitted prior to that time are not be subject to the provisions of the ordinance. There is incentive for these developers to wait until rezoning occurs to move forward with their projects; and it would be in their best interest to rezone the areas as quickly as possible so they can avoid the impact fees. He expressed his belief that the City should not rush the subarea plans in order to accommodate existing or anticipated development applications. Rather, the rezones should occur in the best interest of the City. He voiced concern that small movements might be overlooked by the public because they are focusing on the big picture and their own particular parcels. He asked the Commission to confirm whether or not revisions to the plans are being done in the special interest of particular developers and/or applications or legal challenges.

**John Croft, Shoreline**, commented that 21<sup>st</sup> century transportation is being overlooked completely. The plan provided by Sound Transit was born in 1980 and provided more capacity than what the current plan is proposing. He submitted information for the Commission to consider and asked that they pay particular attention to 145<sup>th</sup>, which is a very congested area. Light rail coming through will make it worse.

**Jeff Eisenbrey, Shoreline**, said he lives in the area that would be impacted by the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. He expressed his belief that the station would make more sense in other areas of the City where the zoning already exists to support development. For example, the 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue areas have high density as opposed to the proposed location across the street from a golf course and the most expensive private school in the state. He expressed concern about aggregation of properties. He has observed growth in and around the Seattle area for years, and the buildings that tend to be constructed where aggregation occurs are grandly out of scale with the entire neighborhood. It takes time to build while aggregation is happening and the properties in and around the development sites become blighted. If the area around the station is rezoned, he has to wonder whether or not he should fix his roof. Maybe someone will offer him a lot of money for the property and his home will be torn down. Anything they can do to limit the number of players would be helpful; taking the multi-million dollar corporations out of it and placing the development in the hands of small scale developers and private land owners who are already in the City. He referred to the Eastlake area of Lake Union as an example of slower-paced development that is resulting in a broad mixture of architectural styles and small, pedestrian-friendly businesses.

**PUBLIC HEARING: 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET LIGHT RAIL STATION SUBAREA PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) AND RECOMMENDATION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

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

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Light Rail Station Subarea Plan DEIS was presented at a community meeting hosted by the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Citizens Committee (145SSCC) on January 22<sup>nd</sup> at the Bethel Lutheran Church and to the Commission on January 29<sup>th</sup>. In addition, an open house was held just prior to tonight's meeting.

Ms. Redinger explained that, although the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea planning process started in May of 2013. After Sound Transit identified a station at 145<sup>th</sup> Street as their preferred alternative in November of 2013, the City's subarea planning process began in earnest and design workshops were held in June and October of 2014. Staff and consultants have analyzed a variety of different zoning scenarios, which will be presented to the Commission. The Commission's task is to conduct a public hearing on the DEIS and make a recommendation to the City Council on their preferred alternative. She noted that the DEIS was published for public review on January 17<sup>th</sup> and the comment period closes on February 17<sup>th</sup>. Once the City Council has approved a preferred alternative, staff will prepare draft development regulations to implement the plan and publish a FEIS. The Commission will have another public hearing on the subarea plan, zoning, development regulations, and planned action ordinance, with potential Council adoption scheduled for the end of June.

Ms. Redinger explained that the purpose of the DEIS is to study the alternatives and identify the impacts over time to transportation, utilities, schools, etc. She reviewed the three alternatives that were analyzed in the DEIS as follows:

- **Alternative 1 – No Action.** A "no action" scenario does not mean no change will occur over time; it means property owners can still maximize the development capacity of the current R-6 zoning. The alternatives selected by the Council were the culmination of three different sources of input: public design workshops and visioning workshops, a market study for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, and existing local, regional and state policies that mostly deal with putting new growth in nodes and near transit. According to this theory, Alternative 1 is more of a baseline. Although many people have expressed support for this scenario, it is probably not the most likely alternative.
- **Alternative 2 – Connecting Corridors.** This alternative reflects important input from the community meetings. Alternatives 2 and 3 contain roughly the same amount of population and build-out schedule. However, Alternative 2 would spread development out over a larger geographic area and there would be shorter height limits. For example, the tallest building height allowed without a development agreement would be 60 feet, which is the height limit of the existing Community Business (CB) zone on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Alternative 2 also identifies connecting corridors on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 155<sup>th</sup> Street, which were specially called out as important at the design workshops. Parks were described as the jewels of the neighborhood, and there was a lot of interest in providing an alternative to 145<sup>th</sup> Street that is more pedestrian and bicycle friendly.
- **Alternative 3 – Compact Communities.** This alternative has a more compact geographic area but includes taller buildings. The base zoning in this alternative can be up to 85 feet, which is essentially a 7-story building with some room on the roof for gazebos, green building, HVAC equipment, etc.

Ms. Redinger said staff is particularly interested in citizen and Commission feedback as to whether they prefer the connecting corridor concept or the compact community concept. Staff would also like direction on whether 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue or 155<sup>th</sup> Streets should be analyzed as connecting corridors in the FEIS.

She noted that the Green Network is a concept discussed at the design workshops and is included in both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3.

Ms. Redinger reviewed that the City has already received a lot of public comment at various meetings and via email. These comments provide well-thought-out, reasonable suggestions, many of which include the desire to phase the zoning rather than adopt it all at once. The Planning Commission's Light Rail Station Area Planning Committee met earlier in the week to come up with a recommendation for how to potentially zone Alternative 2 in the following two phases.

- **Phase 1** – The properties currently zoned CB would be rezoned to MUR-65', which has the same height as what currently exists. The properties currently zoned R-48 would be rezoned to MUR-45', with a 45-foot maximum height limit. In addition, the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor would also be part of Phase 1, including a small additional area based on public comments from people who live in the area who made the case that between the church, the utility yard and other uses, the character of the few remaining single-family homes has already changed.
- **Phase 2** – This phase would be based on other factors. For example, making 155<sup>th</sup> Street a corridor would make a lot more sense if the Community Renewal Area is fully redeveloped as an entertainment or lifestyle center. Also, a transportation planner recommended that this may be an appropriate route for a cycle track, which can happen with or without development. The Commission may want to include policies related to this option in the Transportation Master Plan. In addition, there are wetland issues in the Paramount Open Space area, and it may be appropriate to hold off changes until Phase 2 so that a more detailed study can be done and specific policy direction can be put in place.

Ms. Redinger explained that Phase 1 could be adopted as early as 2015, with Phase 2 approximately 20 years out, after the light rail station is operational. This phasing approach would result in a smaller core area than the compact communities map. However, it would also have a variety of zoning and housing styles to accommodate the long-term, transit-oriented development that was envisioned immediately by the station, as well as townhouse/row house, multifamily or detached single family development.

In addition to the committee's proposed phased approach for Alternative 2, staff has also prepared a phased-approach concept for Alternative 3. This phased-approach would be relatively straightforward, with Phase 1 focused closer to the station. Phase 2 would allow time to further study the remaining areas.

Ms. Redinger specifically requested feedback from the Commission regarding their preferred alternative and which main street/signature boulevard makes more sense. Staff would also like feedback about whether or not they support a phased version of either of the alternatives. The Commission should also identify additional amendments to the full or phased-zoning maps, as well as the DEIS document. When the Commission feels comfortable, the next step would be to forward a recommendation to the Council on the preferred alternative to be analyzed. The public comment period would still close on February 17<sup>th</sup>, and staff will begin preparing the FEIS. The Commission could also decide to continue the public hearing to February 19<sup>th</sup>, which means the public hearing and comment period would close at the same

time and the Council would receive the Commission's recommendation on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. She noted that numerous citizens have requested that the Commission slow down the process.

Ms. Redinger advised that the DEIS is available at <http://shorelinewa.gov\145DEIS.com>. Copies are available at the library, and citizens can also purchase a copy for the cost of production.

### **Public Testimony**

**Brian Derdowski, Issaquah**, indicated he would submit written comments by the February 17<sup>th</sup> deadline and suggested it would not be appropriate for the Commission to make their recommendation before the close of the comment period. He referred to a picture of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. He noted that although half of the subarea is located within the City of Seattle, nowhere in the DEIS is there mention of the City of Seattle's concerns. There is no mention of the 145<sup>th</sup> Subarea in the 185<sup>th</sup> FEIS, either. He emphasized that these two gigantic rezones for the same purpose are just a short distance from each other, and it is a violation of a number of principles established by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) not to look at the two plans together. At this late stage, he suggested the best approach would be for the City to halt the FEIS for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea and do a supplemental that incorporates the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea, and then start a supplemental for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea DEIS that references the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea.

Mr. Derdowski explained that an EIS for a planned action needs to be much more rigorous than an EIS for a subarea plan because once a planned action is adopted, there is no additional SEPA review. The detail of environmental review in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea DEIS is actually less than many of the subarea plans he has looked at that do not purport to address project-level impacts. Since project-level impacts are not being addressed in the DEIS, SEPA should be applied to future projects. He suggested one way to address this problem is to have the preferred alternative move to the FEIS stage as both a planned action and subarea plan rezone, thus allowing the Council a choice. Another option is a "potential zone," where the underlying zoning would stay the same and the "potential zone" would be the recommended zoning. In order to get that zoning, there would be specific triggers, and the applicant would apply to actualize the zoning.

Mr. Derdowski commented that the proposed subarea plan uses a form-based zoning concept, which makes it even harder to identify impacts because the specific uses cannot be identified. In talking to experts and nationally-recognized advocates of form-based zoning, he learned that Albuquerque used form-based zoning for its transit rail corridor and it was a disaster. He also learned that "going out into the neighborhoods with form-based zoning would be a huge mistake," and that the best use of form-based zoning is incremental and backed up by strong regulations that create a public realm with ample investments in public amenities and services.

Mr. Derdowski said another reason for requiring future projects to go through SEPA is so the City can apply special conditions of approval based on project-level impacts. He reviewed that the City's regulatory authority has two components: the development code and SEPA. Under SEPA, cities can identify adverse environmental impacts and impose special conditions. He also reviewed that the current vested rights law is extremely pro development. If the City wants to adopt a stronger stormwater regulation, impact fee, etc. in the future, they run the risk, if zoning is already in place, of developers

rushing to vest. If this were to occur, the City would have no development regulations or zoning conditions in place, and SEPA would not apply, either. He summarized that preserving the opportunity to apply SEPA is something the City can do, and most of what they want to accomplish can be done via a subarea plan.

Mr. Derdowski pointed out that all three alternatives assume that the proposed light rail station would be constructed, along with a park-and-ride structure for 500 cars and other improvements in the vicinity of the station. What happens between now and the completion of the station is one of the real defects in the plan. As the Commission considers the phasing options, he asked them to consider triggering events instead of dates. The EIS should evaluate what the impacts will be over time. In order to turn the City's long-term vision into a plan, the impacts must be studied to a greater degree. He expressed his belief that many of the assumptions set forth in the DEIS, particularly the road impacts, are very speculative.

In order to protect the City's interest, Mr. Derdowski recommended the rezone be adopted as a subarea plan. He recalled that at the hearing on the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea Plan FEIS, staff appeared to suggest that proposed projects would not go through a traffic concurrency analysis. He hopes this is a misinterpretation because it would clearly be a violation of state law. It absolutely takes his breath away that an up zone of this magnitude is being proposed with such a "sketchy" traffic analysis and with a Capital Improvement Plan that is highly speculative, unfunded, and not disciplined with a concurrency analysis. At the very least, the City should do a model run, plugging in background development, etc.

Again, Mr. Derdowski said he plans to submit written comments, and he suggested the Commission consider accommodating panel-style discussions. People are organizing and working hard, and they deserve to have longer conversations with the Commission. This will save a lot of time and heartbreak in the future.

**Dr. Heather Murphy Secrist, Shoreline**, said she and her husband moved to Shoreline in 2010. They fell in love with the Ridgecrest Neighborhood, with its friendly, family appeal, as well as trees, parks, movie theater, local coffee shop, and wide streets with plenty of parking. It had all the benefits of a small town, while still being next to the big city of Seattle. She read the flyers that were sent out and was excited to have the light rail come to 145<sup>th</sup> Street. While the flyers indicated the change would affect where she lived, they did not clearly express just how much things would change. It was only when her husband did a walk through that she began to understand. While attending the meetings last fall, she was shocked to see that the plan was to take her lovely, small-town feeling home and turn it into the next big city with giant high rises up to seven stories tall.

Dr. Murphy Secrist said her fellow neighbors have expressed similar feelings that they do not want the proposed change. Many people spoke about having options that were not as drastic as the zonings in Alternatives 2 and 3; and many said they liked Alternative 1 with no changes. A member of the planning staff responded to that by saying Alternative 1 would not work because the light rail would bring change. She agreed that change is coming, but she questioned why they need to lay out the red carpet for it. Why do they need to make such drastic rezones to the City all at once to accommodate the light rail? The neighbors do not fear change simply because it's change. They fear planned changes that will destroy what they love about the city they call home. She expressed her sincere hope that the Commission will hear that the citizens want a slower phasing of the zoning in order to ensure the best

possible result in the end. She asked the Commission to find a way for light rail to be a positive addition and not a destructive force.

**Dr. Cory Secrist, Shoreline**, said his understanding is that the main impetus of the rezoning plans are light rail and affordable housing, which are both noble goals; and the City is looking at the rather radical and experimental ideas utilized by the City of Seattle to figure out a way to deal with population growth and the need for more affordable housing and mass transit. He voiced concern that the proposed zoning is in excess of what would be needed, as it does not appear the proposed light rail system will offer enough seats on trains to accommodate the amount of people that will come into the City based on the proposed, large scale rezones.

While Dr. Secrist agreed that affordable housing near the station makes sense, he questioned the numbers in the DEIS. For example, the proposal would offer a property tax exemption to developers if at least 15% of the units in a multi-family complex are affordable at 70% Average Median Income (AMI). He pointed out that the AMI in Shoreline is \$66,576, which means that 70% of AMI is \$45,533. The projection is usually based on 1/3 of a person's income being used for rent, which means that apartments that rent for \$1,279 per month would be considered affordable. These units would be affordable to the lower middle class, but not what people typically think of as low-income. He reminded the Commission that, according to the numbers in the DEIS, 13.9% of the City's population falls within the low and very low income groups, and these individuals would not benefit from the affordable housing provisions outlined in the plan.

Dr. Secrist voiced concern that the massive rezone would essentially push people out of their homes and could cause property values to go down because of blight. Over time, the middle class will be in apartments instead of the single-family homes they are in now and the lower class will be pushed into the micro apartments and apodments that are sprouting up in the Puget Sound region, including along Aurora Avenue North in Shoreline. He summarized that the plan will not be good for affordable housing, and the City can likely fill the light rail trains with the current population.

**Pat Kenney, Shoreline**, pointed out the need for adequate transportation to and from the station. There also needs to be a bridge for pedestrians, bicycles, and motorized scooters/chairs for those who cannot walk a far distance. She likes the "green corridor" concept, but the Commission should be aware that the pictures stop at 145<sup>th</sup> Street, and there needs to be a wide pathway across the highway. While the City anticipates that Sound Transit will fund this access, they should wait to make sure it gets done. She asked the Commission to take specific note of the proposed pathway starting on 150<sup>th</sup> Street and going west to 152<sup>nd</sup> Street. She noted that the pathway near 152<sup>nd</sup> is muddy, there is very little light, and cars are often parked there. She said she supports planning ahead to avoid sprawl and uncoordinated growth, but she is concerned about the impact the rezone will have on the existing residential homes. She noted that a number of places in Seattle have boarded up homes, and she would hate to see this happen in Shoreline. She likes the idea of phasing in the zoning, but there should be an opportunity to reexamine the zoning at certain intervals. Lastly, she asked the Commission to delay its decision to include Sound Transit's FEIS.

**Carolyn Creighton, Shoreline**, said she has lived in Shoreline for 39 years. She asked the Commission to slow down the process. She also expressed concern that many of the property owners still do not

have a clear understanding of the proposed changes. The City should make more effort to get the word out and provide a clearer explanation of how the proposed changes can impact residents.

**Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline**, said she has lived in the City since 1982. She briefly reviewed the extensive community process that took place when the City adopted its first 20-year Comprehensive Plan in 1995. She questioned what happened to the City's staff and Council over the past 20 years, as they now appear to make decisions first and then ask what the residents want. She questioned why the staff does not provide the citizens with all the details of the proposals. She asked the Commission to consider citizen requests over the past year to slow the light rail plans down. She said she has not heard one resident voice support for the proposed high-density zoning plans. Instead, they would like slower, more controlled growth. She noted that residents have voiced concern about how the plan would impact roads, schools, utilities, and police. Once the zoning is in place, developers will be ready to start building in the new MUR-35', MUR-45' and MUR-65' zones; and the character of the neighborhood will be lost. The current residents do not want a city like Fremont, Ballard or Lake City. She said she prefers Alternative 1. However, she would also support a phased-in plan that is somewhere in between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

**Sigrid Strom, Shoreline**, said she participated on the citizens committee that worked on the Southeast Subarea Plan in 2008 through 2010. She voiced concern that the current process is flawed, and she urged the Commission not to make a decision until they have received all of the public comments. She also encouraged them to slow down the process. She noted that none of the elements that were identified as important to the residents in the Southeast Subarea Plan were incorporated into the proposed new plan. She recalled that the plan included a lot of details about valued community characteristics, an inventory of who and what was there, and current problems and potential impacts related to transportation. It included a green corridor, which is also in the Comprehensive Plan. Again, she urged the Commission to take more time. She particularly asked them to review the original Southeast Subarea Plan and the community values it identified. These values are consistent with the comments the Commission is currently hearing from the citizens.

**John Behrens, Shoreline**, pointed out that there is a Carmelite Convent on 145<sup>th</sup>, which provides a treed, private, quite place that is important to the corridor. This property is also included in the proposed rezone. It is not likely that the owners of this property will approach the Commission to speak on their behalf, but the City owes it to them to let them know what is going on and attempt to get their feedback.

**Thomas Poitras, Shoreline**, said he supports Alternative 3, for a compact community with no added-on corridors. He also supports a phasing approach where feasible. Neighborhoods within that area which are not curtailed for early population density increases to support light rail should not be opened up for development until they are needed. Those neighborhoods should be spared the unnecessary anxiety associated with what they perceive to be unfettered and uncontrolled development around them. Neighborhood residents have voiced concern about the loss of quality of life and property values if something unpleasant is built near them.

Mr. Poitras reminded the Commission that the stated purpose of the corridors is to increase business activity and connect existing large commercial areas. If this were true, he suggested there would be more corridors included, some of which would be better suited to accomplish that purpose. For

example, 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast could be extended from 155<sup>th</sup> to North City, connecting North City with the substantial business district at 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. An upgraded 145<sup>th</sup> Street could connect Meridian Avenue to Ballinger Way, with access to the very busy shopping center at Aurora Village. Also, 165<sup>th</sup> Street from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue could be up zoned to connect the cluster of shops near the Crest Theater to North City. The business center near the Crest Theater is at a commercial dead end. It does not commercially connect to North City and it has not been suggested that it should be commercially connected to 165<sup>th</sup> Street. Although the initial corridor version had up zoned around 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 165<sup>th</sup> to potentially support these businesses, the possibility was abandoned with no explanation. The benefits of making 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue a connecting corridor from 155<sup>th</sup> Street to 165<sup>th</sup> Street, as currently configured, seem minimal at best and not worth disrupting the lives of the people who live there, including putting their property values in jeopardy. There are many types of businesses that would devalue any home that was next to them, and the code does almost nothing to prevent that from happening. This would be true of all rezoned arterials, and not just 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Poitras questioned if a study has been conducted to provide an educated guess as to how many jobs would likely be created on the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue or 155<sup>th</sup> Street corridors and how much they would increase Shoreline's economy for the next 10 to 15 years. He expressed doubt that the impact would be significant. A more likely scenario is that the corridors would be degraded by cheap home conversions to marginal small businesses. Although home conversions are supported by some City officials, home degradation would inhibit good growth for the future. The City needs smart, inviting streetscapes that people can be proud of.

**Liz Poitras, Shoreline**, said that while she does not advocate that the City slow the process down, it would be very beneficial for a City official to very clearly state the reason for the current timeline and the consequences of not meeting the deadlines. She said she is in favor of Alternative 3, with no added corridors for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. Alternative 2 would connect corridors by spreading out the potential for redevelopment, but it would also spread out the need for costly infrastructure changes. As stated in the DEIS, Alternative 2 would require the most utility and transportation improvements and upgrades. It would also require the highest level of public services to serve the proposed growth because the alternative, at build out, would cover a greater geographic extent than Alternative 3.

Ms. Poitras said Alternative 2 may also make it more difficult to assess the actual results of the new MUR zones and Development Code changes. The projects may be widely scattered, and problems in the code may not be apparent early on. Even with all the hard work the Planning Department has put into changing the Development Code for the MUR zones, we will probably witness many unintended consequences, such as the parking problem at the Polaris Development.

Ms. Poitras noted that Alternative 2 provides far less potential for affordable housing than Alternative 3. If increasing affordable housing is one of the City's goals, Alternative 3 should be chosen. Most of the area in Alternative is covered by MUR-35' zoning, which has no requirement for affordable housing. If early developers in the MUR-45' zones choose fee-in-lieu-of, the City could end up with little or no alternative housing when the station opens. As stated in the DEIS, Alternative 3 would provide more housing opportunities than Alternative 2.

Poitras said the DEIS identifies some of the increases in traffic in the area, and they will be substantial. As stated in the DEIS regarding traffic in Alternative 2, North/Northeast 145<sup>th</sup> Street, North/Northeast 155<sup>th</sup> Street, Meridian Avenue North, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast would all experience a large increase with growth between 40% and 150% as compared to the no action alternative. The numbers for Alternative 3 are 40% to 140%. She noted that 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast, 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast, and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast were not explicitly analyzed in the DEIS. Adding more corridors will result in more traffic everywhere due to the additional commercial and retail development and not all the customers will arrive on foot. For these reason, she supports Alternative 3.

**T.J. Hogan, Shoreline**, said he was shocked to learn about the radical changes being proposed, and he implored the City to slow down the process. He expressed support for Alternative 1, which is to do nothing until they slow down and take a better look at the area. Much of Alternatives 2 and 3 is based on pure speculation on what the City thinks will happen, but they don't know what will happen in the future. The proposed rezoning would tie the City's hands in the future, which is not wise.

**Judy Nelson, Shoreline**, urged the City to take more time, as many people are just finding out how their properties will be impacted. She expressed her belief that any changes or development should be done in steps. This is a large project, and there is potential for many missteps. As an example, she referred to the ongoing expansion of the Evergreen School on Meridian Avenue, where transportation impacts were not adequately planned for and neighbors have repeatedly complained to the City over problems. If this somewhat small project was not planned for adequately, she questioned how the Commission can be sure that this humongous project is being planned for adequately. She asked the Commission to postpone their decision until after Sound Transit has issued its FEIS in April. She also questioned if Twin Ponds should be identified in the plan as a wetland that needs more study.

**Steve Schneider, Shoreline**, said he and his wife live in the upper Pelican Park Neighborhood of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast and Northeast 150<sup>th</sup>. He referred to a letter he submitted previously regarding his concerns. He said he and his wife are in favor of a thoughtful, slow, limited-phase rezone that does not destroy the character of the community they love. They felt the area should remain predominantly single-family homes. It is critical to keep in mind that once the planned action ordinance is adopted, future projects consistent with the ordinance would not be subject to further environmental review under SEPA. A planned action ordinance presupposes that the initial environmental review is thorough and sufficient; but in this case, the project's environmental review fails in fundamental ways. The DEIS concludes in several sections that no significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts would be anticipated; in part because incremental growth will allow the City to monitor and address the impacts over time. He expressed his belief that this type of analysis is inappropriate when the planned action process is intended to limit future review of environmental impacts because the initial review is thorough. He said the DEIS is a review full of guesses, which punts the problems into the future. Moreover, he said there is no way to determine that the growth will be slow or incremental, and there is no guarantee that the City will have the will or the funds to respond to future adverse impacts. The DEIS acknowledges that funding for improvements to serve growth is not secured. He expressed support for the criticisms voiced on many occasions about the inadequate review and mitigation of traffic, parking, surface water runoff and other issues, and he asked the City to slow down the process.

**Cathy Floit, Shoreline**, said she and other citizens are present because they believe the process and comment period have meaning; and the Commission has shown that is true. She commented that her home in the Pelican Park Neighborhood is her sanctuary that is threatened by the proposed plan. She considers her neighborhood to be diverse, and she does not see how this could continue under the proposed alternatives. The neighborhood is affordable and most of the homes are owner-occupied. The owners of the new condos and apartment buildings will likely charge their tenants far more than the mortgage the current single-family homeowners pay. Although they welcome low-income housing, none of them would qualify. They seem to be caught in the middle with no place to live. They are gardeners and love their outdoor space. They frequent the farmer's markets in summer and enjoy growing their own fruits and vegetables, as well. They need sunlight for that and for their own mental health. They are out on beautiful sunny days enjoying the neighborhood, and the thought of multi-story buildings blocking them in is depressing. They love their parks, trees, and the amazing wildlife in the neighborhood. She asked the Commission to please maintain the neighborhoods.

**Shirley Parker, Shoreline**, said that her property in the Upper Pelican Park Neighborhood would have no sunlight if the City adopts a plan that allows seven-story buildings. She loves to garden, but her property would be completely shadowed. She raised her family in the home, which is paid for. She won't be able to live anywhere else when she quits working, as she would be unable to afford \$1,200 per month for rent. She lives in what she considers low-income housing. While she supports light rail, she asked that they not destroy the neighborhoods and keep the single-family homes.

**Dan Jacoby, Shoreline**, observed that the freeway exits in Shoreline are at least 7/10 mile from the main business corridor, Aurora Avenue North. Clearly, this part of the freeway was designed not for commerce, but to bring people from their homes in Shoreline to their work in Seattle and back. The light rail is obviously planned to relieve increasing congestion on the freeway, and choosing to more than double the number of housing units in these two areas would defeat the purpose. With a crowded light rail, the City would merely be adding an uncomfortable way to get to work to an unreliable way to get to work.

Mr. Jacoby pointed out that the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSCR) population forecast for 2040 projects an average annual increase of 1.2% for the region, which is over 50% higher than census projections for the whole country. The planned rezones are based on projections for Shoreline that are 60% higher than the region or 2.5 times the national average for decades. Given the long-term impossibility of predicting business and economic cycles, new technologies and generational shifts, he suggested the numbers are meaningless. He questioned why the City is planning for massive growth 60 to 100 years into the future.

Mr. Jacoby suggested that the Commission recommend to the City Council that they select the no-build alternative for 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Alternatively, they could recommend the opposite of what happened with 185<sup>th</sup> Street where there was suddenly a large up scaling of even the largest proposed alternative. This time, they could create a dramatically downsized alternative. He volunteered to help the planning staff create this new alternative, which would send a clear message that the process is heading over a cliff and the City needs stop, take a breath, and head in a new direction.

**Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline**, said she lives within the subarea and the “no action” alternative (Alternative 1) does not make sense to her. As a lay person, it seems that future growth in Shoreline should be directed and guided rather than be left primarily to market forces. At the same time, the idea of placing more density closer to the station does not make sense because the subarea is not a blank slate. Imposing density just based on nearness to the station ignores the existing established neighborhoods, current conditions elsewhere, and existing infrastructure.

Ms. Saheki recalled that at the Commission’s last meeting, someone living along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast asked to be included in the subarea because her home is one of the few single-family residences left on her block. The Commission listened to this request and extended the subarea boundary to encompass her block. This is one example of how the Commission and the process may have overlooked existing conditions in Shoreline. For example, on the other side of Interstate 5, the widest streets are Aurora Avenue North and Meridian Avenue. It seems that those streets could accommodate more density than 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast, which currently doesn’t have sidewalks and could never hold two lanes of traffic in each direction. She recognized that improvements would come with density, but it would be smarter to have the first planned higher density along streets that already have the capacity.

Ms. Saheki commented that if the Commission is going to hold onto the idea of a parking requirement of .75 spaces per unit, it is important that the higher density occurs first in an area that is within walking distance of a grocery store. As she previously stated, people will do much more than commute to work, and the Commission should give these other activities more weight when considering where density is placed in respect to the forthcoming light rail station. She suggested that the first phase be clustered along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast, Aurora Avenue North, and possibly Meridian Avenue.

**Krista Tenney, Shoreline**, said her family moved to Shoreline in 1988, and they love every inch of their ¼-acre property. She attends a church that is on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast and 147<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a challenging intersection with no left turn. She referenced Mr. Derdowski’s earlier comments about the need for more interaction with the City of Seattle regarding traffic impacts. She specifically asked the Commission to consider the impacts of Alternative 2 for the triangular property between the freeway and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast. This property is proposed for dense development, and she does not understand how 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue Northeast can be widened to handle the additional traffic. She emphasized the need for the Commission to consider the impacts to the neighborhoods. She asked them to slow the process down to make sure the plan is done wisely. She said she supports Mr. Derdowski’s earlier recommendation that the City consider the 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plans together. These two areas are very close to each other and the impacts will be far reaching. If possible, she asked them to wait to make a decision until after Sound Transit has issued its FEIS.

**Janet Way, Shoreline**, said she was present to speak on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Society (SPS), which is a Washington State non-profit organization with members living in and around Shoreline who work to preserve the environment and quality of life. She requested that the SPS be granted party of record status with legal standing. In addition, she asked that all of SPC comments before and after the hearing be included in the record by reference. She explained that the planned action ordinance would leave out residents who wish to give input on details not yet analyzed. New residents who move to the City in the next few years would have no right to comment or play a part in future growth, either. She urged the Commission to reject this aspect of the proposal.

Ms. Way referred to a statement in the DEIS found in the “Changes in Neighborhood Section,” which states that *“the City acknowledges that even though a decision to stay or sell is entirely up to the property owner, those who feel as if their neighborhood is changing beyond their comfort level may still feel forced out. The City also acknowledges that even for those who support change, transition and construction can be uncomfortable and unpleasant.”* The DEIS acknowledges that people are going to be displaced.

Ms Way noted that key areas are not addressed in the DEIS; most outstandingly, the segregation of the environmental review between the 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subareas. It is as if they are in two separate time zones or countries. The cumulative impacts on traffic between the two subareas need to be addressed, as do the cumulative impacts on infrastructure (drainage, stormwater runoff, wastewater, water, etc.) She pointed out that the DEIS does not consider the impact on the existing community when a large number of the residents are displaced. She pointed out that the 145<sup>th</sup> Neighborhood is currently a healthy neighborhood, and nearly all of the properties are developed with single-family homes. She questioned the potential for blight resulting from speculative development, and noted that the issue was not analyzed in the DEIS. The DEIS did not analyze the impact imposed on the neighborhood when properties transition to rental units, either. She suggested that spot development could subject both light rail station areas to blight. The DEIS should study the impact to property owners and the potential for homeowners to sell and buyers to get mortgages.

Ms. Way reminded the Commission that parks and open space is a requirement of density as per the Growth Management Act (GMA), yet the provisions in the DEIS and the preferred alternatives for increasing or enhancing open space are very inadequate. Existing useable open space for the current population is already inadequate, but only one new park is suggested in the DEIS for the projected population increase of between 2,886 to 5,314 new residents. She said there are numerous opportunities within the station area that could be utilized to provide more open space, access and recreation if it was required. In particular, she said the Paramount Park open space needs to be protected, as it is the largest wetland in Shoreline and is salmon habitat if the fish could get there. In addition, the Jackson Park Golf Course is a public course, and it would be an abomination if that were taken over by development as suggested in the market study. She summarized that the emotional impact to the community as a result of the two subarea plans would be huge. The salability of single-family homes and parking impacts are also significant concerns. She resubmitted her drawing of the rezone area with about half the density. She also referred the Commission to the Thornton Creek Watershed Study, which she previously submitted. Lastly, she asked the Commission to slow down the process.

**Sharon Cass, Shoreline**, agreed with the previous speakers that the City should slow down the process. She said she has lived in her home, which abuts Twin Ponds Park, for 52 years. It is so wet in the fall, winter and spring that she cannot walk in her backyard. She said she supports Alternative 1.

**VICE CHAIR CRAFT MOVED TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN DEIS TO FEBRUARY 19, 2015. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**CHAIR SCULLY AMENDED THE MOTION TO ALSO EXTEND THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE DEIS UNTIL THE CLOSE OF THE PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup>. VICE CHAIR CRAFT SECONDED THE AMENDMENT, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Chair Craft explained that the public hearing would continue on February 19<sup>th</sup>. While the Commission would not prohibit those who have already spoken from speaking again at the continue hearing, the Commission would specifically like to hear from those who have not had an opportunity to speak.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Director Markle announced that, beginning March 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Commission meetings will be videotaped.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no committee or Commissioner reports.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

In addition to the continued public hearing on the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan DEIS on February 19<sup>th</sup>, Director Markle said staff is also scheduled to present the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan Development Code Amendments and the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket. The Commission agreed to postpone the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan amendments to a future meeting and focus solely on the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan DEIS on February 19<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

---

Keith Scully  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission

