

**Station Area Planning Council Amendment Tracking Matrix**

**Green Text** denotes this amendment has been placed in the base ordinance that will be presented to Council for adoption on February 23, 2015.

**Red Text** denotes that this has not been placed in the base ordinance; proposing Councilmember must propose this on the dais.

**Bold Text** denotes new amendments that have been provided since the matrix was last sent to Council.

**Proposed Ordinance No. 702 - 185th Street Station Subarea Plan, Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Land Use Map**

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
1.	1/29	Subarea Policies: I do not see the additions of the policies adopted by the planning commission this month. <b>(ROBERTS)</b>	Please see February 2, 2015 Staff Report. The new and old policies are all in that report.
2.	1/29	Housing - Add "evaluate a fee in lieu program for affordable housing including methods for alternative compliance" or alternative staff language. <b>(ROBERTS)</b>	If the fee in lieu and alternative methods sections are removed from the Development Code, then this policy should be proposed for addition as amendment to the Housing Section of the Subarea Plan.
3.	1/29	Housing - Add "evaluate the use and applicability of Transfer of Development Rights" or alternative staff language. <b>(ROBERTS)</b>	If the TDR is removed from the Development Code, then this policy should be proposed for addition as an amendment to the Housing Section of the Subarea Plan.
4.	1/29	Transportation - Add "evaluate opportunities to incorporate best practices for complete street design concepts, including grid patterns of short blocks, smaller lane widths, and street design that includes road access in at least two directions and ped/bike access in at least three directions where this is not precluded by wholly incompatible adjacent land uses," or alternative staff language. <b>(ROBERTS)</b>	Staff has added the following two new polices into the Subarea Plan to provide for Councilmember Roberts' proposed policy language that was supported by the Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Evaluate opportunities to incorporate best practices for complete street design concepts, including grid patterns of short blocks and narrower lane widths.</li> <li>· Residential streets should allow for vehicular connectivity to the street grid in at least two directions and should provide pedestrian/bike connectivity in at least three directions in order to facilitate convenient and efficient travel by all modes.</li> </ul>

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
5.	1/29	Utilities - "Consider requiring the installation of photovoltaic systems in all new government facilities," or alternative staff language. (ROBERTS)	Staff recommends: "Consider the use of alternative energy in all new government facilities." Using 'alternative energy' broadens the choices beyond just photovoltaic systems, and using the word 'consider' does not obligate the government entity, but serves as policy direction from (and for) the City to use alternative energy. This policy could be useful as the City moves into the design phase of the station and garage.
6.	2/8	In the subarea plan, pages 5-4 (8a-112 in the Council packet) and following, I would prefer to drop the reference to R-48 and R-18. While historically accurate, they are potentially confusing and misleading in this document. (HALL)	Staff has made this change.
7.	2/8	Since we haven't adopted the 145th plan yet, I do not understand the proposal to include recommendations from that into the 185th station subarea plan (page 5-34). I would like to remove any policy language that suggests incorporating anything that has not yet been adopted. Utilities and energy systems are the places I noticed this issue, but I would like it addressed anywhere it comes up. (HALL)	Staff has made this change.
8.	2/13	Staff noticed the following incorrect citation and omission in the Subarea Plan: (Page 5-34) For the full text of proposed amendments to the Code, refer to the proposed Planned Action Ordinance (Exhibit C). The following provisions are important to subarea redevelopment. Affordable housing, provision of park space, and _____ will be required as part of development agreements. Other provisions summarized are supported by adopted City policies.	This Subarea Plan section now reads: (Page 5-34) For the full text of proposed amendments to the Code, refer to the proposed Planned Action Ordinance (Exhibit <del>C</del> B). The following provisions are important to subarea redevelopment. Affordable housing, provision of park space, <u>structured parking and LEED construction</u> will be required as part of development agreements. Other provisions summarized are supported by adopted City policies.

## Proposed Ordinance No. 706 - 185th Street Station Area Development Code Amendment and Zoning Map

*Note: The Proposed Development Code Amendments are organized by SMC Section Number.*

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
1.	1/29	20.20.032 - Add definition of live/work unit. (ROBERTS)	See 20.20.016 D definitions – already defined.
2.	1/29	20.20.034 - Rename definition to “Microhousing” for consistency with Table 20.40.160 (or amend Table 20.40.160) or amend other sections that reference microapartment. (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change - sections that did reference "microapartment" now reference "microhousing".
3.	<b>2/10</b>	<b>20.30.355(A), (C), (D); 20.50.020(10), (11); 20.40.235(B) – Postpone consideration of Developer Agreements until 2021. (SALOMON)</b>	<b>Leaving Development Agreements as “General Development Agreements” under 20.30.355(B) is a good idea. This amendment is required in response to the WCIA’s Land Use Audit on the City’s Code. 20.30.355(B) would be renumbered to 20.30.355(A). To support the General Development Agreement that would remain, 20.30.355(C) would also need to remain, but be amended to delete “and Development Agreements in order to increase height about 85 feet”). Leaving the Development Agreements for MUR-85’ in the Code with an activation date of 2021, seems confusing. The Subarea Plan will also have to be amended to reflect this change if passed.</b>
4.	2/8	20.30.355(B)(2) - Underline markup error. (HALL)	Staff has made this change.

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
5.	1/29	20.30.355(D)(1) - Delete reference to fee in lieu program. (ROBERTS)	Staff recommends having a fee in lieu option. Without this option, how would the Council like to handle situations where a partial unit is required (ex. 20% of 112 units is 22.4 units – can’t round up, so you’d most likely only require 22 units). Council could consider fee in lieu for partial units only? Also, it may be beneficial to allow private property owners to have the option to not provide the affordable housing themselves, but pay equitably for an experienced not for profit to provide the required housing. The fee in lieu is also a way for the City to provide in partnership with not for profits housing to for people with low and very low household incomes, which meets a Council goal that can’t be met with incentive zoning. Having said this, this option could be developed and incorporated into the regulations at a later date, but not much later (which is the same case if the Council adopts fee in lieu in the regulations, then the fee will need to be established soon thereafter).
6.	2/8	20.30.355(D)(2) - Prefer LEED gold over LEED platinum. (HALL)	Staff has made this change.
7.	1/29	20.30.355(D)(4) - Delete and renumber section. (ROBERTS & HALL)	Staff does not recommend this amendment. The introduction of regulations related to TDR implements the City’s adopted policy LU58: Support regional and state Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs throughout the city where infrastructure improvements are needed, and where additional density, height and bulk standards can be accommodated. The rezoning of the Station Areas represents the City’s strongest opportunity to start a TDR program. In addition to the original policy which pointed to supporting a TDR program, the City can now obtain funds from King County through the LCLIP program to fund infrastructure. The draft feasibility study was presented to staff. The consulting team, which includes King County, was very positive about Shoreline’s proposed regulations and potential for the LCLIP funds. Advice from the consulting team that is working on the City’s Feasibility Study for use of LCLIP funds was to adopt the TDR provisions with the rezone with the idea that it will be difficult to put them in later. Staff can always delete the TDR program from the Code with a 2015 batch of Development Code amendments if the Council chooses later to not authorize the program based on the results of the Feasibility Study or other information.

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
8.	2/8	20.30.355(D)(5) - I would like an amendment to delete this section and address park impacts through a park impact fee program to be developed, as suggested by staff. Parks of useful size and purpose can be more efficiently planned, acquired, and developed by the City rather than having a large number of very small pocket parks developed by each individual project. (HALL)	<p>Staff does not support this amendment. The City Attorney has advised that adding a park impact fee to SMC 20.30.355(D)(5) is the wrong place and the appropriate place for this language is in Title 12 where other impact fees are located, such as traffic impact fees.</p> <p>The City Attorney has also advised that any policy in the Subarea Plan that speaks to a park impact fee be removed from the Plan and added to the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Docket. Staff will add a park impact fee to the 2015 Docket that Council will see in March or April.</p>
9.	1/9	20.30.355(D)(6) - Development Agreement – Shrink or modify the menu of alternative components to make sure the result is likely to deliver some mix of what we consider priorities – especially if some options are cheaper than others. Specifically, delete 20.30.355(D)(6)(c) and 20.30.355(D)(6)(d). (HALL)	In 20.30.355(D), since this a Council approved permit; the aspect of the developer picking the cheapest two items could be addressed with the application of the criteria. While staff does not have cost information on the alternatives, these can be monitored over time.
10.	1/29	Table 20.40.160 Live/Work MUR 35 - Delete “P-i” insert “(Adjacent to Arterial)”. (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change.
11.	1/29	Table 20.40.160 Apartment - Delete “P-i” and insert “P” in all zones. (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change.
12.	1/9	Table 20.40.160 – Make Research, Development and Testing an allowed use in MUR-85. (HALL)	Staff supports this recommendation.
13.	2/9	Table 20.40.160 - MUR 85 Outdoor Performance Center - Delete "P-A", Insert "P"; MUR 85 Performing Arts Companies/Theater (excluding Adult Use Facilities) - Delete "P-A", Insert "P". (ROBERTS)	The intent behind making outdoor performance centers an accessory use in the MUR-85’ zone was to limit a potentially land intense use to a portion of a building site. The MUR-85’ zone is the closest zone to the future light rail station and should be reserved for high density housing and bigger employment centers.
14.	1/29	20.40.235 - Delete all references to fee in lieu program. (ROBERTS)	Please see answer to #5.
15.	1/29	20.40.235(B)(3) - Delete and renumber section. (ROBERTS and HALL)	Please see answer to #7. If the Council does decide to keep the TDR program placeholders, then staff recommends requiring the purchase of a few more credits to place the City’s quota faster, while still providing a financial

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
			incentive for choosing the Catalyst program. Perhaps a 1 TDR credit for every 3 units ratio.
16.	1/29	20.40.235(C)(2) - Add code language along the lines of "Amenities: Affordable housing units shall have access to all amenities or facilities provided to a market rate unit," or alternative staff language. (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change. Code language reads, "All units in the development must have equal access to the development's amenities or facilities, such as parking, fitness centers, community rooms, swimming pools. If a fee is charged for the use of an amenity/facility, then all units in the development must be charged equally for such use."
17.	1/29	20.40.235(E) - Delete and add language to the subarea policies. (ROBERTS)	Staff prefers to keep this flexible and does not recommend that this language be removed and placed in the Subarea Plan. Having the alternative compliance provisions are important to address truly equivalent provisions for affordable housing that can't be captured and keep the requirement straightforward and easy to understand.
18.	1/29	20.40.245 - Delete. (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change.
19.	1/29	20.40.374(C) - Delete "Marijuana" Inset "Cannabis". (ROBERTS)	Staff has made this change.
20.	2/8	20.40.350 - I am still worried about the definition of outside entertainment. I would greatly appreciate some review, analysis, and options from staff. I would be okay with something like "outside entertainment that creates a potential noise disturbance for neighbors is not permitted after 10:00." (HALL)	Staff has made this change.
21.	2/9	20.40.350 - Delete all language recommended by the Planning Commission. (ROBERTS)	Staff is neutral on this recommendation.
22.	2/8	20.40.506 - Delete (HALL)	Staff is neutral on this recommendation.
23.	1/29	20.50.020(2) Minimum Front Yard Setback MUR 85 - Delete "0 if located on Arterial Street 10ft on	Staff recommended 0 feet on Arterial Streets and 10 feet on non-arterial streets due to the fact that the Arterial Streets typically are wider, have more traffic

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up
		non-arterial street.” Insert “0” (ROBERTS)	volume, and are more suited for building placed at the property line. Non-arterial streets are typically narrower with less traffic volume. A setback of 10 feet on a narrower street would lessen the canyon-effect of the street especially if two large buildings were across the street from one another.
24.	1/9	Table 20.50.020(2) – Densities and Dimensions in Mixed-Use Residential Zones – Add to Min. Density: 18 du/ac in MUR-35, 24 du/ac in MUR-45. (HALL)	Staff supports a minimum density in MUR-85’ of 48 units per acre (currently included in draft code language). Staff supports a minimum density of 18 units per acre in MUR-45’. Staff does not support minimum densities in MUR-35’.
25.	1/29	20.50.021 - Delete “and MUR 85’” (ROBERTS)	Staff recommends that some transition standards for MUR-85’ until Phase 2 is activated because of the parallel situation with other commercial zones adjacent to single family zones. Staff suggest that MUR-85’ be required to meet transition standards for landscaping and screening but not the building setback standards.
26.	2/8	20.50.220 – Amend double negative in this section ("the MUR-35' zone when not on a non-arterial street") so that it reads, "the MUR-35' zone when on an arterial street". (HALL)	Staff has made this change.
27.	1/9	20.50.240 (C)(1)(b) – Delete: Not require upper floor setbacks across the street as the right-of-way provide adequate buffer for other MUR zones, and other transition requirements handle sing family detached zones. (HALL)	Staff does not recommend deleting this provision. This is a design preference recommended by the Planning Commission intended to create a more walkable neighborhood. There could be alternative ways to reach the same end, but removing the provision without a replacement regulation would not achieve the desired result. It is understood that requiring this setback does decrease the area that can be used for development, but this trade off is recommended to enhance the overall health of the neighborhood. This design feature, setbacks is a tool recommended to be used to create a sustainable community. Again, this is a design preference and there is no “right” or “only” answer.
28.	1/9	<i>Potential – Table 20.50.400 Reductions to minimum parking requirements – Replace E and F with “E. The minimum spaces required in Table</i>	Staff does not recommend this amendment. The Planning Commission recommended parking ratios are set at a rate that acknowledges future transit and neighborhood retail opportunities. It goes a step further to automatically

	<b>Date of Request</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Response or Scheduled Follow-up</b>
		<p><i>20.50.390A shall be reduced by 33% in the MUR-85 zone and by 16% in the MUR-35 and MUR-45 zones.” This would take the basic requirement down to 0.5 spaces per unit for studio and 1 bdr in MUR-85, a bit more in the other MUR zones, and it would continue to allow other reductions to be applied. (HALL)</i></p>	<p>reduce parking by 25% for those properties within close proximity (1/4 mile) of the station. Shoreline’s transit and parking management infrastructure needs to catch up even to serve the recommendation.</p> <p>Staff comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The formula at first glance appears more difficult in comprehend. In practice it is just math &amp; is easily figured out.</li> <li>2) Staff is concerned about further reductions in the minimum parking required which would be the result of this proposal.</li> </ol> <p>If this proposal were to move forward staff recommends that the “up to 25% reduction” in 20.50.400 (A) not apply. The additive effect would yield .37 parking spaces for studio/one bedroom units. Also, the up to 50% reduction in required parking spaces for affordable units in 20.50.400(D) should also be called out as “not to be combined with other possible reductions in 20.50.400.</p>
29.	1/29	<p>20.50.410(C) - Delete and renumber section. (ROBERTS and HALL)</p>	<p>This is the provision that would require parking to be included in the rental or sale cost of a unit. This regulation is proposed as a proactive step to have on-site parking utilized and reduce off site/on street parking issues. Staff supports this regulation, however it has not been legally tested.</p>
30.	2/11	<p><b>Requirement for new construction of single family homes in MUR zones to include frontage improvements. (ROBERTS)</b></p>	<p><b>Staff is neutral on this recommendation.</b></p>
31.	2/11	<p><b>Amend the MUR-85 zone to MUR-70. (SALOMON)</b></p>	<p><b>The Market Analysis that was conducted supports reduced building height in this most intense station area zone. While 85' provides more alternatives for developers, such as office buildings that need greater ceiling height (85' allows for six floors of office, which is just barely where these expensive buildings start to make economic sense), staff does not have concerns with lowering this height maximum to 70 feet. This is also the maximum height that the Council settled on in the Town Center zones.</b></p>

**Proposed Ordinance No. 707 - 185th Street Station Area Planned Action**

	Date of Request	Item	Response or Scheduled Follow-up