

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 17, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Chair Pro Tem Craft
Commissioner Chang
Commissioner Montero
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Mork
Commissioner Moss-Thomas

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Miranda Redinger, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pro Tem Craft 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 Pro Tem Craft and Commissioners Chang, Maul, Malek, Mork and Montero. Commissioner Moss-Thomas arrived late.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 3, 2016 were adopted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline, said she had to leave the meeting early and wanted to provide her comments regarding the potential zoning scenarios for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan. She recalled that the consultant's (Otak) report indicated that it is possible to engineer and do construction on top of peat and

wetlands. She also heard that it is possible to engineer development on steep slopes but it is costly. Although it may be possible to do this type of development, she questioned if it is something the City wants to encourage. She expressed her belief that developers will not likely want to spend large amounts of money to engineer development within wetlands and buffers so it is not really necessary to rezone these areas as high-density. They will be interested in land that is more suitable for high-density development.

Ms. DiPeso questioned why the City found it necessary to hire Otak when they already have the Thornton Creek Basin Characterization Report, as well as other similar reports that are more comprehensive and detailed than the report provided by Otak. She suggested that the City did not like the answers provided in the information that was already available so they used taxpayer dollars to hire Otak to give them the answers they wanted. Regardless of whether or not this perception is accurate, that is how the public views these kinds of transactions.

Nancy Morris, Shoreline, asked the Commission to use caution and care, as well as a science-based assessment of Paramount Park before minimizing its importance and infringing upon its established borders for the sake of unchecked development. Years of dedicated volunteer work went into the park to restore its grounds and wetlands. She emphasized that wetlands are vital for clean water and wildlife habitat, and Paramount Park is one of the largest in Shoreline at 6.9 acres. She questioned why various streams and other aspects of the park were missed in the recent report done by Otak. It is disconcerting that the City already had detailed information but hired another outside firm to do a report.

STUDY SESSION: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCKET 2016

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to no more than once per year. To ensure that the public can view the proposals in a citywide context, the GMA directs cities to create a docket or list of the amendments to be considered each year. Tonight's presentation is a continuation of the Commission's February 16th meeting where they voted to forward amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11 to the City Council. At that same meeting, the Commission postponed their recommendation on amendments 5 through 10 in order for the Point Wells Subcommittee to meet with the applicant, as well as the City's traffic engineer. He reviewed each of the amendments as follows:

- **Proposed Amendment 5** seeks to amend language in the Point Wells Subarea Plan Policy PW-1 to state, "However, if a public access road is constructed that connects the Point Wells Island to the Town of Woodway, then the FSAA shall be reduced in scope to be no greater than the area west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe right-of-way."
- **Proposed Amendment 6** generally restricts the amount of traffic that may be allowed on Richmond Beach Road, and the proposed language would amend Policy PW-11 as outlined in the Staff Report.

- **Proposed Amendment 7** is generally like Amendment 6. It also seeks to limit traffic on Richmond Beach Road and adds the following statement to Policy PW-12: “As a separate limitation in addition to foregoing, the maximum number of new vehicle trips entering the City’s road network from/to Point Wells at full build-out shall not exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road under the City’s .90 V/C standard . . .”
- **Proposed Amendment 8** would amend Transportation Policy T-44 by adding the phrase, “with no through movement less than E” before “at the signalized intersections” in the first sentence and at the end of the fourth sentence. It would also add the phrase “or at LOS D with through movement on any leg less than E” before “will not meet the City’s established concurrency threshold” in the second sentence.
- **Proposed Amendment 9** would also amend Policy T-44 by adding “Collector Arterials” to the arterials that are limited to a V/C ratio of .90.
- **Proposed Amendment 10** seeks to update Policy T-44 to add a clarification that no more than one leg of an arterial intersection may have a V/C ratio greater than .90.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the Council on which of the proposed amendments should be included on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket, and staff is recommending that Amendments 5 through 10 not be placed on the draft docket.

Public Comment

Tom McCormick, Shoreline, referred to **Proposed Amendment 5** and explained that the City is currently engaged with the Town of Woodway to study the financial impact of annexation. Possible scenarios include the City of Shoreline annexing the entire site, neither city annexing the site, and Shoreline and Woodway both annexing portions of the site. He expressed his belief that **Proposed Amendment 5** is necessary because the concept of divvying up the Point Wells site for annexation is already on the drawing board. He emphasized that **Proposed Amendment 5** would be a conditional provision, just as the entire Point Wells Subarea Plan is conditional. Staff’s only objection to the amendment is that it is “premature since the second access road leading to the Town of Woodway is uncertain.” Using this logic, he suggested it would be appropriate to eliminate the entire Point Wells Subarea Plan, which is also conditional. He summarized his belief that staff has not raised a legitimate reason for excluding the amendment, and he recommended that it be included on the 2016 docket for further consideration.

Mr. McCormick pointed out that **Proposed Amendment 6** was misstated by staff. It does not amend Policy PW-11. Rather, it amends text in the introductory paragraph to Policy PW-11. This is important to understand given that staff has stated that **Proposed Amendment 7** is unnecessary because it is already covered in **Proposed Amendment 6**. However, **Proposed Amendment 7** actually amends the text of Policy PW-12. He asked staff to make this adjustment when the amendments are presented at the Commission’s next meeting when the Traffic Engineer is present.

Continued Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Montero said the subcommittee met separately with Mr. McCormick and the City Engineer in an attempt to develop language that would work for both parties. They particularly tried to better understand the specifics of the volume of traffic that would be allowed at the intersections. He said the subcommittee would like additional time so they can meet with Mr. McCormick again and share the comments provided by the City Engineer.

COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION DELAY CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 5 THROUGH 10 UNTIL A FUTURE MEETING. BOARD MEMBER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

STUDY ITEM: 145TH STREET STATION SUBAREA PLANNING – POTENTIAL ZONING SCENARIOS

Staff Presentation

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the schedule for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, which started with a kick off meeting in May of 2013. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued on January 17, 2015, and a community meeting, in partnership with the 145th Station Citizen Committee (145SCC) was held on January 22, 2015. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the full DEIS, including zoning scenarios, on February 5, 2015, and the hearing was continued to February 19, 2015. Following the February 19, 2015 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended postponing subarea planning until completion of the 145th Street Corridor Study, and the Council accepted the Commission's recommendation on March 23, 2015.

With completion of the 145th Street Corridor Study, Ms. Redinger said it is now time to resume work on the Subarea Plan. She reviewed that the Commission discussed an addendum to the DEIS on February 18th, which included a wetland and streams assessment and geotechnical considerations for high groundwater or peat conditions. The addendum was published on February 19th, and the comment period will end on March 21st. On March 3rd, staff presented a summary of the 145th Street Corridor Study. The study will be presented to the City Council on March 21st and could potentially be adopted in early April. Tonight the Commission will discuss the zoning scenarios that were analyzed in the DEIS. A public hearing on the Alternative Zoning Scenarios is scheduled for April 7th, after which it is anticipated that the Commission will forward a recommendation on a Preferred Alternative to the Council. She briefly reviewed the Alternative Zoning Scenarios that were studied in the DEIS as follows:

- **No Action (Attachment A).** This alternative represents the current zoning in the subarea.
- **Connecting Corridors (Attachment B).** This concept would connect the parks to residential development to provide recreational opportunities for those who might move into the slightly denser housing around the parks.

- **Connecting Corridors Phased Zoning (Attachment D).** On February 5, 2015, the Light Rail Subcommittee recommended that the Commission consider a phased approach for the Connecting Corridors Alternative, with two changes. At the public hearing, it was pointed out that one area was already not suitable for single-family residential development because of existing churches, utility facilities, etc. The request was that the zoning be extended further up 15th Street and the subcommittee agreed that made sense. The Subcommittee also felt that with less land available in an initial phase, another area could be zoned a little more intensely.
- **Compact Community (Attachment C).** This alternative represents the same level of population growth as the Connecting Corridors Alternative but in a smaller geographic area with taller buildings. The maximum height studied was Mixed Use Residential (MUR-85'), which was consistent with what was being studied for the 185th Street Station Subarea.
- **Compact Community Phased Zoning (Attachment E).** The Subcommittee also recommended that the Commission consider a phased approach for the Compact Community Alternative.

Ms. Redinger said the purpose of tonight's meeting is to discuss potential revisions the Commission wants to make to the zoning scenarios. The revisions could be based on information contained in the Wetlands and Streams Assessment, Geotechnical Considerations Report, 145th Street Corridor Study, regulations adopted as part of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan and public comment.

Ms. Redinger provided a map showing boundaries around Twin Ponds Park and the Paramount Open Space and identifying the location of the wetlands, streams and buffers that were included in the Wetlands and Stream Assessment Technical Memorandum. She noted that the boundary was a little too far to the east in the Staff Report that was sent out. The map has been adjusted so that the boundary is consistent with the wetlands report. Ms. Redinger also provided a map to illustrate the "Green Network" concept, which came out of the design workshops and further evolved during the 145th Street Corridor Study to be slightly different.

Ms. Redinger suggested the following questions for the Commission's discussion:

- What are the pros and cons of the Connecting Corridor versus the Compact Community Scenarios? Does the Commission have a preference between the scenarios?
- Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios based on the technical memorandums that represent the addendum to the DEIS?
- Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios based on the 145th Street Corridor Study?
- Should the "Green Network" shown on the Connecting Corridor and Compact Community Scenarios be replaced by the "Off-Corridor Bike Network" map that was developed through the Corridor Study?
- Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios with regard to changing boundaries, zoning designations, phasing or an overlay?
- What should be the most intense zoning designation analyzed for either or both of the zoning scenarios: MUR-70', MUR-65', Mur-85' or something different?

- Should development agreements like those adopted as part of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan be an option for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan?
- Does the Commission need any additional information before making a recommendation about a Preferred Alternative zoning scenario to the City Council following the April 7th public hearing?

Ms. Redinger provided a map that represents the current thinking of the Light Rail Subcommittee. The subcommittee's previous recommendation was based on the Connecting Corridors zoning scenario, but included some elements of the Compact Communities zoning scenario. The new proposed map is based on the Compact Community zoning scenario, with some features of the phased-version of the Connecting Corridor's zoning scenario. The Compact Community boundary is 155th Street, and the Subcommittee felt it would be appropriate to incorporate some of the Connecting Corridor Map so that the transition to existing single-family homes could happen on the north side of 155th Street. This would retain the area where the character of the neighborhood has already changed from single-family residential based on current uses that are allowed in single-family zoning, but also incorporating some connection to the Ridgecrest Commercial District on the other side of 155th. Also, the new map has MUR-70' zoning on the east side of 5th, then transitions to MUR-45' and MUR-35'. She emphasized that the height limits are one of the defining characteristics of the new zoning designations, and the MUR-35' zone is based on the existing 35-foot height limit for single-family residential zones. Therefore, MUR-35' is intended to be a transition zone.

Ms. Redinger completed her presentation by reminding the Commission that a public hearing is scheduled for April 7th, with potential City Council selection of a Preferred Alternative on May 2nd. Following Council selection, the staff and consultants will prepare the Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the Subarea Plan, and Planned Action Ordinance, all of which will come back to the Board for additional discussion in July. A public hearing is tentatively scheduled for August with a potential recommendation to the City Council in the Fall.

Commissioner Malek commented that the maps presented by staff are a little different than the maps that were part of the Commission's packet. Ms. Redinger said one change was made to the map based on the wetland study to fix a buffer in the Paramount Open Space that was slightly off. The other map is new, based on a subcommittee discussion that took place on March 15th. Commissioner Chang pointed out that the buffer at Twin Ponds is now too far to the west, and Ms. Redinger agreed to review and correct the map.

Public Comment

Tom Poitras, Shoreline, voiced support for the Compact Community Alternative and opposition to the Connecting Corridor Alternative. He expressed his belief that the connecting corridors will do harm to Shoreline based on what is considered current good transit-oriented development (TOD) practices and outcomes. He discussed the following points with analysis:

1. The size of the station areas should be very close to the standard ½-mile radius recommended by TOD. The subarea planning should not be used as an excuse to rezone other nearby neighborhoods that do not fit the criterion for transit-oriented areas.

Analysis: The City should not use “light rail is coming” to justify rezoning non-transit oriented locations. Virtually all experts state that TOD should be less than or equal to ½ mile from the station, which is considered the maximum walkable distance. There is empirical evidence to substantiate this. The Connecting Corridors Alternative extends substantially greater than ½ mile from the station and, technically, should not be considered TOD. There is nothing to indicate that Shoreline is an exceptional case. The City should use established and professional TOD best practices.

2. The development of the subarea TOD should be pedestrian oriented.

Analysis: One of the primary goals of TOD is to create an environment where people can feel they need fewer or no automobiles to live there. Shoreline officials and staff have said this many times, and the City has tried to achieve this by reducing parking requirements for developments as a means to encourage people to think that way.

3. The net effect of the station and TOD on the area should be to increase the population with little or no increase in automobile use.

Analysis: Rezoning the connecting corridors beyond ½ mile from the station will increase the population some, but it will also increase car use and traffic in the station subarea. Except for a few hardy souls, most residents on connecting corridors beyond ½ mile will drive or be driven to and from the station in an automobile. A few may ride bikes. Most people won’t want to wait for a bus, especially in bad weather, and then transfer to light rail for such a short distance.

Liz Poitras, Shoreline, continued presenting points and analysis where her husband left off:

4. Businesses on the corridors greater than ½ mile from the station will need high automobile traffic volume to attract customers and conduct their businesses.

Analysis: Virtually all the residential housing on the corridors more than ½ mile from the station will be low-density MUR-35’ or single-family homes, and there is not likely to be enough pedestrian traffic to keep most businesses afloat. To be viable, they will need many customers who arrive in cars, and the cars will need places to park. This will increase traffic volume on local streets, and make congestion around the station even worse than it otherwise would be. This is a major negative of the Connecting Corridor Alternative. The corridors will not have the bustling, pedestrian street charm and ambiance of TOD right near the station. Instead, they will have the characteristics of an auto-centric strip mall in the suburbs, which TOD advocates abhor.

5. The probability of underfunded, marginal businesses that may be eyesores, is much higher on corridors greater than ½ mile from the station. The profit prospects are lower there than closer to the station.

Analysis: It will likely be difficult for businesses to thrive if there is limited pedestrian traffic and parking, and increased traffic congestion in the area due to light rail will further discourage customers. Marginal and potential rundown businesses on corridors are not the way to showcase

either 5th Avenue or 155th Street, regardless of what they connect to. This will hurt the values of nearby properties and could stifle higher-quality growth. Also, cheap home conversions could cause serious blight when the businesses fail and while they are waiting for new tenants.

6. The Compact Community Alternative will not have the above problems of the Connecting Corridor Alternative because it is mostly within ½ mile of the station. In addition, it has added benefits.

Analysis: The Compact Community Alternative will be much easier for the City to keep under control because it is a smaller area and the emphasis can be put on increasing high density right near the station. With all the changes the City is now putting on its plate, that is an important issue. The density should gradually expand from the station out in phases, which would preserve neighborhoods within the subarea further from the station until they are needed for future growth.

Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline, distributed a handout with “before and after” photos taken of a segment of 1st Avenue NE. The top image is the most recent aerial photo taken in 2012, and the lower was taken in 1999. She noted the southernmost portion of Twin Ponds Park on the left side of both images. She asked the Commission to consider retaining R-6 zoning for the private properties near critical areas in parks. She believes the status quo is in the best interest of public critical areas. The operative principle is the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), which would apply whether the properties are up zoned or not. Since the CAO applies to properties as single-family homes, it seems that public critical areas would be better protected without changes in zoning. She asked the Commissioners to consider what happened to a critical area after the construction of Aegis Assisted Living on 1st Avenue NE, as illustrated by the images. She acknowledged that the facility provides amenities to the general public and future density may bring other new amenities. However, Peverly Pond, a small body of water located on the east side of 1st Avenue NE, was lost when Aegis was developed. The pond through which Thornton Creek flowed has drained and is now a wetland instead of a pond. When it was a pond, there was a bridge on the western edge that was visible from the street, which gave some charm to the neighborhood. More importantly, what was an open body of water for Thornton Creek is gone.

Ms. Saheki noted that Aegis has buildings much larger than single-family homes and future structures under the new MUR zones will probably be similar in size and scale. While she recognized that the single-family homes near Twin Ponds Park could not be constructed based on the current CAO, the existing development allows the current wetlands and ponds to continue. Again, she asked the Commission to retain properties near public critical areas to remain as R-6 zoning.

Dave Lange, Shoreline, voiced concern that the stretch of 5th Avenue between 145th Street and the area just north of the proposed station facility does not line up correctly with 148th Street. The station footprint identified on the map is a little short of the actual dimensions and is actually about 10-lots long. In addition, bus access was left out of the traffic study for the 145th Street Subarea DEIS, just as some of the wetlands were left out of the addendum. The traffic light at 145th Street frequently backs up beyond 148th Street, and the station design should include a new traffic light at 148th Street for the left turn to the highway on ramp and garage access for vehicles. He noted that in the middle of this area is the driveway out of the station for 60-foot busses to cross a couple lanes of traffic and get in the left-turn lane to return to Highway 522 without any traffic signals.

Mr. Lange expressed his belief that either of the growth alternatives for the proposed up zone would add considerable traffic to 5th Avenue NE causing it to exceed the existing traffic on 145th Street. Shoreline is asking for an overhead ramp over 145th Street to keep pedestrians safe, but there will be busses crossing 5th Avenue NE and more pedestrians coming from all directions. He questioned if it would be necessary to add pedestrian ramps for both sides of 5th Avenue NE and another one for those using 148th Street. He also questioned if it would be necessary to add another traffic light at 152nd Street to provide the wished-for vibrant community on both sides of the road. With the exception of Alternative 1 (no change), he questioned how the vibrant community around the station could be protected without building a pedestrian deck above the road at the same height as the rails. He does not believe Sound Transit will like that choice.

Mr. Lange expressed his belief that efforts to reduce car trips will benefit the environment and the local existing businesses in Shoreline. This effort can start with Ridgecrest where an approximately six-minute time period is required for a bus to get through the 145th Street signals twice, the signal at 148th Street once, and then dwell at the station for unloading and loading passengers. At six busses an hour, that is 36 minutes of busses in the station area every waking hour. Drivers will likely see a bus every time they go through the intersection, except for about four hours per night. He said he is trying hard to move the station over 145th Street to get it out of the way of the congestion on 5th Avenue. Unfortunately, the City, who should see these impacts, is not helping his campaign.

John Lombard, Seattle, said he was present to represent the Thornton Creek Alliance, which has members in both Shoreline and Seattle. He said the Alliance submitted a letter to the Community Development Director on January 29th, which was copied to the Commission and Council. His comments elaborate on the concerns contained in the letter, relating them to the DEIS and the addendum, as well as the choice of a preferred alternative. He referred to a book he authored titled, "Saving Puget Sound," as well as a book titled, "Subirdia," which was mentioned in the letter from John Marzluff, and a report by Don Norman that was attached to the list of bird species that have been found in Paramount Park and surrounding neighborhoods. He made the key point that wildlife benefits from natural reserves like Paramount Park, but they benefit much more if the surrounding areas compliment rather than conflict with the reserves. Both Professor Marzluff and Mr. Norman note that typical suburban residential development compliments reserves to the point that bird diversity can actually be greater in those areas than you would find in some large, protected preserves. The bird feeders, nesting boxes, and forested canopy compliment and expand the area of trees and vegetation that the reserve, itself, provides. He voiced concern that this point is not recognized or even addressed in the DEIS or in the addendum. While the addendum looks at parcel-level improvements when non-conforming uses redevelop under new regulations, it does not address the larger landscape level issue that is central to the Alliance's concerns and is central to the research of Professor Marzluff and Mr. Norman.

Mr. Lombard said the Staff Report states that the EIS should evaluate the maximum possible impacts before a final decision is made that might actually reduce them. He expressed his belief that this statement is an accurate characterization of the Planning Commission's responsibility to recommend a preferred alternative that seriously considers possible modifications to alternatives that are in the DEIS. He said the Alliance supports the Compact Communities Alternative, with the critical areas overlay and with the understanding that, within the overlay, it would be appropriate to have more limited

development. The Alliance would appreciate clarification as to the City's views of the implications of the critical areas overlay. The Alliance would prefer a phased approach and they support the Green Network, which was in the original DEIS proposal. The Alliance is unclear about the significance of staff's recommendation to replace the Green Network with the Off-Corridor Bicycle Network. They support trees and vegetation across corridors throughout the area rather than just focusing on bicycle traffic on the roads. There are fewer areas that are identified as connecting corridors in the Off-Corridor Bicycle Network as compared to the Green Network.

Mr. Lombard commented that Ms. Way would be sharing the results of a report done by Dr. Sarah Cook, which differs with the addendum as to the location, size and category of the wetlands found in Paramount Park and the surrounding area. The report also differs with the addendum in regards to stream locations, and she highlights the significance of soils and geology in the area, both for the actual developability of properties surrounding Paramount Park and for the impacts the development would have on streams, wetlands and habitat.

Janet Way, Shoreline, said she was representing the Shoreline Preservation Society. She requested that the Society have legal standing and become a party of record. She asked that all of her comments (previous, present and future) be adopted into the record by reference. Given the new addendum and potential changes, she also requested that the comment period be extended at least until the proposal has been presented to the City Council. She expressed her belief that the City needs to go back to the drawing board on the addendum. She presented the Commission with a number of items, including a report by Dr. Sarah Cook. She also provided pages from the City's 2004 Characterization Report, which states quite clearly (Page 417) that, "Paramount Park between 10th and 12th Avenues NE, north of 145th Street is one of the largest wetlands in the City, at approximately 6.9 acres." She said she is curious why the new characterization report diminishes the wetland down to less than 2 acres. From listening to the consultants present the report, it appeared that the only reason for doing this was to increase the area available for redevelopment. She emphasized that it is the City and Planning Commission's job to protect, enhance and even expand the wetlands and open spaces. If more density is added around the station, the wetland will have to absorb a lot more runoff, pollution, etc.

Ms. Way commented that Paramount Park is an extraordinary place, and she invited Commissioners to visit. There is no other place like it in the entire watershed or in the City. It retains huge amounts of clean water, and it is a major headwater of Thornton and Littles Creeks. It is also a vital wildlife corridor that provides clean air and clean water. Protecting and enhancing the wetlands and open space becomes even more important as density is increased. When the Commission gets to the point of making a recommendation on zoning, she asked that the areas around Paramount Park retain their current R-6 zoning. It will be a detriment to the City to allow development to occur right up to the wetlands. The Society and other groups have done an enormous amount of restoration and enhancement at the park, and there are more areas that need to be fixed. The City should go out of its way to protect it. She said her same comments would apply to the wetlands and streams in Twin Ponds Park, as well. She emphasized that the public should be notified if the map is changed at some point in the future.

Patty Hale, Shoreline, said her husband was the superintendent for Turner Construction, the general contractor for the light rail station on Capitol Hill. She noted that not seen are the 6-story, 65-foot maximum height mixed-use buildings that are anticipated to be developed. Even Capitol Hill, with a

light rail station that connects most of Seattle, does not have the heights that are currently being proposed for the 145th Street Station.

Ms. Hale referred to Ms. Redinger's comments about density around the park and reminded the Commissioners that Paramount Park is already programmed at capacity during the sport seasons. Adding more density will not give more people places to play. She voiced her belief that R-6 density should be around the perimeter of the upper portion of Paramount Park. She reviewed the historic drainage problems associated with this area of the park, which only got worse when Paramount Park Elementary was demolished and the playfields were put in. When the City incorporated, the playfields had to be redone to address a variety of drainage problems. Allowing more development will decrease the ability for absorption to take place naturally. She recommended that the City maintain minimum soil disruption and limit development around the upper Paramount Park Playfield and natural space, as well as Twin Ponds Park. These open spaces help control water runoff, and covering them with development is not the right approach.

Dr. Corey Secrist, Shoreline, said he first found Paramount Park while on a bicycle ride, and he decided to purchase a home in Shoreline that was within walking distance to the park. He views the parks as the jewels on a necklace, and he urged the City to protect them. He does not support the plan for additional density, but even from the perspective of trying to increase population and create commercial viability, the parks are high selling points for attracting new residents to the area. He said the Commission should keep in mind that denser development will result in less soil to absorb the water, and the parks will be very important to maintain the flow of clean water and produce clean air. He asked the Commissioners to carefully consider the reports submitted by the Shoreline Preservation Society that outline how Paramount Park has and will continue to change.

Dr. Sarah Cook, Seattle, said she was hired by the Shoreline Preservation Society to examine Paramount Park. She pointed out that the Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that counties and cities use Best Available Science (BAS) in developing policies and regulations to protect the functions and values of their critical areas. All the ensuing studies and policies must take BAS into consideration before any activities are undertaken in critical areas that might affect their integrity. She emphasized that the Paramount Open Space and the adjacent neighborhood to the east is the largest remaining wetland area in Shoreline and the Thornton Creek Watershed. For that reason, the Commission needs to consider the importance of the area. She also emphasized that since the headwaters of the entire Thornton Creek Basin is located within Shoreline, the increased percentage of impervious surface will certainly affect the downstream receiving water.

Ms. Cook referred to her detailed report, which was previously submitted to the City. She asked that the Commissioners read the report, which consolidates all the information that was included in the 2004 Thornton Creek Watershed Report that was done by Tetra Tech and is a much more comprehensive study than the study performed by Otak. Her report also summarizes some of the information in the 2004 Thornton Creek Watershed Report that included all of Shoreline and Seattle. She said her report examines soils information because the City's geotech report does not cover soils and there is currently no mapping for the soils in the City of Shoreline. While it is known that there is a high percentage of peat deposits in both Twin Ponds and Paramount Parks, the City does not know where they are located. Therefore, the potential for development becomes very difficult to identify. The newest geotech report

only looked at the potential problems of peat deposits and high ground water from the perspective of how it would impact development. They did not consider what compacting peat soils and building on them could do to dewater the wetlands and streams within the Thornton Creek Watershed.

Lastly, Ms. Cook said she reviewed the accuracy of the wetlands and streams mapping done by Otak during the dry season of 2015 versus the study that was done in 2004 by Tetra Tech. She reported that she and Ms. Way visited each of the areas where there are discrepancies between the old and new maps, and Figure 6 of her report identifies each of the areas where she found wetlands and Otak did not. She encouraged the Commissioners to review her report, which consolidates the information in the old report and compares it to the new Otak reconnaissance. She concluded that when making an informed decision relative to zoning, it is important for the Commission to use the larger acreage (6.9) and the alignments of streams contained in the City's GIS database rather than the new work that was done by Otak, which she feels is very inaccurate.

Jeff Eisenbrey, Shoreline, said his interest is in preservation of the unique views from Paramount Park. In this lowest income area of the City, it affords views to the south, east and west, and the current plans would block the views completely and diminish the value of the park to the community. He noted that none of the alternatives provide provisions for the protection of riparian recharge areas, and he supports the concerns raised by the previous speakers. He asked that the City create maps that describe flood water retention zones. To construct to the proposed density, he presumes there will be retention ponds, but the locations are not indicated anywhere. This information would be helpful for citizens to envision how the build-out is supposed to look in the future. He also asked the Commission to consider protection of single-family homes from the loss of southern exposure, especially those that border 155th Street. A full build out means that adjacent properties would be completely shaded from their southern exposures.

Mr. Eisenbrey said he would like to see prescribed building standards for LEED Certification and to minimize the effects of impermeable surfaces. There are a number of environmentally-sensitive building practices that could be required in these areas to guarantee that the quality of construction is very high. He said he finds the parking projections to be unrealistic, and he asked that they be upgraded. He does not know of any examples in his neighborhood of licensed drivers who do not have a vehicle. While it is a lovely idea to provide neighborhoods that encourage walking, the reality is they become choked with cars when no off-street parking provisions are in place.

Lindsay Hannah, Shoreline, said she recently purchased a home in the North City Neighborhood and chose to move to Shoreline because she is excited about light rail. She is also excited about the subarea station planning, which is a huge draw to Shoreline right now. She loves the characteristics of the neighborhoods and her single-family home, and she commiserates with those who have concerns with the changing characteristics of their neighborhoods, especially around the 145th Street Station. At the same time, she expressed her belief that it will be a huge asset to the community in the future to have TOD. As a resident who just moved to the City, she looks forward to the walkability, bike-ability and near proximity that light rail will provide.

Ms. Hannah referred to the thoughtful concerns that were raised about critical areas, and she urged the Commission to take the concerns into consideration as they move forward and refine the details of the

Subarea Plan. She emphasized the importance of keeping momentum going by deciding which zoning option to move forward with, and she believes the Compact Community Alternative is more attractive unless the 5th Avenue residents are urging a rezone at this time. She would prefer to keep the growth consolidated around the light rail area. If there is a desire to expand the more intense zoning out through the corridors, it could be an option at a later point.

Tom Lawler, Shoreline, said he is a resident of the Meridian Park Neighborhood and agreed with the comments provided by Ms. Hannah. As a young person who recently moved to Shoreline, he is excited about the new development and about light rail. He also expressed similar concerns around the Paramount Park and Paramount Open Space, which can be jewels in a very beautiful necklace for Shoreline. Going forward, he urged the Commission and City Council to keep the momentum going. He said he is excited about connecting the 155th Corridor to Aurora Avenue North. This is a strong move that will link development and make the area more walkable and bikeable. Having more development outside of the area would make the light rail stations a greater asset, especially when they are linked to existing corridors.

Christine Southwick, Shoreline, voiced concern that taller buildings would change the amount of air flow and sunlight that reaches the Paramount and Twin Ponds Parks. The vegetation in the parks, as well as the vegetation on surrounding residential properties, would be impacted by these changes. She also voiced concern that the proposed changes could alter wind flow and bird patterns. She recommended that the height limit should remain lower for the properties that surround the two parks.

Steve Schneider, Shoreline, suggested that the public comment period should be extended to give citizens an opportunity to review and comment on the new map that was just presented by staff. He agreed with previous speakers that the zoning for the properties that surround the Upper Paramount Park should remain as R-6.

Dia Dryer, Shoreline, voiced concern that if the City chooses to move forward with the Phased Approach for the Compact Community Alternative, it would push the development for the MUR-35' to the furthest points instead of having it expand from the inside out. She observed that 50% of the property identified as Phase I (west side of I-5) is outside of the ½-mile walkshed, and 50% of the property identified as Phase II (east side of I-5) is well within the ½-mile walkshed. She asked that the phasing lines be reevaluated.

Diana Coleman, Shoreline, said she works in Downtown Seattle and is in the City every single day. She purchased a home in Shoreline because it provided an opportunity for her family to be near the City but have some personal space. She spends time every day in her backyard, which backs up to the Paramount Open Space, and she hears birds every single day. She said she would hate to see her neighborhood turned into a concrete jungle.

Continued Commission and Staff Discussion

Ms. Redinger said the new map that was prepared by the 145SCC and presented to the Commission includes an overlay of the more revised version of the 145th Corridor Study. They found there were some problems with the previous graphic because the size of the trees denoting the amenity zones

made people think that the road would be expanded to create potential property impacts. The new map is a cleaner version, and the blue lines that denote the Off-Corridor Bike Network are differentiated between existing and proposed bicycle facilities. The information came from the Transportation Master Plan, which was used in the draft EIS analysis.

Ms. Redinger noted that numerous questions have come up about the proposed Green Network and Off-Corridor Bike Network, and the Transportation Planner who prepared the network maps indicated that specific details have not been decided yet. Once the City Council selects a Preferred Alternative, the study will move through a multi-year process of environmental review and final design, and the networks will be included in the final design. She recalled that when the Commission previously looked at the Green Network Concept, a variety of images were used to illustrate what it could look like. They are essentially lower-volume streets that are more supportive to various modes of transportation, including non-motorized. Some of them may be wide enough to include an amenity zone and protected lane, and some even striping. They welcome feedback on this issue. If the Subarea Plan defines a network pathway that Commissioners and/or citizens feel is very important, especially as it would accommodate the projected growth, it could be incorporated into the design and environmental analysis of the corridor study.

Ms. Redinger responded to Mr. Lombard's recommendation that the DEIS needs to evaluate the highest impact. She explained that, it is not necessary to choose a preferred alternative in order to complete the DEIS. However, the City felt that choosing a preferred alternative to take through the FEIS would help the public understand exactly what is being debated and what zoning could be adopted. This approach allows for more accurate projections in terms of mitigation and impacts. It is important to understand that the City cannot adopt something that is more intense than what was analyzed in the DEIS, but it is acceptable to adopt zoning that is less intense than what was analyzed. When choosing a Preferred Alternative, the Commission should look at the high end. However, the City would still have the option to choose not to zone something, zone something at a lower level, or to zone it at a later timeframe.

Regarding the request to extend the comment period as a result of new map changes, Ms. Redinger explained that the comment period was specifically about the addendum to the DEIS. She advised that the Commission will have a Public Hearing on April 7th. While most of the focus will be on the zoning scenarios, citizens could also submit comments about other issues. Also, anyone can email comments to the City Council and Commission at any time. They appreciate all of the comments made tonight, and people can continue to comment through the Council's May 2nd meeting where a Preferred Alternative will be selected and even beyond. The maps are intended to be an interactive process. The Commission will listen to public comment, receive new information and change the maps accordingly throughout the process. That's why it is important that the website is updated regularly and that notifications are sent out when important changes are made.

Ms. Redinger announced that on March 24th, the Parks Board will begin their work on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan, which is anticipated to be adopted by mid-2017. The Parks Board will be looking at light rail subarea planning as an important component of the PROS Plan. The March 24th discussion will include a possible recommendation to acquire properties around Paramount Open Space, Twin Ponds, and possibly Paramount Park if they become available for sale. The intent is to develop a mechanism whereby the Parks Department would have funds available to purchase the

properties and expand the parks. She reminded the Commission that the DEIS identified a need for additional park space, and it is through the PROS Plan that the Parks Department and Parks Board will make recommendations relative to priorities. She agreed to provide the Commission with updates on decisions made by the Board.

Director Markle referred to the report provided by Dr. Cook, as well as information provided by other citizens suggesting that the existing information the City has on wetland delineation is much better than the information provided in the new report prepared by Otak. She explained that the Otak report was never intended to be a delineation. Although it does include delineation information, the main purpose of the report was to answer the question of what zoning is best for the health of the wetland. They were interested in obtaining scientific information the Commission and Council could use to help make that decision. While a single-family home is clearly less intense than an apartment building, leaving the zoning at R-6 would mean that none of the updated stormwater regulations would be applied. Which is better, less intense development or better stormwater regulations to reduce runoff and pesticides into the wetland? Both options are still open for consideration. She agreed to have a discussion with Dr. Cook about whether or not the City's stormwater regulations would address some of the runoff concerns noted in her report. If the Commission seeks an overlay approach, it is important to understand that the wetland boundaries may change over time. Therefore, it is better to do a case-by-case study so that the BAS is available for each site where development is being proposed, whether it is a single-family home or apartment building. The City's previous and updated CAO's include provisions for how to limit development and provide for mitigation.

Commissioner Chang said her understanding is that the Department of Ecology's (DOE) new stormwater regulations encourage on-site infiltration to mitigate the stormwater affects from more hard surface. However, what happens when the water table is too high to allow for infiltration? Director Markle answered that the developer would still be required to meet the metrics and standards of the stormwater manual. However, because she is not a stormwater engineer, she does not know the various options available to address ground water issues. Commissioner Chang said that, typically, a developer would have to find some way to retain the water until it is slowly dispersed into an existing stormwater system. She asked if there is a stormwater system in the subarea. Ms. Redinger agreed to provide the maps of existing stormwater facilities that were included in the DEIS. In addition, she noted that the City's Surface Water Master Plan will be updated within the next few years, and the subarea will define a lot of things that will need to be addressed in the Surface Water Master Plan, the PROS Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. She has heard the concern that existing conditions preclude improvements, but often it is the improvements that change the existing conditions. Improvements can be made through the subarea plan process to accommodate growth, and often it is growth that drives the projected improvements.

Commissioner Chang said she would like the zoning to be realistic. She referred to the Greenwood area in Seattle, which has a very high groundwater table. New development must infiltrate to account for any new impervious surface, yet infiltration is not possible. Ms. Redinger agreed that high water table conditions can significantly limit the type of development that can occur.

Commissioner Montero asked the City's philosophy on vacating streets, particularly in the area of Paramount Park. Ms. Redinger said there are a couple of different methods for requesting a street

vacation. A petition method is used for the vacation of private streets, which requires the support of 75% of the surrounding land owners. The process for a public street vacation is slightly different, and no petition is required. However, all vacations must be reviewed by the Hearing Examiner, with the final decision being made by the City Council. Street vacation is a criteria-based system. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that it is not possible to go further south on 10th Avenue NE than the intersection of 155th Street.

Commissioner Chang reported that she met with Ms. Redinger earlier in the day for an update on the process to date. She also connected with her friend, who is the president of commercial real estate with Ewing and Clark, for additional information. She observed that there is nothing to draw people to the area now. With it being close to the freeway, there may be apartment development, but it will be difficult to bring in tax-based retail. She suggested that the Commission should focus their efforts on a very small phase 1, starting with the blue area around I-5 that is currently shown as MUR-70'. They should focus on creating a sense of place that will draw people to this smaller area first, rather than allowing large buildings near the parks where properties are currently developed as single-family homes. She expressed her belief that it will be a number of years before any significant redevelopment occurs, which gives the City considerable time to encourage the State and Federal Governments to fund a freeway lid over the interstate to make the area more attractive for residential uses. As an example, she referred to the lid over I-90 in Mercer Island that was turned into a park to connect both sides of the freeway.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that the CAO applies to all critical areas, and all wetlands and wetland buffers are considered critical areas. She noted that the current recommendation would not change the northwest corner of the subarea near Twin Ponds Park. However, it is recommended that the areas adjacent to the Paramount Open Space be rezoned to R-35'. That means that any development that occurs on these properties must go through the CAO checklist. Mr. Szafran agreed and explained that a Critical Area Analysis for wetlands and buffers must be done individually for each property so it stays current. The new CAO, which became effective February 1st, uses all of the State's BAS and was commended as one that incorporated the most BAS. The CAO applies to all areas, including Paramount Park as a wetland area and public park.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas thanked Ms. Way for taking her and two other Commissioners on a tour of the Paramount Open Space. It was very helpful to be on site. As they were looking at an overlay, it was noted that several of the current R-6 zoned properties extend well into the buffer area. She is glad to hear that any development on these properties would have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas recalled that the MUR-35' zone was intended as a type of transition that had the same height limit as the single-family residential zones but less stringent standards for setbacks. Ms. Redinger said the MUR-35' also allows for more flexible use of properties for development such as row houses, town homes, or small apartment buildings. Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if a property owner could lose the portion of his/her property that is located within a wetland or its buffer. Director Markle clarified that State Law precludes the City from outright prohibiting development on properties that are largely or totally encumbered by a wetland or its buffer. However, a property owner would have to go through a rigorous Critical Area Reasonable Use Permit process, which is time consuming and involves a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner and opportunities for appeal.

Some development must be allowed or it would be considered a “taking of property” through regulations.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that there are no minimum densities or minimum heights in the MUR-35’ and MUR-45’ zones. In theory, every lot could be developed as single-family residential and mixed-use development would not be required. Ms. Redinger said the City anticipates there will be areas where no one wants to change their properties, and that is fine. However, there may be blocks where the neighbors get together to sell their properties as a package. The issue is a choice and flexibility versus predictability, and the City Council landed on the side of choice and flexibility. As per the regulations adopted for the 185th Street Subarea Plan, a minimum density of 18 units per acre is identified for the MUR-45’ zone. She recalled the Commission’s previous discussions about the MUR-45’ zone and how non-conforming uses would be addressed. The final regulations allow existing development in the MUR-45’ to be remodeled and even expanded by 50% or 1,000 square feet, whichever is lesser.

Chair Pro Tem Craft asked members of the Light Rail Subcommittee to speak more about their recommendation. In particular, he questioned the developability of the properties around Paramount Park even if they are rezoned. He also had questions about 145th Street as it moves eastward beyond the intersection at 15th Avenue.

Commissioner Maul said the subcommittee’s proposed changes were based on comments from citizens. Property owners living north of 155th Street along 15th Avenue wanted to be included in the MUR-45’ zone, which would be consistent with what was proposed south of 155th Street. The property climbs to the east and the 45-foot height limit would not impose view blockage. The MUR-35’ zone was added north of 155th Street and north along 5th Avenue as a result of citizen comments. The subcommittee recommends that the Compact Community Alternative would be the best place to start, but with some small adjustments.

Chair Pro Tem Craft said he is concerned about the area between 12th and 8th Avenues where there are numerous dead end streets and cul-de-sacs. He asked if people living in that area have shared their thoughts about whether or not it could be developed over a period of time in the future after the light rail station becomes active. Commissioner Maul said the terrain through the area slopes quite a bit, and there were not a lot of citizen comments. The subcommittee is recommending MUR-35’ zoning, with the understanding that any redevelopment would result in stormwater improvements. However, they do not recommend an increase in height. Ms. Redinger said she has heard from a number of citizens living in a cul-de-sac in the area who are requesting that their zoning remain as R-6. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that the MUR-35’ zoning would limit height to that of the R-6 zone.

Chair Pro Tem Craft agreed with Commissioner Chang that, absent of sound barriers, he is not convinced that the subarea will be the ideal place for redevelopment for quite some time. He asked the subcommittee members to share their thoughts on redevelopment opportunities on 145th Street and 15th Avenue. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that most properties along these two streets are already zoned for more intense uses, and there are a lot of existing commercial uses. There is already a fair amount of redevelopment activity on 15th Avenue, and the single-family homes are generally rentals and/or used as commercial spaces, and many are not well cared for. The subcommittee chose 15th

Avenue as the upper limit because going north there are more single-family homes that are used as single-family residences. There is already a commercial/industrial feel on 15th Avenue going south to 145th Street.

Chair Pro Tem Craft recalled a citizen comment about the loss of wetland fidelity that resulted from the Aegis development. He asked staff to speak specifically to this situation and also describe the protections that will be put in place as the plan moves forward. Director Markle said Aegis was developed before the Critical Area Reasonable Use Regulations were adopted. She recalled significant discussion about Peverly Pond, but she does not remember what mitigation was approved for the project. She agreed to review the project and report back, but said the intent is to prevent wetlands from disappearing. Chair Pro Tem Craft commented that, going forward, the intent is that any development that takes place within the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan would have to take into consideration the preservation of wetlands such as the one brought up as an example. Mr. Szafran agreed. He recalled that the Aegis structure was required to be placed outside of the buffer area for the pond, and significant restoration work around the buildings and pond was also required.

Commissioner Montero noted that MUR-45' zoning is proposed on the southern side of Paramount Park and MUR-35' on the eastern side. He said it seems that the goal should be to keep the park enclosed by all of the streets, and the park should actually be extended. He suggested they leave these two areas alone and designate them for future City acquisition to expand the park. Chair Pro Tem Craft noted this approach would create more proximity between the open space and the park. Ms. Redinger recalled that in the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan, it was actually included as a policy to consider City acquisition of parcels that were ill suited for development because of high ground water, etc. She suggested the recommendation could be included as a policy in the subarea plan, a provision of zoning, or via a policy in the PROS Plan.

Commissioner Mork clarified that the Green Network and Off-Corridor Bike Network are not really part of the Commission's discussion relative to the Preferred Alternative. Ms. Redinger said it can be part of the Commission's discussion, and it would be better for the FEIS if the corridor is mapped out as close as possible. She briefly described the difference between the two networks, noting that the original discussion was to construct an off-corridor bicycle network on 147th Street, and the concept evolved further when the City learned that the City of Seattle is proposing an entire network four streets to the south. There are a lot more trails and paths identified on the Green Network, and she invited Commissioners to note trails and paths that are identified on the Green Network map that should also be added to the Off-Corridor Bicycle Map.

Commissioner Mork said she has some concerns about the safety of the bicycle and pedestrian plans. They are trying to encourage bicycle and pedestrian access, which will not occur unless the pathways are protected. Without knowing what the City plans to protect and not protect, it is difficult for her to provide suggested changes.

Commissioner Mork recalled that one concept for crossing I-5 was separating the location where bicyclists and pedestrians cross versus where busses and vehicles cross. One suggestion was to move the detached crossway slightly further to the north to perhaps 147th Street. She asked when would be the appropriate time to discuss this concept further. Ms. Redinger said this has been a topic of conversation

for many years, and Councilmembers are working hard to get Sound Transit and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to consider a bridge at 147th. The conversations will continue throughout the design and environmental analysis of the corridor network, and WSDOT and Sound Transit are partners in this effort. The discussions will also continue through Sound Transit's design process and be included in the guiding principles that are being submitted to Sound Transit upon which the City will judge their future design submittals. As WSDOT and Sound Transit considered the bridge concept as part of the 145th Street Corridor Study, they realized what it would cost to seismically retrofit the bridge by expanding it. They have begun to think it might be a better solution to cantilever a sidewalk off of the south side so there is still some pedestrian access on the south side of the bridge, but a separate structure would be built on the north side. She expressed her belief that it is a valid concept to push forward.

Commissioner Mork asked if staff is asking the Commission to think of the most aggressive things they can realistically envision for the purpose of doing the FEIS. They can then back off their proposal as appropriate. Ms. Redinger emphasized that the subarea plan is intended to be general, and it is perfectly appropriate for the Commission to include elements in the plan that they believe are appropriate. It is not that critical whether the FEIS analyzes a pedestrian bridge at 147th Street versus 145th, but the recommendation of the Board will carry some weight.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said the subcommittee is encouraging a pedestrian bridge on 147th Street because it will allow people living on the other side to cross the freeway without having to go to 155th or 145th Streets. Also, 147th is a narrower place to cross and much closer to the station entrance doors. They also discussed doing a non-motorized crossing under the actual rail corridor where it is elevated. The goal is to provide sufficient non-motorized access so that people do not have to use cars to access the station. Chair Pro Tem Craft said he supports a crossing at 147th Street.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if WSDOT would have to pay for a new pedestrian crossing at 147th Street if they decide not to retrofit the existing bridge. Otherwise, they would lose capacity for biking and walking. Ms. Redinger said there are requirements for sidewalks on both sides, which is where the cantilevered south sidewalk came from. The issue is whether moving the sidewalk two blocks north would meet the requirement or if WSDOT would still have to provide a sidewalk on the north side of 145th Street.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas recalled that when reviewing the DEIS for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan, the City Council made significant changes that were not part of the Commission's general recommendation. It was subsequently decided that anytime the Council makes a significant change to the Commission's recommendation, it should come back to the Commission for more public input. Hopefully, this will avoid problems in the future. She summarized that the subcommittee felt that it would be appropriate to evaluate MUR-35', MUR-45' and MUR-70' as part of the proposed plan. However, they may find that the zoning change would not be feasible without having a negative impact on the wetlands. They want to protect the wetlands from unintended consequences, and it is important to do the subarea plan right.

Ms. Redinger said the Parks Board must consider what kinds of spaces are appropriate within the subarea, not only to accommodate anticipated growth, but to use parks for stormwater functions. There

are ways to turn a public space into a stormwater function. There are also opportunities for providing a large-scale detention system, perhaps even at the Sound Transit site. She summarized that there are creative ways to manage stormwater, especially through low-impact development techniques, which the City very much supports.

The Commission and staff reviewed each of the questions that were posed in the Staff Report as follows:

- **What are the pros and cons of the Connecting Corridor versus the Compact Community Scenarios? Does the Commission have a preference between the scenarios?**
- **Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios based on the technical memorandums that represent the addendum to the DEIS?** Ms. Redinger said the subcommittee is recommending that the Compact Community Alternative should be the basis for discussion, with some elements of the Connecting Corridors Alternative drawn in.
- **Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios based on the 145th Street Corridor Study?** Ms. Redinger encouraged the Commissioners to offer their suggestions so they can be incorporated directly onto the map.
- **Should the “Green Network” shown on the Connecting Corridor and Compact Community Scenarios be replaced by the “Off-Corridor Bike Network” map that was developed through the Corridor Study?** The subcommittee indicated they would prefer that the Off-Corridor Bike Network be included instead of the Green Network.
- **Would the Commission like to recommend changes to either or both of the zoning scenarios with regard to changing boundaries, zoning designations, phasing or an overlay?** The subcommittee did not recommend any changes to the zoning scenarios based on the 145th Street Corridor Study. The subcommittee recommends a phased approach, and any feedback to help reach a consensus would be helpful.
- **What should be the most intense zoning designation analyzed for either or both of the zoning scenarios: MUR-70’, MUR-65’, Mur-85’ or something different?** The subcommittee recommended that the regulations adopted for the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan could be used for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, as well.
- **Should development agreements like those adopted as part of the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan be an option for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan?** The subcommittee did not discuss the concept of development agreements. For the DEIS, there was an assumption that 25% of the eligible land could be developed with a development agreement. While this is a high assumption, it is important to assume more than is possible to make sure the appropriate mitigations are captured in the FEIS.
- **Does the Commission need any additional information before making a recommendation about a Preferred Alternative zoning scenario to the City Council following the April 7th public hearing?**

Commissioner Chang noted the large number of property owners in the subarea, particularly in the blue area around the freeway. While they are only talking about zoning, aggregation of properties will be a challenge to get redevelopment to occur. She asked the City’s thoughts for making aggregation happen. Chair Pro Tem Craft said it is not the City’s responsibility to make it happen or not. He recalled that the Commission discussed this challenge in conjunction with the 185th Street Station Subarea Plan. Because

of all of the small, individual parcels, aggregation will be difficult, and a much more staggered approach is likely. Ms. Redinger explained that when Sound Transit and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) did an analysis of the TOD potential, neither of the station areas scored high because they are existing single-family neighborhoods with a lot of small lots that would need to be aggregated. This challenge added to the timeframe of how long it would take the areas to redevelop. Other stations are sited in areas with larger lots and existing commercial zoning. She agreed with Chair Pro Tem Craft that the City would not get involved in personal real estate transactions.

Commissioner Malek observed that the City does need businesses to provide commercial sales tax revenue. The way to support large swaths of R-6 zoning is to collect revenue through sales tax income rather than simply putting the burden of property taxes on the individual owners. He noted that the Community Renewal Area, as well as the areas that surround the stations will play a significant role in this effort. He expressed his belief that there is redevelopment potential in the area between Shoreline Community College, Fircrest and the Community Renewal Area, and potential investors will be particularly interested in how many people are drawn to the area and how amenable the City is to businesses. He questioned if it will be necessary to retard growth and limit the phasing, or if phasing will happen on its own based on the market and the pace of the economy. He suggested that the latter would be true.

Commissioner Montero said a good example of how quickly redevelopment can happen would be the new Spring District Station in Bellevue that is supposed to open in 2023. Wright Runstad and Company has already purchased all of the property around the area and has planned development and even started construction. Once an area is rezoned, redevelopment can happen quickly.

Commissioner Chang said the market analysis report talks about the large number of single-family properties in the subarea being a significant hurdle. This makes it difficult to get a site together that is large enough to do a viable commercial development. The area may not redevelop if all they do is rezone the area around the station to MUR-70' and then sit back and wait for it to happen.

Commissioner Mork suggested that a citizen's committee could be formed to consider the non-motorized trail network and provide feedback to the Commission. Chair Pro Tem Craft agreed, but suggested that the concept should at least be included in the Commission's recommendation to the Council relative to a Preferred Alternative so that it can at least be studied. Changes can be made later on to make it more correct based on a committee's review. Ms. Redinger recalled that a citizen's advisory committee convened the last time the Transportation Master Plan was updated in 2011. It was a very intensive, multi-year committee, and probably not the type of committee they want to convene for subarea planning. However, it would be helpful to hear from members of the committee, and most of them are still involved in city planning. She agreed with Chair Pro Tem Craft that the Commission should make a recommendation based on the vision they have right now, and the plan can be reviewed and updated with more detail when the Transportation Master Plan is updated in the future and the citizen's committee is reconvened. Additional design and analysis could also occur with implementation of the 145th Street Corridor Study.

Commissioner Malek agreed with Commissioner Montero's earlier suggestion for the City to purchase land to connect Paramount Park and the Paramount Open Space. The line should be drawn all the way to the street.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas recalled that when she visited the Paramount Open Space with Ms. Way she was surprised to see a number of bicyclists going through the site. She further recalled Ms. Way's comment that people bicycle through the park a lot, and perhaps it would be appropriate to identify a location for a designated bicycle path. Ms. Redinger suggested the Commission could draw a blue line through the open space to indicate that it is an important part of the bicycle network. In terms of specific improvements, the Commission could recommend that improving the site with an elevated trail would be better for the health of the wetland and the cyclists. It would be appropriate to include it on the map for purposes of the FEIS, but the Commission should not attempt to design the actual trail system.

Chair Pro Tem Craft thanked the citizens for their comments and encouraged them to continue to submit both written and verbal comments as ideas and questions come up.

Ms. Redinger said a question was raised about whether or not the public would be allowed to comment on the addendum after March 21st. She said the City has been accepting comments for the last three years, and they will continue to take comments through the end of the process. The intent is to set deadlines so that the comments can be compiled and organized in sufficient time for the Planning Commission to consider them as part of their decision-making process. She encouraged citizens to get their comments in as soon as possible, and by Monday would be ideal.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle did not have any items to report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no committee or Commissioner reports.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

It was announced that a public hearing on the potential zoning scenarios for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan is scheduled for April 7th.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Easton Craft
Chair Pro Tem, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission