

From: [Susan Chang](#)
To: [Plancom](#); [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Lisa Basher](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Donna M. Moss](#)
Subject: Susan Chang's comments for April 7 meeting
Date: Thursday, April 07, 2016 8:24:04 AM

All,

I hope this is the appropriate forum to provide my comments since I won't be able to attend tonight's meeting--I am still out of the country, returning Saturday.

I have one primary concern: the mapping of the wetland in Paramount Open Space. I understand that Otak was not asked to do a full delineation; however, I am concerned about the large discrepancy between their work and the 2004 report by Tetra Tech that states 6.9 acres. If we do not have a more detailed delineation, shouldn't we be working with the presumption of the larger area given that Otak's work was done in the dry time of a dry year?

I'm curious as to why staff recommends against an overlay for the wetland. How is an area protected unless development staff know to ask for a wetland delineation when a development application comes in? Perhaps I don't understand how Shoreline uses overlays. My question comes from my understanding of how it works in Seattle...Seattle has wetland overlays so everyone is aware of where potential wetlands and buffers are likely to exist. Then as part of the development application, it is up to the applicant to site-specifically delineate the wetland and then critical areas regulations and protections apply. I believe (though it is not my area of expertise) that the Seattle wetland overlay is advisory, not prescriptive.

Without better information about the wetland delineation, I support the R-6 designation around Paramount Open Space in the Compact Community Hybrid scenario. (I assume that although R-6 and MUR-35 have the same height limit, MUR-35 allows for greater developmental coverage. What is the difference in lot coverage allowed by the two designations?). We should not change zoning from R-6 to MUR-35 in areas where critical areas regulations would not allow the denser development.

I'd also like to make a comment about the idea of new development being better in terms of environmental considerations, as suggested by Otak. It primarily comes down to how stormwater is handled. New stormwater regulations require onsite infiltration of stormwater, if feasible, and infiltration is better than conveying stormwater directly to pipes as older developments do. If infiltration is not feasible through bio-retention facilities and the like (due to high groundwater; till, clay or peat soils that don't allow infiltration; or slope stability issues), I think (?) the stormwater then goes into the stormwater hard pipe systems, which makes the result a mixed bag when compared to R-6.

Susan

From: Plancom
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 4:30 PM
To: Rachael Markle; Steve Szafran; Easton Craft; David Maul; William Montero; Paul Cohen; Lisa Basher; Jack Malek; Laura Mork; Miranda Redinger; Julie Ainsworth-Taylor; Susan Chang; Donna M. Moss
Subject: FW: Packet Deliveries tonight

From: Lisa Basher
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 4:30:14 PM
To: Plancom
Subject: Packet Deliveries tonight
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Bill, Easton, Laura, and Jack: look in the usual places. Susan, I'll drop yours in the mail since you will be gone for the meeting but will likely want to review the materials.

Donna, I'll keep yours here in case you want to pick it up tomorrow before 5, if you haven't picked up by the time I leave, then I will take it home with me and keep it on my porch.

Trying to have them all distributed by 6.30. or 7.00.

Thanks,

Lisa Basher
Department of Planning & Community Development
City of Shoreline
206.801.2514