

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

April 7, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

### **Commissioners Present**

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

### **Staff Present**

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

### **Commissioners Absent**

Commissioner Chang

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Pro Tem Craft called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **SWEARING IN CEREMONY FOR RETURNING PLANNING COMMISSIONERS, PERFORMED BY MAYOR ROBERTS**

Mayor Roberts formally swore in the following Commissioners: Easton Craft, David Maul, and William Montero. He recalled that he recently swore in Susan Chang as a Planning Commissioner, as well. He thanked the Commissioners for their work. He said Shoreline is a great City and he is proud to serve as its mayor. Citizens are very willing to get involved with issues that are important to them, and he encouraged the Commission and the City Council to listen and respect the opinions of everyone.

### **ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Pro Tem Craft and Commissioners Maul, Malek, Montero, Moss-Thomas and Mork. Commissioner Chang was absent.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA BY REMOVING ITEM 7, WHICH IS A STUDY SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS PERTAINING TO THE LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM AND FACILITIES PERMITTING PROCESS AND APPLICABLE REGULATIONS. COMMISSIONER MONTERO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The remainder of the agenda was approved as submitted.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of March 17, 2016 were adopted as presented.

## **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dia Dreyer, Shoreline**, suggested that the manner in which the Commission's minutes are loaded onto the website should be consistent. It is difficult to search the minutes using key words because some have been loaded as pictures rather than true PDF documents.

## **PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING ALTERNATIVES AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL ON PREFERRED ZONING ALTERNATIVE FOR FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Chair Pro Tem Craft reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing and invited staff to present their report.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger explained that this is the public hearing on the Preferred Alternative Zoning Scenario to recommend to the City Council to be studied in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). She briefly reviewed the timeline for the process, which started in May of 2013 with a visioning process and design workshops. There were two breaks in the schedule. The first occurred while the City waited for Sound Transit to decide whether or not the second station in Shoreline would be at 145<sup>th</sup> Street or 155<sup>th</sup> Street. The second break occurred last March when the City Council accepted the Commission's recommendation and elected to postpone subarea planning until the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study had been completed. During that time, staff prepared an addendum to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Both the Corridor Study and the DEIS Addendum were presented to the Commission on March 17<sup>th</sup>, at which time they also discussed potential zoning scenarios that resulted in a base map for the public hearing. Following the Commission's recommendation, the City Council will discuss the Preferred Alternative Zoning Scenario on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Once the City Council has selected the Preferred Alternative Zoning Scenario, the consultant and staff team will begin working on the FEIS.

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the scenarios that were analyzed in the DEIS:

- **No Action.** This alternative represents the current zoning in the subarea.
- **Connecting Corridors.** This concept would connect the Aurora Square commercial area and Ridgecrest Neighborhood to the station. The Commission also considered a phased version of this scenario.
- **Compact Community.** This concept did not include any corridors, but did include more intense zoning in the area immediately around the station. The Commission considered a phased version of this scenario, as well.

Ms. Redinger presented the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative, which will be used as the base for the public hearing, and emphasized that the Commission can make revisions. She explained that the map is primarily based on the Compact Community Alternative, with some elements (mainly north of 155<sup>th</sup> Street) that more closely resemble the Connecting Corridor Phased Alternative. The map shows Mixed Use Residential (MUR) 70' as the base height limit, and retention of the existing R-6 zoning for the areas around Twin Ponds Park, Paramount Park, and Paramount Open Space. She reviewed the zoning designations as follows:

- MUR-35' has a height limit of 35 feet, which is the same as the Single-Family Residential Zones. However, it allows additional housing styles and the conversion of single-family homes to businesses along arterial streets. This zone is intended to be a transition between the existing single-family zones and other housing styles that may develop over time.
- MUR-45' has a height limit of 45 feet and would allow, but not require, a mixture of uses within a building. The zoning is intended for application along arterials within the subarea or as a transition between the MUR-70' and MUR-35' zones.
- MUR-70' is the zoning that was adopted with the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, as were the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones. Development in the MUR-70' zone will most likely be six to seven story, mixed-use buildings.

Ms. Redinger explained that, as outlined in the Staff Report, the Commission may choose to make certain revisions or keep certain revisions in place with regard to the Preferred Alternative based on the Wetland and Streams Assessment and Geotechnical Considerations for High Groundwater or Peat Conditions Memorandum, the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study, regulations from the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, public comment, Planning Commission Light Rail Station Committee proposals, and phased zoning.

Ms. Redinger specifically referred to the map showing the results of the Wetlands Assessment that was performed by the consultant, Otak. She emphasized that this assessment was scoped to be a reconnaissance, not a delineation, for public properties only. She recalled that the Commission has heard a lot of concern that this level of detail is not sufficient to look at the macro level because boundaries, etc. may change. She displayed the Critical Areas Layer from the City's internal GIS system, which was updated with the new Critical Areas Ordinance. She advised that staff is not recommending an overlay as part of the Preferred Alternative because this Critical Areas Layer represents what staff checks every time a site-specific development is proposed. Development within these areas will require a geotechnical report. Approval of permits for development in these areas will be based on this layer and not on a wetlands assessment.

Ms. Redinger reviewed the potential schedule for the remainder of the process. After the City Council selects the Preferred Alternative, Otak will prepare the FEIS that will be presented to the Commission in June and July along with the final subarea plan. In May, the Commission will consider potential Development Code amendments associated with the subarea plan and forward a recommendation to the City Council. As per the timeline, the City Council could consider adoption of all documents as early as September of 2016. She summarized that the purpose of the hearing is to solicit public comment, discuss potential revisions, and forward a recommendation to the City Council of a Preferred Alternative to be studied in the FEIS.

Chair Pro Tem Craft advised that, earlier in the day, the Commissioners received an email from Commissioner Chang stating her concerns and opinions and posing some questions. She also stated which alternative she supports for recommendation to the City Council. Because Commissioner Chang is not in attendance at the hearing, her support for any given alternative will not be considered in deciding a recommendation, if the Commission chooses to do so tonight. However, the email will become part of the public record and citizens can request a copy of the email by contacting the Planning Commission Clerk.

### **Public Testimony**

**Dave Lange, Shoreline**, commented that if the City cares about community and energy usage, getting people around businesses is job one, and getting busses running between town centers and transit is a close second. He recalled that he has previously mentioned several problems with the City's implementation of transit-oriented development (TOD), which works best with an existing business base and when business and transit is plentiful and regular in the middle of density. Ridgecrest is, at best, a half circle for development with a squishy wetland for 1/3 of it. TOD works well when the transit center is located within a pedestrian hub of activity, and he agreed with Commissioner Mork's assessment that the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study has failed its pedestrian mandate. He suggested it is time to think of 145<sup>th</sup> Street as the City's bus center and punt the idea of it being a walkable community.

Mr. Lange questioned if quadrupling the density of housing and only tripling the number of car trips around 145<sup>th</sup> Street would improve walkability. He expressed his belief that, unless the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study is revamped, there is little a new Sound Transit station can do to get out of the way of Shoreline's compact development. Instead of cars on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, they need busses there in order to link more of the City with transit and link more transit users with the town centers. Without bus lanes on the overpass, there won't be abundant transit around 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Cars would get 6 lanes, un-motorized transportation would get 2 lanes, and busses would fend for themselves. Given the mistake Sound Transit has built into their station (busses for one route running 7 days a week and up to 19 hours a day at 10-minute intervals), he feels justified to ask for no change in zoning from 145<sup>th</sup> Street to 155<sup>th</sup> Street and from the freeway to 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If they encroach on the borders and make 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue into East Northgate Way, there will be police directing traffic for years and emergency meetings at some point in the future. They can change some parts of the station, but staying on the current rail corridor has its limits. He urged the Commissioners to think carefully of their responsibility and their interest in driving in the area.

**Dr. Sarah Cooke, Seattle**, said she represents the Shoreline Preservation Society. She submitted written comments and asked that the Commissioners also refer to the comments she previously submitted on March 10<sup>th</sup>. She referred to the proposed Compact Community Hybrid Alternative and said her comments would focus on the southwest sector adjacent to the Paramount Open Space (between 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE). She specifically referred to a small stream that stops just short of crossing 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and pointed out there is an inconsistency with the City's GIS map. Currently, there are three tributaries that feed the area that is proposed for MUR-35' zoning. Although this area has been mapped by the City, the stream tributaries that currently pass through the backyards of every single residential lot to the west of 10th Avenue NE have not been included. Many of the lots are associated with wetlands, but none have been mapped. She concluded that zoning an area that is encumbered by critical areas to MUR-35' will be very problematic, if not virtually impossible.

Dr. Cooke referred to the inaccuracies she pointed out in her March 10<sup>th</sup> letter and said it is problematic for her to believe that the Commission can accurately evaluate the proposals that have been presented. Even after spending substantial money, it will be very difficult to know what is and is not accurate, especially since the database in place before the recent studies is more accurate than the new information. She asked the Commission to read her letter.

**Janet Way, Shoreline**, referred to a letter that was submitted just prior to the meeting by attorney's representing the Shoreline Preservation Association. She requested an extension of the comment period so that all pertinent information can be submitted before the Commission forwards a recommendation to the City Council. She commented that the Shoreline Preservation Society has concerns about the Planned Action Ordinance that will come before the Commission at some point in the future. If the ordinance is going to be part of the subarea process, it is important to keep in mind that State Law requires project level analysis as part of the FEIS. Although the City is saying that environmental review will be done as development is proposed, there is no project level analysis in the DEIS for the developers and/or the City to go by. With the Planned Action Ordinance, the public would be excluded from the process and would have no opportunity to comment or appeal. Any information to add to the discussion about critical areas, traffic, etc. will come only from the FEIS. She expressed her belief that adopting a Planned Action Ordinance would be a harmful environmental impact.

As mentioned by Dr. Cooke, Ms. Way said there are many errors in the addendum to the DEIS, and even the proposed Preferred Alternative has an error in that the creek is not identified. For these reasons, the public comment period should be extended, and there should be a separate notice for the Planned Action Ordinance to carefully consider the consequences. She said the society is asking that more Residential (R) 6 zoning should be retained. As mentioned by Dr. Cooke, the area west of Paramount Park is wetlands and streams run through the backyards. This entire area is critical to the wetland and should be considered for R-6 zoning. She recommended that the steep slope along 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should also be considered for R-6 zoning, as well as the houses on top of the slope.

Ms. Way said the Society is in favor of a Critical Areas Overlay, and the parks should not be part of the rezone. The Society would also like the Commission to consider potential impact fees. Currently, the City has an impact fee for transportation, but none for parks, schools, or other needed infrastructure. The Society would like the Commission to defer consideration of the DEIS until the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study has been completed. She recalled that at the April 5<sup>th</sup> special meeting of the Planning

Commission, it was obvious that many things were still unclear. She recommended that the City should have a Capital Facilities Plan in place before adopting the intensive zoning designations. She asked that the Commission consider the letter from the Society's attorney, as well as other letters that have been submitted.

**Liz Poitras, Shoreline**, referred to an area identified on the Compact Community Hybrid map, which shows two rectangles of MUR-45' zoning east and west on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and north of 155<sup>th</sup> Street. She requested the following changes:

- No rezoning north of 157<sup>th</sup> Street on both sides of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.
- The remaining chunk of the MUR-45' rectangle shown on the east side of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should be divided into MUR-35' in the north portion and MUR-45' in the south portion, or it could all become MUR-35'.
- Continue the strip of MUR-35' that is south of 157<sup>th</sup> Street all the way to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Ms. Poitras explained that most of the perimeter of the two combined MUR-45' areas on the map will remain R-6. Since the beginning of the project, the City has stated that it is important to buffer the R-6 areas from MUR-45' and higher zones. She pointed out that most of the homes in this area are 1 and 1.5 stories, not even close to the maximum height allowed for R-6 zones. The Compact Community Hybrid map shows that there is no road in this area to separate the MUR-45' from R-6 zoning. In addition, the topography of the area slopes downward going west from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and even the land that abuts the west side of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is below the grade of the street. The elevation at the intersection of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 156<sup>th</sup> Street is 409.7 feet compared to an elevation of 355 feet at the west end of 156<sup>th</sup>. This equates to a difference of 54 feet. For the R-6 homes west of the proposed MUR-45' zones, 45-foot buildings would seem even taller than 45 feet. She summarized that, with her proposed changes, there would be no MUR-45' abutting R-6 zoning, and businesses on arterial streets would be allowed in the MUR-35' zone.

**John Lombard, Seattle**, said he represents the Thornton Creek Alliance, which includes residents of both Shoreline and Seattle. He explained that the upper third of the Thornton Creek Basin is within the City of Shoreline. He said the Alliance supports the Compact Community Hybrid as the best of the alternatives considered by the Commission. They appreciate the careful thinking and balancing of concerns that has gone into it, and they believe that staff has made a persuasive case against phased zoning, particularly with the current proposal. The Alliance also supports the revised Off-Corridor Bicycle Network, which adds a path through the Paramount Open Space, over the Green Network that was considered as part of the earlier Compact Communities Alternative. The Alliance supports maintenance of R-6 zoning adjacent to the Paramount Open Space and Twin Ponds Park; not just because of the reduced pressure on wetland habitats it would create, but because it supports the larger landscape approach to habitat that the Alliance articulated in its comments at the last Commission meeting and in its letters. As noted in the Staff Report, even left as R-6 zoning, the areas will likely see substantial redevelopment, which will have to meet the updated requirements of the Critical Areas Ordinance.

Contrary to Otak's report and based on their own map (Figure AW-1), Mr. Lombard said it does not appear that any of the single-family homes to the east of Paramount Open Space are actually located in

wetlands. However, many of these parcels are entirely within the buffers, which means that any redevelopment on them will continue to be nonconforming, whether it is R-6 or the denser zoning. He summarized that the Alliance appreciates the support of the City's Parks, Recreation and Tree Board for acquisitions to expand parks and protect wetlands around Paramount Open Space. They support the staff recommendation that any new development using the new zoning must be outside of wetland and stream buffers.

**Joe Cairo, Shoreline**, said he has lived in the Pacific Northwest since 1967 and has seen the area go through a lot of change. He has seen planning commissions and councils create plans that they were sure would solve problems but failed over and over again. He said he is particularly troubled that there are errors in the City's maps. He said he recognizes that change is coming and there will be more density. However, he is concerned about allowing this increased density to expand into the existing neighborhoods that make Shoreline great. Shoreline is a suburb and offers a great place to raise a family. However, he is concerned about increasing the ratio of unrelated single adults who are not stakeholders. These people are typically not interested in keeping the schools good and helping the community thrive and prosper. Absentee landlords and property managers should not become the order of the day in the neighborhoods. He encouraged the Commission to keep the increased density closer to the transit center rather than letting it expand into the neighborhoods.

**Frank Shields, Bellevue**, said he owns property near the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station and he supports the proposed Compact Community Hybrid Alternative. It appears to strike an appropriate balance and is well thought out. He expressed his belief that the community, in general, greatly needs the light rail system. The traffic is already horrible and the City is growing rapidly. For the new light rail system to work, there will need to be high nodes of density in order to maximize the number of people who can access the station via walking. Creating more density close to the station is the right approach, and it will give citizens of Shoreline an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the light rail amenity. He said he believes that light rail will be fabulous amenity for Shoreline, and it will increase property values in the area.

**Dia Dreyer, Shoreline**, commented that the map staff prepared to illustrate the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative is deceptive and is a visual riddle about which match stick is larger. She noted that Interstate 5 is nearly ¼ mile wide. Decades of studies have been done, both in and out of Washington, that repeatedly shown that a ½ mile walkshed is the generally-accepted limit of range and that ¼ of a mile is the primary increase in ridership. Although she does not live next to either of the parks that have been discussed so significantly, it does not change the fact that her voice is the same and she pays the same property taxes. She emphasized that the hybrid map is vague and her points may be mute. However, if there is still consideration of phased zoning, it needs to be approached logically. It is concerning to her that the MUR-35' zoning on the west side of Interstate 5, which is beyond a ½-mile walkshed, is included in all options. She is also concerned that if phased zoning were to be applied, the maps she has seen have excluded blocks that are within the ¼-mile walkshed from Phase 1. This will push development to the outskirts of the subarea. She observed that while MUR-35' and MUR-45' along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is considered Phase 1, it should be noted that most properties have already been developed to that standard. She pointed out that the majority of what was included in Phase 1 of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan was within a ½-mile walkshed. There are also a few instances where Phase 2 and even Phase 3 were within a ½-mile walkshed.

**Lorn Richey, Shoreline,** asked that the Commission base its decisions relative to zoning around the light rail stations on what is best for Shoreline residents. Focusing first on the residents' use of the light rail is the surest method of assuring the future success of the project for the entire community. Shoreline already has something that works, and they should be looking at the best way to integrate light rail into it. He cautioned that the Commission should not vote in favor of the Preferred Alternative thinking it will be an economic stimulus plan, since this gamble has been tried unsuccessfully elsewhere. While it may benefit a few, it does not benefit the general population. They should not vote for the Preferred Alternative thinking it will create more moderate priced housing and help low-income people and people of color. The Black Lives Matter movement attended a recent Town Hall event and confronted the Mayor on the very aggressive, dense zoning propositions and gave a brilliant critique of how it actually hurts people of color and the poor. Lastly, they should not vote to support the Preferred Alternative based on environmental tradeoffs. While light rail will help the environment and there are a lot of benefits to increased density, the City should be very careful in how density is integrated in the neighborhoods that are already functioning well. There was a big rush to approve the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, but if it had been done right, it could have become a model of sustainability and ecological integration with the neighborhood and existing environment. They now have a very aggressive plan in place that may not be best for the residents.

**Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline,** encouraged the Commission to reject the Staff's recommendation to remove the R-6 zoning near parks just so that MUR-35' zones can be studied in the FEIS. She voiced concern that the FEIS would be conducted by Otak, who wrote the Wetlands and Streams Assessment Technical Memorandum and concluded that rezoning would be better for critical areas. She suggested there is something circular about the relationship between the Otak Assessment and the forthcoming FEIS. She would have been more comfortable if the two documents were prepared by different consultants, and she is doubtful that that the same consultant will come to a different conclusion in the FEIS.

Ms. Saheki said the technical memorandum at least got a couple of things right through reconnaissance. Specifically, Otak was correct in the classification of the large wetland in Twin Ponds Park, which requires a buffer of 165 feet. While Otak did not delineate the wetlands in Twin Ponds Park, the Parks Department separately commissioned a wetland delineation. The report is not yet finished, but boundary flags have been placed in the park by the wetland biologist. These flags have been placed on the property line between the park and the houses on the north side of N 149<sup>th</sup> Street. If Otak is correct in its classification of the Twin Ponds Wetland, the buffer zone will cover not just the houses on the north side of N 149<sup>th</sup> Street; it will also encroach on the properties on the south side of N 149<sup>th</sup> Street. Therefore, she asked that the Commission include the south side of N 149<sup>th</sup> Street for R-6 zoning. She recognized that, at some future date, some of the properties could become part of the expansion of Twin Ponds Park, but that is mostly speculative at this stage. Therefore, it important for the City to do its best to protect the existing public wetlands. She reminded the Commission that after Aegis Assisted Living was built, a body of water on private land was lost. She summarized that keeping the present zoning will best serve the wetlands and Twin Ponds Park.

Ms. Saheki commented that there has been a lot of new information lately, including a Planning Commission meeting on April 5<sup>th</sup>. It seems it would serve the process if the Commission were to



continue the discussion and collect more public comment after tonight's hearing. She asked that the Commission delay their recommendation to the City Council for at least a few weeks.

**Michael Jensen, Shoreline**, said he lives within the subarea boundaries and loves his neighborhood. He also values light rail and recognizes there is opportunity in what the neighborhood can become. He commented that zoning typically guides what the neighborhood can become, and details matter. However, many of the risks to the neighborhood have much to do with the when and how of redevelopment. He recalled that the City's Planning Director indicated she had similar concerns when she asked for advice from other planning colleagues in September of 2014. She said, "This opens a lot of single-family zoned property up for redevelopment. We are concerned that, if opened up all at once, redevelopment will not transition well from the old to the new (spotty)."

Mr. Jensen recalled that phased zoning was the proposed solution, and the City Council adopted the approach as part of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan using the following language from Ordinance 706, "A phased-zoning approach provides for a more predictable pattern of redevelopment, insuring a cohesive, connective community that is supportive of transit while providing an opportunity to monitor development prior to allowing redevelopment of the entire area in a manner that could be inconsistent with the vision for the subarea."

Mr. Jensen emphasized that the residents of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea want these same benefits, and the former preferred alternative included phased zoning for blocks around the natural areas. However, the staff has now dropped phased zoning from the latest recommendation, despite admitting there were issues that it could help solve and despite the fact that by excluding it now they were eliminating it from consideration down the road. He said he disagrees with the reasons provided in the Staff Report for recommending against a phased approach. The report states that if Seattle is in charge of what happens south of 145<sup>th</sup> Street, there is no longer a reason to care about the sequence of development north of 145<sup>th</sup> Street. While spotty development was considered bad in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea, the Staff Report indicates that it would be good in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea because it would allow more variety of housing styles. Lastly, the Staff Report suggests that developers will not start building the densest, central buildings until after the light rail station opens in seven years. To allow more redevelopment to occur as soon as possible, the new recommendation turns the prior one on its head and encourages peripheral blocks, including those adjacent to natural areas, to redevelop first and the central core to redevelop second. He suggested this is backward and he questioned why the rush. He encouraged the Commission to take the extra time to get it right. He summarized that sequence matters. The results will be suboptimal if redevelopment happens from the edges towards the center. The quality of life during transition will also be worse if a lot of additional people and their cars arrive before new infrastructure is in place. He asked the Commission to consider phasing in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea, including blocks near natural areas. He asked them to guide the pace of change enough that it gets done right.

**Steve Schneider, Shoreline**, said he also lives within the subarea. He appreciates the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, which was very informative and allowed citizens an opportunity to interact with the Commissioners. He voiced concern that the maps presented at the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting appeared to be incomplete, and the plan does not address how to deal with 145<sup>th</sup> Street when residents from Bothell, Kenmore, Lake Forest Park, etc. are planning to access the light rail station via bus. He observed that the busses will not provide

easy access to the station because 145<sup>th</sup> Street is only two lanes. He recommended the Commission postpone its recommendation to the City Council until they have addressed exactly what will happen with 145<sup>th</sup> Street, which will be a major thoroughfare to and from the light rail station.

**Ginny Scantlebury, Shoreline**, commented that in all of the planning to date, she does not believe that enough has been done to address traffic issues. The larger population will create a need for more police and fire resources, which are already stretched. Schools and utilities must also be addressed as part of the infrastructure plans. She recalled that citizens raised infrastructure concerns at multiple hearings for both the 185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plans, but they were ignored.

Ms. Scantlebury recalled comments made in 2015 by City Council Members to City residents who attended a meeting regarding the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. City Council Members said not to worry about massive redevelopment happening overnight as the process will be very long and nothing will happen for quite some time. However, as soon as the ink dried and the up-zoning occurred for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea, residents started getting slammed by developers and realtors harassing them to purchase their properties. It has even started in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea, although nothing has been finalized. She encouraged the City to be truthful with citizens. She also asked the Commission to postpone action until more study has been done.

**Lindsay Hanna, Shoreline**, said she recently purchased a home within the subarea because she was excited about the proposed light rail amenity. She has been following regional growth trends and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) estimates that by 2040, there will be 1 million new people in the area. A number of people have encouraged the Commission to slow the process down and postpone their decision. However, it is important to note that over the past year, 63,000 new people came to the region. She recognized that deciding where to accommodate the additional growth is difficult, but change and growth will continue to occur. A huge public investment will be made for the new stations, and it is the City's responsibility to the public and future generations to ensure that as many people as possible can use the asset. When thinking through different alternatives, she noted there are pockets of single-family homes. She encouraged the Commission to consider whether this decision was based on something that is ecologically threatening to the parks or something else. She urged them to consider how important it is that as many people as possible can live within walking distance to light rail. Whether they like it or not, people will be moving to the area, and they will need a place to live and she supports compact growth around the light rail stations.

**Tom Lauler, Shoreline**, said he supports the Connecting Corridor Alternative because he believes development would be stronger when connected to other areas of development. Particularly, he suggested that the rezoning of 155<sup>th</sup> Street should be connected to the Community Renewal Area of Aurora Square. As a young person who recently moved to Shoreline, he feels he has a stake in the community. As a conservationist who has done ecological restoration in the City, he feels comfortable and satisfied with the City's efforts on remediation and the environmental integrity of the area. He urged the Commission to keep the momentum going. Growth is happening, change is happening, and people are moving to Shoreline.

**Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline**, agreed that changes are occurring and the City needs to be prepared. However, the City cannot be prepared if they do not have all the information when making decisions.

The Preferred Alternative will not fit within the current restrictions imposed by existing traffic conditions, existing habitat, or the needs of the current residents. She referred to the map provided by staff to illustrate the critical areas, which is considered each time an application for development is submitted. If that is the case, she questioned why the City would rezone properties within these areas to higher density. She suggested that the Critical Area Layer should be overlaid onto the Preferred Alternative map to determine whether or not the high-density zoning is appropriate in areas that are considered buffer zones for wetlands. She suggested there will be increased problems with flooding and other infrastructure challenges. It will also confuse developers who purchase property based on zoning, but later learn that properties are not developable. She cautioned that the City should not move the subarea plan forward before the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study has been completed. She also cautioned that adopting a Planned Action Ordinance would cut the City off from a valuable source of information provided by people who live in the area. She recommended a zoning overlay instead of a Planned Action Ordinance. This would allow citizens to continue to have a voice in designing their own community as it grows and changes. Rather than a top-down approach, she suggested that planning be done together as a community. The community cannot afford the costly lawsuits that result from the top-down approach.

**Deborah DeMoss, Shoreline**, said she lives within the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea and she supports the concerns raised by residents who live in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. She urged the Commission to be prudent and wise in their decisions. Do not run with the staff's recommendation just because they say it is good and sound. It is not sound for anyone to rush because of the almighty dollar. She said Seattle is a good example of what can happen when planning is rushed. While she loves the shops and restaurants, she refuses to go there because of the changes that have taken place and the horrific traffic. She does not want Shoreline to be like that. She urged the Commission to base their decisions on what the public is saying. She shared that the street she lives on is a nightmare because decisions were made and changes were allowed to occur without providing sufficient infrastructure improvements. Additional study related to infrastructure, city resources, traffic, etc. needs to be done before the Commission makes a recommendation.

**Jeff Eisenbrey, Shoreline**, expressed his belief that a Planned Action Ordinance is inappropriate for a project of this scale, and it is without precedent in North America. As originally proposed, the Planned Action Ordinance would have made all existing uses in the rezone area non-conforming, and thus illegal and challengeable in court by developers. The staff's early recommendations have given the residents in the area cause to wonder. Staff is deeply invested in a very exciting plan, and they are thrilled to see a dense, urban area built. Informed by development interests, staff has been chipping away at the language that defines the realities on the ground. They have introduced inaccuracies, which endanger wetlands, enjoyment of properties, and the investments that land owners make to their lands and homes. He urged the Commission to take care that the development community is not provided the means to get a legalistic foot in the door, and thus, adversely impact the community.

Mr. Eisenbrey suggested that the course and quality of development must be regulated beyond zoning. Phasing, construction standards, realistic parking impacts, and expansion of community infrastructure (schools, stormwater, sewers and public space) must all be spelled out in detail before the first permit applications are accepted. If this is not done, developers' attorneys will force unintelligent decisions that will impact property owners and the City forever. Planning must be more holistic if the City is to

see beautiful, ecologically sound, livable, and lasting work done that does not make victims of current City residents.

**Cathy Aldrich, Shoreline**, said she has lived in the Paramount Park Neighborhood for over 30 years. She agreed that light rail is coming and the City cannot avoid greater density. However, it should be taken very slowly. She referred to Virginia and the Washington D.C. area where there are great transit options, but traffic is still a nightmare. The same could happen in Shoreline if the City is not careful. She recalled that when she moved into the neighborhood, there were many more businesses on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Although there was a population that supposedly could support the businesses, most are gone now. She agreed that additional study is needed. The people who live in the area will suffer the greatest affects. Again, she asked the Commission to slow down the process. She noted that, although the light rail station on Roosevelt in Seattle has not even opened yet, the community has totally changed. Change can happen quickly.

**Jan Stewart, Shoreline**, said she also lives within the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. She referred to a written letter she submitted prior to the meeting. She said she agrees with many of her neighbors who have raised concerns about whether or not the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study is sufficiently complete for the subarea plan to move forward. She said she supports additional R-6 zoning around the parks, particularly Paramount Open Space and Twin Ponds Park, which are both sensitive areas.

Ms. Stewart noted that residents living between 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE were part of the Southeast Subarea Plan, which was adopted in 2011 and intended to be a 20-year plan. She asked why these properties are now included in a different subarea plan without being noticed of revisions to the previous plan.

Chair Pro Tem Craft thanked citizens for their comments. The Commission appreciates the input they provided. He said he particularly appreciated the opportunity to tour the Paramount Open Space with Janet Way.

### **Commission Deliberation and Recommendation**

Commissioner Moss-Thomas referred to Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) requirements, which pertain to where the non-motorized bridge can be located and make it highly unlikely that the bridge could be located further north on 147<sup>th</sup> Street. She asked the process for addressing the bridge at some point in the future if it is not addressed as part of the FEIS. Ms. Redinger clarified that, at this time, the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council as to what should be studied as part of the FEIS. This is not a hearing to adopt zoning. The 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study is a continuum, and the first year was specifically focused on developing a preferred concept, which is set to be approved by the City Council on April 11<sup>th</sup>. The Preferred Concept will go through a process of final design and additional Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study.

Ms. Redinger explained that the Preferred Concept identifies three segments of the corridor (Lake City Way to the I-5 interchange, I-5 interchange to Aurora Avenue North, and Aurora Avenue North to Greenwood), and each segment has different concepts. The April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting was intended to solicit more information about the interchange section, which is the only section that was still being debated by

the City Council. She recalled that the City Traffic Engineer spoke with the City Council and other transportation planners and traffic engineers on March 21<sup>st</sup>, and the pedestrian bridge at 147<sup>th</sup> Street was one of the major topics the City Council wanted to discuss further. At this point, it appears that the bridge will remain in the preferred concept, and the Commission could recommend an amendment to the map to include the line to be studied in the FEIS. She emphasized that the FEIS does not start until after the City Council has selected the preferred alternative. Citizens are welcome to submit comments pertaining to the map prior to and at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> City Council Meeting. She noted that the DEIS goes into great detail about impacts to schools, utilities, roads, water, parks, etc., and what will be needed during the 20-year and build-out time frames to accommodate the anticipated growth. It also identifies specific mitigation measures.

Chair Pro Tem Craft asked staff to address Ms. Stewart's question about what will happen to the Southeast Subarea Plan. Ms. Redinger explained that rather than adopting Comprehensive Plan designations, the area was identified as a special study area. The purpose of the Southeast Subarea Plan was to define Comprehensive Plan designations for the area. The subarea plan also includes policy statements for every category that is included in the Comprehensive Plan, which are consistent with and have informed the station subarea planning process. Although the boundary of the Southeast Subarea Plan was expanded to the west side of Paramount Park, the primary focus of the study was to determine Comprehensive Plan designations for the area east of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Commissioner Montero said he believes that the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study satisfied many of the Commission's questions pertaining to what needs to be done at the I-5 Interchange. He noted that bicycle pads have been identified on the map, and there was a small change from the original Off-Corridor Bicycle Network concept to run straight down 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue N from 155<sup>th</sup> Street and then jog north or south to the pedestrian bridge on either 147<sup>th</sup> or 145<sup>th</sup> Streets. If the intent of the network is to get bicyclists off of the major arterials, he proposed that a path also be added on 147<sup>th</sup> from Meridian to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue N.

Commissioner Malek noted that the proposed 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea is only half the size of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. He asked how much the total area would increase if the Compact Community Hybrid were to include more of a connecting corridor concept that extends out towards the Community Renewal Area. Ms. Redinger agreed to provide the information, which is included in the DEIS. The Commission agreed that it would increase the subarea by a moderate amount. Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if this option would have to be specifically studied as part of the FEIS. Ms. Redinger answered that the analysis done as part of the DEIS would also be included in the FEIS, and the final map would have to be consistent with the "bookends" that were analyzed through the EIS process. The Commission could recommend an expanded preferred alternative recognizing that it could be amended to include less, but not more, area than what was studied in the EIS. Because the Connecting Corridor Alternative will be analyzed in the FEIS, as it was analyzed in the DEIS, the boundaries could be expanded as suggested by Commissioner Malek. However, the idea is to select an alternative that identifies the most accurate impacts so that appropriate mitigation can be identified.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked how much acreage is included the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative in relationship to the entire City. Ms. Redinger said the alternative represents roughly 4% of the zoned area in the City. Commissioner Moss-Thomas recalled several previous conversations about

how zoning smaller areas has a greater benefit to the community as a whole because the density would not be spread out in spot pockets. Ms. Redinger explained that City must show, through its zoning, that it can accommodate a certain target for households and jobs. The City does not need to rezone the subarea to accommodate the target, but the current philosophy is to focus the growth in mixed-use nodes near transit rather than spreading the growth throughout the entire City, including residential neighborhoods.

Commissioner Mork clarified that, when a development application is submitted, staff reviews the Critical Areas Layer Map to determine if the property is located within a critical area or its buffer. If so, a geotechnical study would be required. Ms. Redinger summarized that the Wetlands and Streams Assessment was intended to provide more information about what would be better for the health of the wetlands, and the Critical Areas Layer Map is used to require site-specific delineation. The layer map is continually updated with each geotechnical report that comes in. Commissioner Mork summarized that, using the Critical Areas Layer Map would address the concerns raised by citizens that a developer may be able to avoid a geotechnical report if the site is assessed during the dry months. Ms. Redinger said there is more to the evaluation than whether or not the site is wet, and completing a geotechnical report in the summer can provide more information about the types of plants that grow in the area. She explained that the scope of work of the Twin Ponds delineation includes a parcel-by-parcel review; and once done, the information will be added into the City's GIS layer.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that even if the map is not clear as to whether a critical area exists, staff visits properties when a development application is submitted. Mr. Cohen said the City recently adopted an update to its Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) to be much more specific, stringent and thorough. Because it now includes a list of items that must be analyzed in critical areas reports, the City can rely more heavily on the reports before going forward with an application for permit approval.

Commissioner Maul asked if there would be a separate hearing for the Planned Action Ordinance, and Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively. Commissioner Maul asked if a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review would still be required for specific projects if a Planned Action Ordinance is adopted for the subarea. Ms. Ainsworth Taylor emphasized that the Planned Action Ordinance is not currently before the Commission for consideration. Before the Commission at this time is the consideration of what to study in the FEIS. The Planned Action Ordinance will be addressed at a later time.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE TO BE STUDIED FOR THE FEIS AS PRESENTED BY STAFF, BUT TO EXPAND THE REVIEW TO INCLUDE MUR-35' REVIEW FOR ALL AREAS CURRENTLY SHOWN AS R-6 AND TO REVIEW NON-MOTORIZED OPTIONS FOR ACCESS TO THE NORTH END OF THE STATION, INCLUDING A POTENTIAL PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE.**

**AFTER FURTHER CONSIDERATION, COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS WITHDREW HER MOTION.**

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE COMPACT COMMUNITY MAP (ALTERNATIVE 3) AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE TO BE STUDIED FOR THE FEIS. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Malek expressed his belief that the Compact Community Alternative has the highest density and offers the most area for study. As the process moves forward, the subarea can be made smaller and the density lower. However, it is not possible to increase the density and area beyond what is studied in the FEIS. He recalled comments made by Mr. Lauler and Ms. Hanna about the need to make the most use of the public transit. As proposed, the higher density would only apply to 4% of the City's 11 square miles. He also expressed his belief that MUR-70' to MUR-85' is more appropriate and would allow the City to preserve as much of the wetland and park area as possible. He voiced support for expanding Paramount Park, as discussed at an earlier meeting.

Commissioner Maul indicated that when he seconded the motion, he thought it was to recommend the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative.

**THE MOTION FAILED 1 TO 5, WITH COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN FAVOR.**

**COMMISSIONER MONTERO MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE TO BE STUDIED FOR THE FEIS. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

*(For clarity, the amendments to the main motion are numbered below.)*

**1. COMMISSIONER MORK MOVED THAT THE MAIN MOTION BE AMENDED TO CHANGE THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP AS FOLLOWS:**

- **ADD THE MISSING PORTIONS OF THE GREEN NETWORK CONCEPT WITHIN THE SUBAREA TO THE OFF-CORRIDOR BICYCLE NETWORK.**
- **INCLUDE THE SECTION OF 45H AVENUE NE TO THE NORTH TO THE END OF THE SUBAREA.**
- **THE SECTION OF 155<sup>TH</sup> STREET BETWEEN 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE AND MERIDIAN AVENUE WILL SHOW THE SAME PROPOSED BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN LANE DESIGNATION AS THE SECTIONS DESCRIBED ABOVE.**
- **THE PROPOSED BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN LANES CURRENTLY DRAWN ON THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP SHOULD ALL BE ANALYZED TOGETHER.**

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE AMENDMENT.**

Commissioner Mork explained that the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study clearly indicated that bicycles do not fit on the roadway; and in her mind, the proposed Off-Corridor Bicycle Network is not robust enough. It does not have enough inner connections, given that the goal is to have as many people out of cars as possible. Having pleasant bicycle and pedestrian lanes that provide access to the

station without having to use 145<sup>th</sup> Street is critical. The bicycle lanes need to be separate and protected so people feel safe.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if the proposed amendment encompasses the potential non-motorized bridge on 147<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Mork answered no, but agreed that the non-motorized bridge needs to be part of the FEIS study.

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED A SUB-MOTION TO ADD TO THE AMENDMENT THAT THE PEDESTRIAN NETWORK SHOULD INCLUDE A NON-MOTORIZED BRIDGE CROSSING OVER THE FREEWAY AT 147<sup>TH</sup> STREET. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Montero explained that the purpose of the motion is to keep non-motorized transportation off of 145<sup>th</sup> Street, which will be extremely congested due to rush-hour traffic.

Commissioner Montero noted that a path is shown along the Jackson Golf Course, but the current path stops mid-stream at Jackson. He asked if there is a future plan to make the path more accessible. Mr. Szafran said the bike network from the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study was superimposed onto the Off-Corridor Bicycle Network, so there is a plan to make this connection in the future. Ms. Redinger noted that the Commission can provide specific direction relative to this path and others as part of their discussion on subarea plan policies.

**THE SUB-MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**THE AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED BY THE SUB-MOTION.**

- 2. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO INCLUDE ALL AREAS THAT ARE CURRENTLY ZONED R-6 ON THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP TO BE ANALYZED AS MUR-35'. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Moss-Thomas explained that, although they could retain all of the existing R-6 zoning, it is likely that prospective owners will request rezones at some point in the future for properties that are surrounded by higher density. It makes sense to evaluate whether MUR-35' zoning will work. If it will not work, at least they will have some basis for the decision.

Commissioner Montero recalled that the Parks Department has recommended that the properties be examined for future acquisition to expand the parks. If the properties are considered for MUR-35' zoning and the property values increase, the City will no longer be able to purchase them. Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that she is simply asking that MUR-35' zoning be studied in the FEIS; she is not suggesting that it should be the Commission's recommendation.

Chair Pro Tem Craft said he understands the need to study all potential zoning. However, he agreed with Commissioner Montero and said he would prefer not to include MUR-35' as potential zoning



for these properties. The idea of the opportunity and possibility of expanding the Paramount Open Space and Paramount Park is important and something the community should encourage. He also voiced concern that including MUR-35' as potential zoning in the FEIS could increase property values just on the hopes that zoning will change in the future. This could negatively impact the City's ability to acquire the properties for park space.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said it appears that the major concern is related to the properties near the Paramount Park and Paramount Open Space. She clarified that she is also talking about the areas that are north of 155<sup>th</sup> Street, west of Twin Ponds Park, and west of Meridian Avenue. She asked if Chair Pro Tem Craft and Commissioner Montero are opposed to considering MUR-35' zoning for any of these properties. Chair Pro Tem Craft said he used the properties near the Paramount Park Open Space as an example, but he also has the same concerns about the R-6 zoned properties to the northwest and south of Twin Ponds Park. He would prefer that these properties not be examined under the MUR-35' zoning.

Commissioner Mork voiced caution that the value of properties in the subarea are likely to increase. However, the Staff Report indicates that the Parks Department can acquire the properties regardless of how they are zoned. From her perspective, people who live by the park should be able to sell their properties for the full market rate, and restricting the zoning to R-6 presents an ethical question. She expressed her belief that MUR-35' zoning should at least be studied.

Mr. Redinger clarified that MUR-35' zoning was studied in the DEIS as part of the Compact Communities Scenario. The Compact Community Hybrid could be studied without the MUR-35' zoning, and the MUR-35' zoning could still be adopted at some point in the future because it has been studied. However, the intent is to get the Preferred Alternative as close as possible to what the final product will be so that the impacts and mitigations are as close as possible to what will be adopted for zoning. Commissioner Moss-Thomas added that including MUR-35' in the study would also allow the cumulative impacts of up-zoning to be addressed.

Commissioner Mork observed that all of the Commissioners desire the properties around the Paramount Open Space to be acquired by the City for park space. The only issue is what gives the City the most flexibility moving forward. She voiced concern that R-6 zoning will allow 35-foot high McMansions around the parks and normal people will not be able to live there. If the City does not acquire the properties for parks, the City should maintain the ability for market forces to factor into the properties' future.

Chair Pro Tem Craft expressed concern that studying all of the R-6 zoned properties for potential MUR-35' zoning is a bit of an overreach. He tends not to believe that the McMansion scenario will come to pass, and people will likely maintain the existing homes. Given the Critical Areas Layer Map, the opportunity for development in the area will be significantly impacted by the wetlands and slope. He does not believe that studying it as MUR-35' is the best approach.

Commissioner Malek pointed out that the height limit in the R-6 zone is the same as the height limit for MUR-35'. The only additional opportunity related to the MUR-35' zone is the mixed-use aspect. He did not feel that retaining the existing R-6 zoning would disadvantage property owners, and it

would not do anything to stigmatize or devalue properties. Instead, they would target the properties as something beautiful to expand into at market value. In order to get the anticipated density in the subarea, there will need to be plaza and open spaces, and the City should take advantage of the existing parks and open space.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas voiced concern that if the properties are not at least studied as MUR-35', they must remain designated as R-6 and be subject to the zoning regulations for R-6. That means they would not have to address issues such as impervious surfaces, that the MUR-35' zoning will require developers to address. Mr. Szafran pointed out that the R-6 zoning regulations also address hardscape, building coverage, surface water management, etc.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION FAILED 2-4, WITH COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MONTERO, MAUL AND CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT VOTING IN OPPOSITION AND COMMISSIONERS MOSS-THOMAS AND MORK VOTING IN FAVOR.**

- 3. COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE THE ZONING ON THE EAST AND WEST SIDES OF 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE, NORTH OF 155<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO MUR-35'. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Maul said he has visited the properties and believes the motion would be consistent with Ms. Poitras' recommendation. Commissioner Montero concurred.

Chair Pro Tem Craft said he is not comfortable with the proposed MUR-35' designation in the area north of 155<sup>th</sup> Street. It moves beyond the boundaries of the compact community concept, which he supported. He asked if the intent was to take advantage of the arterial. Commissioner Moss-Thomas said it is anticipated that 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE will become a much busier street, as it will be a main thoroughfare between the 185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridors. Six or seven blocks further north, the area of Ridgecrest is becoming more of a boutique feel. The mitigation that may be required at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 155<sup>th</sup> Street for pedestrian, bicycle and car access remind her that this area may get expanded somewhat, making it less desirable. This corner area may be an opportunity to increase density without taking it from the other areas around Paramount Park or otherwise, and MUR-35' zoning would give the corner area more opportunity to be addressed for infrastructure improvements that benefit the entire City. She is not in support of Commissioner Maul's motion.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that the property on the west side of the street is considerably lower from the road and does not lend itself to MUR-45' zoning. The property on the east side goes up, and a 45-foot height limit would be quite imposing. In addition, these properties are bordered by R-6 zoning, which means there would be no transition.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION WAS APPROVED 5 TO 1, WITH COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

- 4. CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO REZONE EVERYTHING NORTH OF 155<sup>TH</sup> STREET FROM I-5 TO 13<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE TO MUR-35' RATHER THAN MUR-45'. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Pro Tem Craft asked staff to clarify the allowed uses in MUR-35' versus MUR-45', particularly as it applies to non-conforming, single-family homes. Ms. Redinger answered that a property owner could build a completely new single-family home in the MUR-35' zone as per the code that was adopted with the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. However, existing housing would become non-conforming in the MUR-45' zone. While there are ways to expand or rebuild existing single-family homes in the MUR-45' zone, no new single-family homes would be allowed.

Chair Pro Tem Craft said that while he understands that 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 155<sup>th</sup> Street are busy corridors, he does not support designating areas north of 155<sup>th</sup> Street that are currently zoned R-6 as MUR-45'. Doing so would make all of the existing residential homes become non-conforming uses. From a study standpoint, MUR-35' zoning would allow existing homeowners to feel comfortable that they have a conforming use on their property.

Commissioner Mork asked what would be required if there is an interest to up-zone these properties at some point in the future. Ms. Redinger answered Comprehensive Plan designations normally denote a range of zoning designations, but the Station Area Comprehensive Plan Designations are each tied to a specific zoning designation. She summarized that it would be possible to change the zoning at some point in the future, but it would be more difficult because it would require both a Comprehensive Plan amendment and a Development Code amendment.

Again, Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she would like to study the most intense uses. While she is not necessarily supporting the change, studying the potential would provide helpful information.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION FAILED BY A VOTE OF 3 TO 3, WITH CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT AND COMMISSIONERS MAUL AND MONTERO VOTING IN FAVOR AND COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MORK AND MOSS-THOMAS VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

- 5. CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF THE AREA NORTH OF PARAMOUNT OPEN SPACE BETWEEN 152<sup>ND</sup> STREET AND 153<sup>RD</sup> STREET FROM MUR-35' TO R-6 ZONING. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chair Pro Tem Craft explained that the proposed amendment would reasonably adjust the map to a more accurate representation of those areas that could be designated for acquisition as part of the open space in the future. A non-motorized connection through the area would create a more effective transfer of people. This area is not designed for mixed-use, and the R-6 designation would be best.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION WAS APPROVED 4 TO 2, WITH CHAIR PRO TEM CRAFT AND COMMISSIONERS MAUL, MONTERO AND MALEK VOTING IN FAVOR AND COMMISSIONERS MORK AND MOSS-THOMAS VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**THE MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL THE COMPACT COMMUNITY HYBRID MAP, AS AMENDED, TO BE STUDIED AS THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IN THE FEIS WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Chair Pro Tem Craft closed the public hearing. He encouraged the citizens to continue to participate in the process and voice their opinions and concerns.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Cohen did not have any items to report.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Commissioner Malek reported that the Point Wells Committee continues to work with the City's Traffic Engineer and will be meeting again with Mr. McCormick prior to the next meeting regarding his proposed amendments.

Chair Pro Tem Craft requested an update on Point Wells issues in the near future. Mr. Cohen agreed to discuss the request with Director Markle and prepare an update for the Commission's next meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS – ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Ms. Basher briefly reviewed the procedure for electing officers and then opened the floor for nominations for Planning Commission Chair.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS NOMINATED COMMISSIONER CRAFT TO SERVE AS PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS AND NOMINATIONS WERE CLOSED. THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY ELECTED COMMISSIONER CRAFT AS CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

Chair Craft opened the floor for nominations for Planning Commission Vice Chair

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS NOMINATED COMMISSIONER MONTERO TO SERVE AS PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS AND NOMINATIONS WERE CLOSED. THE COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY ELECTED COMMISSIONER MONTERO AS VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Szafran advised that the next meeting agenda will include a continuation of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket and Development Code amendments related to Sound Transit activities.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

---

Easton Craft  
Chair Pro Tem, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission