

**From:** [Dave Lange](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [John Norris](#)  
**Subject:** 8b) 145th Rezone  
**Date:** Thursday, April 28, 2016 8:36:59 PM  
**Attachments:** [Council 5-2.pdf](#)

---

For your consideration, including some articles for your reading pleasure,

Dave Lange, Shoreline

I have comments on the upzone subarea, why the success of TOD tied to business varies by location and ideas on the concept of “destination Places”.

Lets put list some documents and useful pullouts. The minutes of the 2/19/2015 Planning Commission meeting are at: <http://www.cityofshoreline.com/Home/ShowDocument?id=19953>

(Page 21) Commissioner Montero suggested a three-phased approach, with nothing being done until the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study has been completed. If the study includes a plan to improve the corridor to support additional density, the City could move forward with Phase 1... Commissioner Malek agreed that a staggered approach to phasing so that one phase is predicated on the milestone of another would be sensitive and incorporate the comments of the public.

(Page 22) Chair Scully said his understanding is that the corridor study would look at a range of options for improving capacity on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Hopefully, one of the options would be build out for the maximum possible upzone. (Page 21) Chair Scully argued the City would be in a better position to negotiate if the traffic impacts are all due to Sound Transit’s station and not the City’s upzones. (Page 18) Chair Scully moved that the commission recommend the city council not adopt the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) or any alternative pending completion of the transportation corridor study on NE 145<sup>th</sup> street. He further moved that the commission recommend the city council keep the public comment period open pending completion of the study, but take no further action on any of the items studied until the study is complete. It passed 6-1 with no further amendments.

Then the minutes of the 3/23/2015 Council meeting are at:

<http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/Council/Minutes/2015/032315.htm>

Councilmember Salomon moved to delay the adoption of the preferred alternative until after the 145<sup>th</sup> Corridor Study is completed. It passed unanimously.

Moving forward:

The foundation of comfortable growth is establishing a set of rules and enforcing them. We can have any parking policies we want, if you don’t have employees to enforce the policies, cars just scamper into the neighborhood next door. The availability of enforcement affects future multi-unit construction, affordable housing allowances and external station hide and rides around a 19 hour/day station.

While the upzone subareas suspend parts of the GMA, they shouldn’t ignore the carbon triangle. Lets generate some carbon, I mean lets look at TOD. There are plenty of glossy expectations about TOD, foot dragging Millennials, shopping by bus and the self driving car, upon which we can set expectations and see it works well in some places. Or there is a near quote from a Councilmember, they’ll commute by rail, be gone all day and come home and drive. Unfortunately the Bus Rapid Transit/High Capacity Corridor will run longer than commuting times and frequently advertised for weekend events.

Shoreline should have a goal to provide walkable communities, which includes business, and accessible transit. TOD varies in success by location much like you can’t drive an Indy car everywhere. The perfect explanation of fishing and the research to back it up are of little value when you are up a mountain peak. You may think I am anti-growth by the time you finish this; I’m against dumb density that generates more car traffic than growth should. This is sometimes caused by density being built where or when it shouldn’t. I

believe in smart density which includes preserving the businesses in Shoreline while increasing the use of transit and minimizing the use of cars and their carbon consumption, especially with my recent change in employer. There is a goal in Shoreline to promote reasonable growth. Dodging the 80% of trips by car while I'm walking or busses are crossing lanes can hardly be considered reasonable. The current plan is for 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to become busier (especially when you fix the errors in the draft analysis) than 145<sup>th</sup> is now. While adding ramps for pedestrians will make the station facility look like a spider with 4-5 ramps, there is less mitigation for the buses serving the station.

Shoreline's draft EIS for the suburban/residential 145<sup>th</sup> subarea lists expected trips by car to be 55% of total trips. Lloyds Center is an urban (business and residential) area near Portland that has reported that number before. In residential Ridgecrest we have no walkable business from the station and limited bus service pushing the trips by car up to 80-85% until we create a vibrant business community at the station. Even an apartment block in Lloyd's has reported an 80% of trips by car. Should walking commuters and buses have to interact with the additional car traffic centered in a compact model around the station? VTPI, in the Section on Density says "increasing urban residential population to 40 people per acre increased transit use from 2% to 7%. It is hard to create walkable transit with low participation rates." Hopefully you will agree the worst result of more traffic is for pedestrians to get in their car or roads so congested that the buses quit running. Almost equally bad is the driver willing to get out and try walking, but feeling safer in the car due to the increased traffic.

The literature cited also includes the following concepts:

TOD is a congestion generator; it is frequently used to move congestion from a critical area to a less fortunate area. What Commissioner Moss-Thonas calls the sufferage of 3-4% of Shoreline for the benefit of everyone else. In south Shoreline is there a higher priority than safe pedestrian access to the station from all directions first and bus routes serving the station second? We can build density anywhere, does it have to be everywhere?

TOD should not be implemented next to a highway on ramp. Density around a highway on ramp will attract driving commuters that want fast access to the freeway. Do you think that is a historical concept? Why is there a rumor of the first piece of identified density at 145<sup>th</sup> likely to be a hotel that wants fast access to the freeway for its customers? Is that TOD? Is that benefitting the pedestrians to the station? How do we limit car volumes on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and their impact on bus service if either of the growth alternatives is selected for the subarea?

TOD belongs in urban (business and residential) areas to reduce carbon burning car trips and increase walkability. The efficiency of TOD is tied to business/residential mix rather than transit, part of the secret of Urban Villages. Walkability is tied to sidewalks and crosswalks with traffic lights at regular intervals. Putting TOD on arterial corridors is just asking to slow down the route. Putting TOD on arterials and having garage and pedestrian access from the back will likely cost the city curbs, street lights and raised sidewalks to the nearest major road for safe pedestrian passage on streets where existing volumes are under 10 cars per hour and sidewalks are painted stripes on the road. TOD will add another 25-30 cars per hour.

TOD depends on available businesses, what I call smart density. Shoreline competes with the rest of the Puget Sound for businesses and creating new areas of "Place" will spread out existing businesses and marginalize survivability of our hard working business owners. If City Planning shifts to an Urban Village method and adds density around existing businesses it may increase their survivability. Blessing them with

new construction and higher rents may not keep them. It is hard to implement vibrant anything with marginal business areas everywhere.

The destination Place common with good TOD is ignoring some basic facts for Shoreline. Lets talk about "Place" relative to the 145<sup>th</sup> station. TOD works well in areas where the full circle has the potential for density. 145<sup>th</sup> only has a quarter radius of residential, half of it is freeway and the other quarter is a golf course. TOD works when you can have a plaza on one side of the station, but at 145<sup>th</sup> the station has a highway on ramp, a garage, a freeway and the 145<sup>th</sup> street overpass around it. TOD Place is easier to establish at 185<sup>th</sup> especially if Shoreline Center is a willing player. Having at least 2 residential areas competing for too few businesses doubles the unsuccessful places longer. There are serious reasons to start 145<sup>th</sup> station as a transit stop where commuters and transit modes converge. We have full expectation of additional rail between 3<sup>rd</sup> and Greenwood as well as 522/Lake City. Do we dive on every new station with added density and shifting businesses which thins them out temporarily or do we build long term strong business centers and use transit to connect commuters from home to the random stations and transit solutions? Shoreline wins with a strong transit solution between its pearls of density not investing to spread some density out closest to their primary need which requires burning carbon for all their other wants.

- 1) Robert **Cervero**, Arlie Adkins, and Cathleen Sullivan (2010), "Are Suburban TODs Over-Parked?" *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 13, No. 2; at [www.nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT13-2.pdf](http://www.nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT13-2.pdf)
- 2) <http://www.citylab.com/housing/2013/06/transit-might-not-be-essential-transit-oriented-development/5851/>
- 3) <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm45.htm>

Having read this would you could be surprised that I want to select the do nothing alternative 1 for the 145<sup>th</sup> upzone subarea plan and direct the city to move to an Urban Village method of planning?

Dave Lange, Shoreline