

From: [Debbie Tarry](#)
To: [Chris Roberts](#)
Cc: [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Heidi Costello](#); [John Norris](#); [Miranda Redinger](#)
Subject: FW: Questions about 145th
Date: Friday, April 29, 2016 5:02:24 PM

Chris –

Please see responses to your questions below. We'll add this to the green folder for Monday.

Debbie Tarry
City Manager
City of Shoreline
17500 Midvale Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

From: Miranda Redinger
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2016 4:57 PM
To: Debbie Tarry
Cc: Steve Szafran; Rachael Markle
Subject: FW: Questions about 145th

Answers in red.

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Roberts
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 8:51 AM
To: Debbie Tarry
Cc: Carolyn Wurdeman
Subject: Questions about 145th

Debbie,

Here are multiple questions about the 145th hybrid map.

1) North of 155th, there are changes made along 15th and on 5th compared to the connecting corridor map. Were these changes initiated by the subcommittee, staff, or residents? Are there changes between the connecting corridor map between 7th and 14th in the hybrid map in this area?

The changes shown on 15th were the result of public comment from a couple of property owners who argued that the character of that street had already changed from single-family because of existing uses that are allowed in R-6 zoning like churches and utility facilities.

The changes around 5th were recommended by the Planning Commission committee because that intersection is located between the future light rail station, Aurora Square, and the commercial district at NE 165th Street. They felt that extending the boundary north of NE 155th Street could provide additional opportunities for neighborhood-serving businesses and a cohesive streetscape. There are no new zoning changes between 7th and 14th Avenue on the Hybrid Map.

2) Can you produce a map showing the planning commission recommendation with a walkshed map from the station?

Yes, this will be provided in advance of Monday's meeting.

3) One of the concerns I saw in the public comments is that the wetlands map produced through the study was incomplete and missing wetlands that are shown in existing maps produced by the City. In addition, reading the report, I was struck by the minimalness the section is about the liquefaction risks (and building potential in a liquefaction zone). If I remember correctly, state law does allow people reasonable use of their property. What happens if someone purchases a property where a large percentage of the property is in a wetland, and wants to build or rebuild?

What were the planning commissions thoughts about retaining R-6 zoning east of Paramount Open Space and south of Twin Ponds?

- Wetlands map- In discussing the map produced for the Wetlands and Streams Assessment memo, it is important to keep in mind that the scope approved by Council for that work was a reconnaissance on public property, not a delineation including private property. This is why the buffers shown are not as extensive as other maps, including the Critical Areas (CA) GIS layer that the City actually uses to determine whether or not CA regulations apply when development is proposed. The purpose of the Wetlands and Streams Assessment was to answer the question of whether it would be better for the health of the wetlands and ecosystems to retain existing zoning (including homes that are non-conforming with regard to current CA regulations) or to have the area redevelop with more stringent stormwater and CA regulations.
- Liquefaction- The purpose of the Geotechnical Considerations for High Groundwater and Peat Conditions memo was to determine whether development envisioned under proposed zoning would be feasible given known geologic conditions. The answer is that there are many available engineering solutions to mitigate such conditions, but that it will take site-specific analysis to determine whether or not a project would pencil out once specific conditions have been determined and engineering solutions applied.
- Reasonable use- State law does say that owners must be granted reasonable use of their property. So if someone wanted to develop property that was encumbered by a wetland, stream, or buffer, they would go through a Critical Area Reasonable Use Permit (CARUP) process. Staff is proposing regulations that would require that if a development couldn't fit entirely outside of critical areas and buffers, then R-6 standards would apply when determining reasonable use. Because Critical Areas regulations would apply regardless of zoning, this could potentially create default R-6 zoning around Paramount Open Space and Twin Ponds park, even if the actual adopted zoning was MUR.
- R-6 zoning- The Commission supported retaining existing zoning around the open space and park. The primary reason was the number of public comments asking them to retain single-family zoning, but they also supported future City acquisition of these parcels for park and open space.

4) What were some of the reasons the Subcommittee decided to split the difference between

the compact community and connecting corridor map between 5th and 8th? In the past City staff have stated that there is a potential for hotels or corporate campuses in the sub area. My sense is that properties fronting 145th might be more conducive to these activities, especially hotels. Does staff have any insight into the retail/tourist potential of MUR 70 along 145th compared to areas north on 5th? Was there an initial guideline about zoning 1/4 mile from the station adopted by the Council? How does the Planning Commission map compare with the initial guidelines for light rail zoning?

- The Commission committee recommended extending MUR-70' to both sides of 5th for a cohesive streetscape and to create more opportunities for transit-oriented development close to the station. They decided to step down zoning with MUR-45' as a transition between the proposed MUR-70' to the west and MUR-35' to the east.
- Both the market reports prepared by Sound Transit and for the City show little probability for hotel development in the next 20 years.
- Land Use Policy LU29 states "Evaluate property within a 1/4 mile radius of a light rail station for multi-family residential housing choices (R-48 or greater) that support light rail transit service, non-residential uses, non-motorized transportation improvements, and traffic and parking mitigation." The Commission recommendation supports this policy.

5) What were the conversations that occurred in the subcommittee about phased zoning?

In order to discuss advantages and disadvantages of phasing zoning for the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, it is first important to lay out a few key differences between this subarea and the three-phased approach to zoning in the 185th Street Station Subarea. The 185th Street Station Subarea encompassed a full half-mile radius around the future stations, whereas the 145th Street Station Subarea encompasses only half of a half-mile radius because NE 145th Street is Shoreline's boundary with Seattle. Since the land considered for rezoning in the 185th Street Station Subarea covered a large geographic area, a Comprehensive Plan Land Use policy (LU34) provided additional guidance with regard to phasing zoning in the 185th Street Subarea.

The 185th Street Station Subarea also included the corridors of 185th Street to Aurora Avenue on the west, and 10th Avenue NE and NE 180th Street to the southeast. These corridors were included in the Subarea Plan based on Comprehensive Plan Land Use Policy 30 and the concept that came out of the Design Workshops that the subarea should connect Aurora Avenue and Town Center with North City.

In contrast to the zoning alternative that was adopted for the 185th Street Station Subarea, the Compact Community Hybrid alternative encompasses a smaller geographic area and does not include corridors that connect the subarea to Aurora Avenue or the Ridgecrest commercial district at 165th Street.

Given the smaller geographic area of study for the 145th Street Station Subarea, allowing for the full rezone to occur upon adoption of the Subarea Plan provides more certainty for property owners and real estate market forces with regard to redevelopment potential. Being able to utilize new development standards throughout the subarea would also allow for a greater variety of housing styles to be constructed. Some supporters of the concept of phased

zoning have suggested that a phase I for the 145th Street Station Subarea rezone should encompass just the MUR-70' zoned property immediately adjacent to the station. The market analysis done for the both the Lynnwood Link Extension EIS and the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan DEIS both indicate that development in the MUR-70' is likely to occur closer to and after the light rail station is operational. In most cases, six to seven story buildings would require aggregation of multiple parcels. A major factor in the marketability of these types of developments would be proximity to transit. Since the station will not be operational until 2023, and parking reductions based on proximity to transit would not be effective until this time, it is less likely that developers would see projects in this area as viable in the near term.

However, this is not the case with MUR-35' and MUR-45' zoning. Since there is so little land available in the city for lower density multi-family dwelling units, staff believes that there is a pent up demand for housing styles such as townhomes, row houses, and smaller apartment buildings. It is more likely that these housing styles would be marketable even prior to the start of light rail service. Height limits in the MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones were intended to be compatible with existing or potential single-family homes while supporting additional housing choice in the neighborhoods. The MUR-35' and 45' zones also allow for the development of neighborhood-serving businesses along arterials.

Additional housing styles could begin to increase population density in ways that would support emerging local businesses, which in turn help to create a sense of place. Redevelopment could begin to fill in the sidewalk network and improve stormwater infrastructure. Places that include amenities like shops, restaurants, gathering places, walkability, and future transit service tend to attract more interest from potential residents and investors.

Therefore, the Commission did not recommend using phasing as a tool in the 145th Street Station Subarea. However, it is important to note that if phasing is not studied in the FEIS, then it cannot be adopted as part of the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan and rezone without the City preparing an addendum or a supplement to the EIS.

6) In the Subcommittee map, there are R-6 properties along 14th across the street from MUR 45. There are R-6 properties along 12th across the street from MUR 70 (and MUR 45). There is an R-6 property south of Twin Ponds which is across the street from a MUR 70 (and multiple properties across the street from MUR 45). There are also R-6 properties adjacent to and across the street from MUR 45 along 5th north of 155th. was the Council been consistent in transitional zoning in the 185th area?

Generally speaking, streets have been considered an appropriate buffer between different heights because typically you have at least a 60 foot separation between the zones. For 185th, Council adopted a 10 foot step-back at 45' of building height or a 10 foot setback for the entire building for properties zoned MUR-70' when fronting a street. This was done to be more pedestrian-friendly. The Council declined discussion of transition design standards that would create additional requirements when transition zoning is not in place, but staff could develop such standards if directed.

Thanks,

Chris

Chris Roberts
Mayor, City of Shoreline
croberts@shorelinewa.gov
(206) 391-2733