

# DRAFT

## CITY OF SHORELINE

### SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

May 19, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

#### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Craft  
Vice Chair Montero  
Commissioner Chang  
Commissioner Maul  
Commissioner Mork  
Commissioner Moss-Thomas

#### **Staff Present**

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

#### **Commissioners Absent**

Commissioner Malek

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

#### **ROLL CALL**

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

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of May 5, 2016 were adopted as submitted.

#### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no general public comments.

## **STUDY ITEM: DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL POLICIES FOR THE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN**

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger said the focus of the study session is the policies that will be included in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. She briefly reviewed the timeline for the subarea plan, which is intended to conclude with City Council review and adoption in September of 2016. She advised that the staff and consultant are currently working on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), which will be followed by the subarea plan document.

Ms. Redinger explained that subarea plan policies are adopted into the Comprehensive Plan and then filtered into the functional master plans (Transportation, Parks and Surface Water) that are integrated into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP filters into the annual budget and staff work programs. Some subarea plans, such as the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan, include changes to the Comprehensive Plan Map and the Zoning Map. Other subarea plans, such as the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, also include development regulations that will influence site design and building permits.

When discussing policy, Ms. Redinger cautioned that it is important to keep in mind how they will be implemented and who will be responsible for implementation. Policies for transportation, parks and surface water are addressed in separate master plans, and the Commission can provide high-level direction for how the policies will filter down into actual capital projects. The Commission is also responsible for providing specific direction to the City Council relative to development regulations.

Ms. Redinger explained that the intent of the study session is to review the policies that were included in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, which have been adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan. In order for them to apply to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, they must be specifically included in that subarea plan. This is an opportunity for the Commission to identify the development regulations and policies in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan that should also be included in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. They can also provide general direction about the types of policies they would like to see included relative to transportation, parks and surface water. Staff will work with the various departments to craft specific language to incorporate the general direction, which could then be presented to the Light Rail Subcommittee for consideration before it is included in the subarea plan that will be presented to the full Commission.

Ms. Redinger provided a map to illustrate the boundaries of the Southeast Subarea Plan, which was adopted in 2010. She also provided a map of the Planning Commission's recommendation for the boundaries of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, specifically pointing out the area where the two plans overlap. She explained that it is important that this overlap be corrected so that the Comprehensive Plan is an internally-consistent document. To do this, the City Council could amend the boundary of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan when the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Docket is finalized on June 13<sup>th</sup>. If the City Council chooses to change the boundaries so the two subareas zip together, the following three policies would need to be moved from the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan:

- **Transportation.** Implement improvements along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to revitalize business, increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and usability, and add vehicle capacity where necessary.
- **Community Design.** Improve the area around 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue with place-making treatments, such as lighting, benches, and landscaping to identify it as a gateway to the city.
- **Parks, Recreation and Open Space.** Redevelop paths in Paramount Open Space to ensure at least one year-round connection between the east and west sides of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood.

Ms. Redinger invited the Commissioners to identify other policies in the Southeast Neighborhood Plan that they would like to move to or replicate in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan.

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the current schedule for moving the subarea plan forward, noting that the Commission would continue its discussion on potential Development Code amendments on June 2<sup>nd</sup>. Staff hopes to present the FEIS to the Commission on July 7<sup>th</sup>, followed by the subarea plan document on July 21<sup>st</sup>. On August 4<sup>th</sup>, the Commission will discuss the Planned Action, and the entire subarea plan package will be presented to the Commission for a final recommendation to the City Council on August 18<sup>th</sup>.

As requested by Commissioner Moss-Thomas, Ms. Redinger advised that three maps were included in the Commission's packet: the Off-Corridor Bike Network from the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study and two maps that show the current street classifications. She suggested that the Commission could have a discussion about the specific characteristics of different streets within the subarea. She recalled that the policies in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan talked about the need to perform a corridor study on the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. Since that study has already been done for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, it may be more important to discuss the characteristics of streets that are internal to the subarea.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if the intent is to have separate policy documents for the 185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plans. Ms. Redinger answered that starting with the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan policies, the Commission is being asked to consider what policies would also apply to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, what policies could be changed, and what unique policies could be added. No changes are being proposed to the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan.

Commissioner Mork clarified that the Commission is being asked to provide general direction for the elements that would be handled by the Transportation, Surface Water, or Parks Master Plans. Ms. Redinger explained that each would have its own process, and this is the Commission's opportunity to influence the outcome of future updates. For example, the Commission could provide general direction about what should be considered as part of the next Transportation Master Plan update. Once the general direction is adopted as policy in the Comprehensive Plan, it would provide guidance when the Transportation Master Plan is updated in the future. There would be a separate public process to implement the Comprehensive Plan policies into the various master plans.

### **Public Comment**

**Janet Way, Shoreline,** said she was present to represent the Shoreline Preservation Society. She recalled that the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan was being considered when she served on the

City Council in 2009. She asked if the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan would supersede or cancel out the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan or if it would have the same value and importance. Would the new plan cancel out the zoning that was established in the previous plan, which was primarily single-family residential? She recalled that after she left the Council, she wrote several letters on behalf of the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group relative to a number of issues, including the path through the park and fixing the culvert. In recent months, an attorney for the Shoreline Preservation Society has sent several letters to the City, specifically pointing out the confusion between the two plans and asking which plan would have precedence.

Ms. Way recalled that the City Council recently voted to have no preferred alternative for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, and several Councilmembers proposed alternatives for further discussion. Staff indicated that all of the suggested alternatives would be studied as part of the FEIS, but they have not been included in the Commission's packet for consideration. She commented that, at this time, all alternatives should be on the table for discussion, including those put forth by Councilmembers.

Chair Craft asked staff to discuss how the Council's decision to not identify a preferred alternative will impact the overall process. He also asked staff to talk about how the inconsistencies between the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan and the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan could be addressed in light of the various alternatives that are currently on the table.

Ms. Way advised that the Shoreline Preservation Society likes many of the policies contained in the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan, including the path through the park and other environmental aspects. However, she noted that both 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues are identified as neighborhood streets in the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan, and she questioned if these designations would be changed if the streets are incorporated into the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. She commented that 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a neighborhood street, and additional traffic could result in a negative impact.

**Patty Hale, Shoreline**, said she was present to represent the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Association. She said her comments would be limited at this time, since she had anticipated a more in-depth staff report. She agreed with Ms. Way that the Commission must do due diligence when considering how to meld the two subarea plans together. She reminded them that the Southeast Neighborhood Plan represents two years of citizen and staff work, as opposed to six months the Commission will have to deliberate on the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. She urged them to not only look at what the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan planned for, but the boundary lines that were the topic of considerable public input.

Ms. Hale suggested a tighter (smaller) boundary for Phase 1 the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. Early development should be concentrated directly around the station rather than allowing it to spread into the neighborhood. She asked them to remember that 185<sup>th</sup> Street is not like 145<sup>th</sup> Street in any way, shape or form. Many of the policies in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan are completely wrong for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, including wide-spread density and extreme building heights.

Ms. Hale reported that on May 17<sup>th</sup>, the Ridgecrest Neighborhood Association met with the Parks Department to look at long-range planning for the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan. The 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan was a topic of discussion; and unilaterally, citizens at the meeting agreed that development must pay for development. There was also concern about the loss of park land,

and no consideration has been made yet for how this loss of public property would be mitigated. General comment was that park land lost in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood needs to be replaced with new park space in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood.

**Dia Dreyer, Shoreline**, reiterated that if phased zoning is going to happen, it must be done logically and tightened down. She voiced opposition to the proposed Mixed Use Residential (MUR-35') zoning on the west side of the freeway. This area is outside of the watershed of a half mile. If the boundary is ratcheted down on the east side where it is more logical (on the same side of the freeway), the area on the west side of the freeway should also be excluded from Phase 1.

Ms. Dreyer voiced concern about what appears to be an attempt to squeeze through minimum-density zoning in the MUR-35' zone. She asked that the staff and Commission publicly explain the logic of how the minimum density requirement would satisfy detached town homes. She suggested that it is simply an excuse to apply a minimum density of 35, when it was decided that would not be the case.

### **Continued Staff and Commission Discussion**

Ms. Redinger reviewed that on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, the City Council deliberated about the preferred alternative map that the Commission forwarded to them. Four Councilmembers came to the meeting with proposed amendments, assuming they would get to a preferred alternative. Staff can provide maps of the potential amendments. However, it is important to understand that none of the amendments were adopted, as the City Council took action to not select a preferred alternative. This action was followed by a motion to look at phasing for each of the three action alternatives (Compact Community, Connecting Corridor, and Compact Community Hybrid). When the FEIS is published, it will analyze not only the No-Action alternative and the two action alternatives (Compact Community and Connecting Corridor) that were considered in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), but a fourth alternative (Compact Community Hybrid), as well as consideration of phasing for the three action alternatives.

Ms. Redinger said it is important to note that the four alternatives, plus phasing for three of them, will move through the FEIS, but the maps will not change again until the adoption phase. After the public hearing in August, it is anticipated the Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council on the entire subarea plan package (subarea plan, Comprehensive Plan designations, zoning designations, development code regulations, and Planned Action). The Commission could also choose to recommend changes to the zoning map as part of their recommendation to the City Council. At that point, the City Council could bring fourth the amendments that were previously discussed. Chair Craft asked if the City Council's proposed amendments would be studied as part of the FEIS, and Ms. Redinger answered that the changes would fall under the umbrella of what is being studied, but they would not be specifically studied. She reminded the Commission that the City Council can adopt something that is less intense than what was studied, but not something more intense. All of the City Council's proposed amendments would fall under the category of less intense than what was studied.

Ms. Redinger advised that the FEIS would look at the zoning scenarios over a 20-year time frame and at build-out using a growth rate of 1.5% to 2.5% to address population, employment, housing, transportation, utilities, parks, schools, public services, etc. The result of the FEIS will be a list of required mitigations to accommodate the growth level at 20 years and at build-out. As per the phasing

proposed by the City Council, Phase 1 would become affective in 2016 when the plan is adopted and Phase 2 in 2033. In a lot of ways, this phasing would be similar to the 20-year and build-out scenarios. She explained that as part of the FEIS, traffic models will be run for all three of the action scenarios. The traffic models will also extrapolate how it would be different if only the Phase 1 areas are open for development in the next 20 years.

Ms. Redinger recalled that the primary impetus for the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan was that when the Briarcrest Neighborhood was annexed into the City, it was not given specific Comprehensive Plan designations. Instead, it was given the designation of “Special Study Area.” The initial purpose of the plan was to work with citizens to identify the desired characteristics and lay down Comprehensive Plan designations and zoning that represent the long-term vision for the neighborhood. If the boundaries of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan are changed, all of the policies will still apply to the area that remains in the plan. Most of them are complimentary to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. For example, a lot of time was spent on how to create compatible development that maintains the desired neighborhood characteristics. The Briarcrest Neighborhood would not be impacted by the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea Plan, and the policies would still apply. However, if the boundaries are changed, the three policies identified earlier would be more appropriately housed in the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. The intent is to preserve the work done by those who crafted the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan.

Ms. Redinger said the intent of the proposed change to the boundaries of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan is to provide consistency in the Comprehensive Plan designations. Chair Craft summarized that staff is proposing to integrate the area on the west side of the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue/145<sup>th</sup> Street intersection into the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. Everything to the east would remain part of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan, and the policies would not change.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that the Commission is being asked to consider the critical elements that pertain to the portion of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan that is proposed to be moved to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. Ms. Redinger said staff is proposing that three policies be moved from the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan if the boundary change is approved. However, the Commission can recommend other applicable policies, as well.

Chair Craft asked staff to talk about the potential loss of parks and open space, including the idea of preserving existing parks and providing incentives for potential park expansions. Ms. Redinger said the City is in the process of updating its PROS Plan. Based on the proposed zoning, which defines the impacts and mitigations, it is clear that more park space will be needed to accommodate the growing population. However, it is up to the Parks Board, Parks Department, City Manager and City Council to talk about the mechanisms to get there. It is great that the PROS Plan will include an entire section about light rail station planning and the specific services that will be needed. In the past, the Parks Department has preferred, from a maintenance standpoint, to have larger parks (3 acres minimum) rather than smaller parks that are spread out. However, given the density proposed for the light rail stations, it may be appropriate to have smaller spaces or more specifically defined spaces. It is also important to consider what the demographics will be over time, and it is the Parks Board’s responsibility to address these details in the PROS Plan. The proposed subarea plan would not result in the loss of park space, but the goal is to provide more.

Director Markle advised that part of Ridgecrest Park would be impacted by the alignment, and Sound Transit is aware that they have to replace what is impacted. They are working with staff, and there will be a public process to discuss the issue. Chair Craft asked if Sound Transit would be the entity that holds the hearings. Director Markle answered that it would be guided by Sound Transit, but the City would participate. Chair Craft asked if public notice would be provided, and Director Markle answered affirmatively. She referred to the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan Map and noted the exact location of Ridgecrest Park, as well as the portion of the park that would be impacted. Chair Craft summarized that Sound Transit would have to mitigate for the loss of park space, and Ms. Hale suggested that the new park space be located within proximity of the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. Director Markle said her understanding is that the new park space would be located next to the existing park.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas referred to the maps that were submitted by Ms. Way and asked that staff also provide the narrative that accompanied the maps for the Commission's information. She agreed there is a lot of information the Light Rail Subcommittee needs to look at, and she anticipates that more than one meeting will be needed. The subcommittee can provide updates to the full Commission.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if updates to the Transportation, Surface Water and Park Master Plans would come to the Commission for review before final adoption. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively, noting that all Comprehensive Plan amendments are presented to the Commission for a public hearing and recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Craft referred to the policies in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan (Page 28 of the Staff Report) that apply to parks. He reviewed that the Commission has already expressed a willingness to advocate for programs and incentives to increase parks and open space, so the same policies should also apply to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. The idea about paths in the Paramount Open Space is important; but at the same time, it would be nice to have some guidance from the Parks Board and/or Parks Department about how implementation could occur via impact fees, potential acquisition, etc.

Chair Craft referred to the proposal to change the boundary of the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan by transferring a portion of the area to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan and asked staff to explain the impacts this change could have to the specific properties involved, as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Redinger said the policies would be similar. Many of the conversations during the course of developing the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan were the same issues that people brought to the design workshops and visioning sessions for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. The major difference is the Comprehensive Plan designations and zoning. The Comprehensive Plan designations for the 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plans are very specific to MUR zoning (SA-1 = MUR-70', SA-2 = MUR-45', and SA-3 = MUR-35'). The MUR zoning would supersede in this area. The DEIS lists all of the policies from the Southeast Neighborhood Plan that actually complement the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, and there were not a lot of discrepancies other than the three policies identified earlier.

Ms. Redinger reviewed the policies that were adopted as part of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan and also integrated into the full Comprehensive Plan. She invited the Commissioners to provide comments and direction about how they do or do not apply to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan.

**Land Use:**

Ms. Redinger referred to Land Use Policy 3 and explained that the Commission will receive a code amendment package at some point to recommend adoption of an ordinance and specific regulations in the building code related to the Living Building Challenge Ordinance. This policy was originally in the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, but it has not been adopted yet. Staff believes it would also be applicable to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. The language has been updated to be consistent with what is currently being considered by the City of Seattle.

Ms. Redinger said Land Use Policy 4 makes it clear that more planning is needed to determine the specific requirements for meeting future demands on infrastructure, schools, parks, etc. Commissioner Mork asked if this needs to be a policy statement. Ms. Redinger agreed that it is an obvious policy statement, since it addresses something that would happen anyway. The point is to make it clear that more planning is needed.

**Transportation:**

Ms. Redinger referred to Transportation Policy 1, which emphasizes the importance of developing a multi-modal transportation network within the subarea. Commissioner Mork suggested that the policy be changed to read, *“Develop a multi-modal transportation network within the subarea through a combination of public and private infrastructure investments. Emphasize the creation of non-motorized transportation facilities, such as (separated and dedicated) sidewalks and bicycle paths, as well as improvements that support greater transit speed and reliability. The bicycle/pedestrian network must have robust connectivity with existing and proposed paths (non-motorized corridors) within the City or region.”*

Vice Chair Montero said it is important to consider where people will come from in Shoreline for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station. There needs to be a more formal plan in place to figure out how to provide non-motorized methods for people to access the station. He suggested that a new Transportation Policy should be added to read:

*“Create a cross-corridor connection plan between the Interurban Trail (Aurora Avenue) on the west side and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE on the East and the light rail station(s).*

- a. Analyze an east-west (Highway 99 – 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE) non-motorized connection route utilizing N and NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street.*
- b. Include north-south connection recommendations such as 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and Meridian Avenue N.*
- c. Explore sub-route connections between the corridors for access to Shoreline Community College and Aurora Square on the west and Briarcrest Neighborhood on the east, as well as extended connection(s) to the Burke-Gilman Trail.*
- d. Identify “marked” sub-route connections between these major routes and the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station.*



- e. *Incorporate the designation of these road(s) as alternative “non-motorized arterial(s).”*
- f. *Identify needed bicycle and pedestrian improvements to these routes to reduce conflicts between motorized and non-motorized use.*
- g. *Review plans from development projects for recommendations for connections to the designated routes.”*

Vice Chair Montero noted that, while the routes are currently gently marked, it is easy to get lost if you don't know where you are going. The goal should be to steer people off of 145<sup>th</sup> Street and onto more pleasant ways of getting to the station. Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that not only are the current markings confusing to cyclists, they are also confusing to drivers. In many cases along 155<sup>th</sup>, the existing sharrows are also in line with parking, which creates even more confusion.

Commissioner Chang recalled that the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan includes a policy about traffic-calming measures and cut through traffic, which seem to be important elements. Ms. Redinger said that traffic-calming measures will be considered when discussing the particular characteristics of 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenues and 155<sup>th</sup> Street. For example, the Commission may provide some high level recommendations on the various street classifications, and perhaps the neighborhood streets could include policy language about traffic calming measures to discourage cut-through traffic.

Ms. Redinger explained that the policies outlined in Transportation Policy 3 are not relevant to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan because a corridor study has already been completed. However, staff is seeking direction on whether any of the bullets should be kept or moved to other sections to address other streets within the subarea. Commissioner Mork voiced her opinion that Transportation Policy 3 could still apply to streets within the subarea other than 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Redinger acknowledged that analyzing the arterials and streets within the subarea was not part of the mandate for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study. This type of study would occur through the Transportation Master Plan process, and Policy 3 would be the appropriate place for the Commission to provide guidance to be considered when the Transportation Master Plan is updated.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if the City would consider reclassifying some of the streets within the subarea as part of the Transportation Master Plan update. For example, 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is currently designated as a local primary street and it may take on more of the characteristics of a collector arterial street as the area is developed. The street runs from 175<sup>th</sup> Street all the way to 155<sup>th</sup> Street and is already used extensively by neighborhood residents in order to avoid 5<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenues. Chair Craft suggested policy language about directing non-local traffic to the major arterials and creating traffic-calming and other mitigation devices in the streets that are primarily residential.

Vice Chair Montero asked when King County Metro Transit would come out with projections for new routes to accommodate station growth. Ms. Redinger said they are currently working on a long-range plan, but she is not sure when it is scheduled to be completed. Vice Chair Montero commented that Metro's plans could have a huge impact on traffic associated with the station. Ms. Redinger said staff is keeping abreast of the progress of the different plans, and they can provide updates as they become available.

The Commission discussed the various elements of Transportation Policy 3 and agreed that most of the items would be applicable to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, but some would need to be changed to more accurately reflect the needs of the subarea. They agreed to change the first sentence of Policy 3 to read, *“The next update of the Transportation Master Plan should:”* They also agreed to change Item I to read, *“Provide site access via side streets and/or alleyways in order to minimize driveways and conflict points with bicycles, pedestrians and transit.”* In addition, they agreed to eliminate Items e, h and j, move Item f to the Utility Policies, and add the following new policies:

- *“Consider reclassifying arterials within the subarea to accommodate potential growth projections.”*
- *“Develop traffic-calming for non-arterial streets.”*

Questions were raised about why Transportation Policy 7 is limited to just 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Ms. Redinger answered that Transportation Policy 7 came directly from the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan, and it could be amended to be more inclusive. Commissioner Moss-Thomas suggested that the policy should also include 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Chair Craft pointed out that if the reference to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue is eliminated, the policy would speak to the entire station area and would not be limited. The remainder of the Commission concurred.

#### **Community Design:**

Commissioner Mork reminded the Commission that the goal of the subarea is to have it be a place that is pleasant and safe to walk and bicycle. She suggested that a new policy could be added to encourage the development of livable communities. The Commission agreed that a new Community Design Policy 7 should be added to read, *“Develop livable community.”*

Commissioner Moss-Thomas suggested it would be helpful to have a representative from one of the coalitions on livable cities do a presentation to the Commission so they all have a better idea of what a livable city is and can share that with the citizens, as well. Ms. Redinger noted that the agenda for June 16<sup>th</sup> is free for topics the Commission wants to explore further. Staff will continue to work with other departments that will be impacted by the policies and then schedule a subcommittee meeting. The June 16<sup>th</sup> agenda can be arranged based on feedback from the subcommittee.

#### **Economic Development:**

Commissioner Maul suggested there is a point to be made about 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is struggling right now with businesses opening and closing. There have been a lot of public comments that the subarea needs to support rather than detract from business opportunities on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Ms. Redinger suggested that 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue could be addressed by a specific Economic Development Policy. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that the intersection at 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a gateway to the City, and the area needs to be improved. Ms. Redinger asked for clarification on whether Commissioner Maul was suggesting that the focus be on revitalizing the entire 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor or just the intersection at 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Maul said his intent was to encourage revitalization of the entire corridor. The Commission agreed that Economic Development Policy 5 should be changed to read, *“Encourage redevelopment at the intersection of 145<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> to identify it as a gateway to the community.”*

Chair Craft asked staff to elaborate on Economic Development Policy 3, which calls for considering an incentive program for new buildings to incorporate Combined Heat and Power Systems and other innovative energy saving solutions. Ms. Redinger responded that Combined Heat and Power Systems is a term related to eco-districts. Where eco-districts tend to be a block or neighborhood scale, Combined Heat and Power Systems can happen within one building. For example, within a 200-unit apartment building, you could capture the heat off of the sewage pipes and use it to heat hot water. This would create a smaller delta than the water heater in the building would have to raise the temperature of the water. She explained that the policy originated from a project being considered that wanted the City to pay for the delta for the project and then be reimbursed through the savings for the building. Perhaps it is worth looking at an actual policy and/or regulation at some point to provide this as an incentive. She summarized that part of the scope for the Eco-District Feasibility Study that the City Council authorized will look at potential incentives for Combined Heat and Power Systems, as well.

Vice Chair Montero referred to Economic Development Policy 4 and asked if the word “initial” should be changed to “initiate.” Ms. Redinger said the sentence would be fine with either word.

**Utilities:**

The Commission agreed that Item f of Transportation Policy 3, related to undergrounding of utilities, should be moved to the Utility Policies.

**Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS)**

Chair Craft recommended that PROS Policy 1 be amended by replacing the words “consider potential” with “prioritize.” In PROS Policy 2, he suggested that the word “explore” should be replaced with “encourage or promote or implement.”

Chair Craft referred to PROS Policy 3 and suggested there should be a policy that calls for a comprehensive approach to parks, so that all parks can be approached with the same type of vigor and idea towards preservation and enhancement. The Commission suggested that a new PROS Policy 5 should be added to read, *“Through parks master planning processes, develop a comprehensive approach to preservation, enhancement, and creation of new parks and open space.”*

Vice Chair Montero spoke to the importance of researching and mitigating the impacts that increased density and/or uses will have on the Paramount Park Open Space. The Commission recommended that a new PROS Policy 4 should be added to read, *“Consider impact of increased surrounding density to Paramount Open Space and plan for mitigation.”* The Commission also agreed that there should be policy language encouraging plaza or other public space at the stations themselves and that there should be additional language encouraging the City to acquire available land adjacent to existing parks and open space.

**Natural Environment:**

The Commission agreed that a new Natural Environment Policy 3 should be added to address streams, wetlands, buffers and potential mitigation.

**Housing:**

It was noted that the Development Code was recently updated to include some very specific language relative to housing. Ms. Redinger said there are still a few steps the City must take to finish implementing the program.

Chair Craft encouraged Commissioners to continue to review the policies and provide comments to staff as appropriate. He also invited the public to email their comments to the City.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Director Markle did not have any items to report.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Vice Chair Montero reported that there was a meeting relative to Point Wells, but he did not have details to share with the Commission. Chair Craft suggested that the June 16<sup>th</sup> agenda could include an update on Point Wells from the staff and subcommittee.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Chair Craft reviewed that the June 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda includes continued discussion of the Development Code Regulations for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. Mr. Szafran advised that staff received some clarifying questions since the Commission’s last meeting. At the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, staff will spend some time reviewing the amendments that they received questions on. They will also provide more examples to clarify what is being proposed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

---

Easton Craft  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission