

# CITY OF SHORELINE

## SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 2, 2007  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

---

---

### **COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Chair Piro  
Commissioner Broili  
Commissioner Hall  
Commissioner McClelland  
Commissioner Phisuthikul  
Commissioner Pyle  
Commissioner Wagner

### **STAFF PRESENT**

Joe Tovar, Director, Planning & Development Services  
Steve Cohn, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services  
Alicia Sherman, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services  
Jessica Simulcik Smith, Planning Commission Clerk

### **COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Vice Chair Kuboi  
Commissioner Harris

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Piro 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 Piro, Commissioner Broili, Hall, McClelland, Phisuthikul, Pyle and Wagner. Vice Chair Kuboi and Commissioner Harris were excused.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Commission accepted the agenda as proposed.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Tovar reported that a computer software program called Sketch Up was used by the University of Washington Students to show several kinds of building form possibilities for properties in the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. Staff also used this software in their preliminary work on the South Aurora Triangle, and a number of meetings have been held with the neighborhood to discuss the many issues

and concerns. One particular discussion centered around the implication of taller building forms on shadows, and Sketch Up is an excellent tool for modeling different building forms and the building shadows they would cast. Staff is considering options for displaying the materials created by the software at public meetings and hearings.

Mr. Tovar recalled that staff recently discussed with the Commission the concept of using a form-based code as a new approach for dealing with land use. Because the City's existing zoning designations do not fit all circumstances, staff also plans to bring forward the concept of creating specific land use zones that are specifically written for a particular part of the City. For example, staff would likely propose a new zone that would only apply to the Ridgecrest Neighborhood. It would include a discreet set of uses, building envelopes, standards, etc. In addition, Shoreline Community College has expressed a desire to have a master plan, and one option would be to create a new zone for the site. The concept could also be considered for other subareas in the future.

Mr. Tovar reported that he has attended several presentations on VISION 2040, which is an update of the regional plan that was adopted by the local governments in King, Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap Counties. A presentation is scheduled before the City Council on August 27<sup>th</sup>, and the Planning Commissioners are invited to attend. The video presentation could be made available to the Commissioners upon request, and perhaps it could also be accessible from the City's Website. A number of important regional issues are addressed in the document, and it would be helpful for the Commission to consider the information as they continue with their work program over the next several months.

Mr. Tovar announced that a community meeting regarding the City Hall Project was conducted on July 30<sup>th</sup>. The public was invited to look at proposed designs, and the consultant and architect were present to answer questions. There was discussion and agreement about how to orient a 60,000 square foot building envelope on the property and how to provide adequate parking and access. The next meeting regarding this issue is scheduled for August 21<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Hall suggested that if some of the structured parking is going to be underground, then connectivity could be provided between City Hall and the potential park site across the street by tunneling Midvale Avenue under a pedestrian crossing plaza. The entrance to the parking garage could be located where the street tunnels down, making cars an invisible element of the project. While he recognizes this would add a significant cost to the project, it would be of extraordinary benefit to the public. Commissioner Broili agreed this would be a superb idea that should be placed higher on the priority list since it would deal with traffic problems, as well as access to the Interurban Trail.

Chair Piro suggested that if it is cost prohibitive at this time, it would be appropriate to include the concept as a design feature for future implementation. He pointed out that this concept could dovetail with future plans for the Interurban Trail to be placed underground at 175<sup>th</sup>. While moving the Civic Center complex away from Midvale to create a plaza would not be as ideal, another option would be to provide special treatment to that portion of Midvale Avenue with different pavement, etc. This area could be used as part of the plaza upon occasion to allow for a more cohesive link to the proposed heritage park.

Commissioner McClelland said that if the Commission feels a pedestrian friendly development is important enough, perhaps they could consider opportunities for a shared parking facility that would serve not only City Hall and the new park area, but the surrounding properties, as well. This would prevent the City from having to bear the full burden of the parking costs. Mr. Tovar pointed out that this would take active negotiation and agreement by others to provide funds for this purpose. He noted that the cost of a single parking stall in a structured parking facility is about \$20,000. He cautioned that time would also be a factor when considering parking options.

Commissioner Pyle pointed out that the frontage of the property along Midvale Avenue is only about 100 feet. Because of standard grade requirements, it would probably be physically impossible to create a sub grade road with a lid in this location. Commissioner Phisuthikul added that the close proximity of the intersection would make the concept even more difficult to implement.

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that Dan Burden is scheduled to conduct walking audits on August 6<sup>th</sup>, and Commissioners have been invited to attend. There are still spots open in both the morning (Civic Center/City Hall site) and afternoon (Interurban Trail between 145<sup>th</sup> and Sears) sessions. He encouraged Commissioners to contact him if they want to attend.

Mr. Cohn announced that the Housing Conference would be held in early September in Spokane, Washington. Interested Commissioners should contact Ms. Simulcik Smith as soon as possible.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes were approved as submitted.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS**

Chair Piro announced that the City Council conducted a public hearing on July 16<sup>th</sup> for the second phase of the Aurora Project, and 25 individuals participated. Twenty-three individuals indicated they were in favor of the staff proposed alternative, which is a continuation of the design for the first mile. It is considered a flexible alternative because it recognizes there are some properties and buildings where continuing the design would be challenging and interim treatment must be considered. The other two individuals were neither for nor against the project, but they raised concerns about the cost. The City Council unanimously approved the flexible alternative at their July 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting.

Commissioner Wagner reported that the Housing Citizen Advisory Committee met in May to review a visual preference survey, which provided a variety of housing choices. During their last session, they toured Shoreline to view a variety of the options. They specifically discussed that although the same

zoning regulations are used for town home developments, some are much more aesthetically pleasing than others. She suggested that as they consider options for redevelopment in the City, it is important to integrate pedestrian friendly design components.

## **STAFF REPORTS**

### **Draft Framework Policies (Town Center Subarea Plan) Discussion**

Mr. Tovar referred the Commission to four policies, which establish the framework for development of the land use, capital facility, and programmatic aspects of the Town Center Subarea Plan. He reviewed each of the proposed policies as follows:

- ***Establish a study area boundary to provide context of evaluating the opportunities and potential impacts from future development of commercial and mixed uses along Aurora Avenue and Midvale Avenue North.*** Mr. Tovar reminded the Commission that the City Council recently made a decision with respect to Miles 2 and 3 of the Aurora Project, and it is important to keep this decision in mind as the Town Center Subarea Plan moves forward. He emphasized that this policy talks about a study area boundary (Fremont Avenue on the west, 192<sup>nd</sup> Street on the north, Ashworth Avenue to the east, and 170<sup>th</sup> Street to the south) that is large enough to include not just the land that would be part of the plan, but surrounding properties that could be impacted by the changes.
- ***Engage Shoreline residents and businesses in detailed design processes both for Midvale Avenue North and the “heritage park” site between North 175<sup>th</sup> and North 185<sup>th</sup> Streets.*** Mr. Tovar recalled that the City Council made the decision to move forward with design and construction of a new City Hall facility, and the proposed design would incorporate many of the strategic points that were adopted by the City Council in June. The City Council has already indicated that Midvale Avenue and the “heritage park” sites are important and that the projects should move forward as soon as possible.
- ***Design roadway, transit and pedestrian facilities consistent with the City’s preferred “Flexible Alternative” for Aurora between North 165<sup>th</sup> Street and North 205<sup>th</sup> Street.*** Mr. Tovar explained that now that the City Council has made a policy choice with respect to Aurora Avenue, this decision should be a major consideration when determining the roadway, transit and pedestrian facilities that are appropriate for the area. There is an existing policy in the Comprehensive Plan that defines the maximum extent of right-of-way for the Aurora Project, and this must be repealed or amended to reflect the approved flexible alternative that was approved for the next two miles of Aurora Avenue.
- ***Prepare a program of civic directional or “wayfinding” signage and evaluate refinements to City sign regulations to reflect the emerging function and aesthetics of Aurora Avenue North.*** Mr. Tovar reported that the Parks Department has been working with a consultant to create wayfinding signs for parks, and staff believes it would be beneficial to have this same type of signage for other public facilities, as well. He explained that this policy also speaks to the need to review the City’s current regulations for private signage along Aurora Avenue.

Mr. Tovar advised that staff has a list of email addresses for all members of the ABC (Aurora Business and Community) Team. In addition, they are compiling an email list of all those who have been involved in the City Hall public design process. Because it is important to engage the public early in the process, staff would forward the framework policies to all individuals on the list. In addition, information would be distributed via Currents, the City's Website, and the large plywood notice board signs. Commissioner McClelland suggested the email notices would be more effective if they were formatted to appear as a newsletter or news bulletin. In addition, recipients should be invited to pass the notices on to other citizens within the community.

Ms. Sherman provided a brief update on the next phase of the Aurora Project. She recalled that one of the ABC Team's primary roles was to provide input for the federal environmental process in conjunction with the next few miles of the project. The City opted to evaluate all three alternatives plus the no build alternative, which normally isn't done at this stage of the environmental review. Staff was pleased with the valuable effort that was put forth by the ABC Team, which resulted in a draft recommended alternative the community supports.

Commissioner McClelland inquired when the various reports would be presented to the ABC Team. Ms. Sherman answered that the reports are being presented to the State and Federal Governments in a staggered format and would not be released to the public until they have been accepted by the State and Federal Governments. Five documents have been released to the public thus far, and they have been posted on the City's website. Once all of the reports have been completed staff will finish the Federal environmental process and begin the SEPA process, evaluating just the flexible alternative. They hope to have all of this completed by the end of 2007 so they can move forward with the right-of-way phase in early 2008.

Ms. Sherman said staff anticipates doing a 30% design for the next two miles, and then bringing the second mile up to 100% design. Continued work would be somewhat contingent on funding. The joint RTID/Sound Transit ballot measure includes \$40 million for Aurora Avenue. If the City is able to secure this funding, the project would be nearly funded.

Commissioner McClelland recalled that one individual at the recent public meeting indicated support for the proposed design but cautioned that significant concerns would come up during construction of the project when major disruptions occur.

Commissioner Hall announced that Community Transit is proposing to develop a Swift Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Service from Snohomish County, with a terminus where the buses could turn around and unload passengers at the Aurora Transit Center. King County Metro Transit is ultimately planning a BRT Corridor north to the Aurora Village Transit Center. He suggested Shoreline do what they can to convince the two transit agencies to share buses and systems so they can make continuous runs. They should also encourage them to shift from the Aurora Transit Center to the 192<sup>nd</sup> Park and Ride, since this would decrease the transit time for buses getting on and off Aurora Avenue.

Ms. Sherman advised that Community Transit just sent out the scoping notice for the EIS for their Swift BRT Service. She said that in the two and a half years she has been with the City, Shoreline has

consistently encouraged a cross-county service. She noted that transit riders don't care about the line at 205<sup>th</sup>; they want to keep going. However, there is strong resistance from both transit providers to share the route and cross boundaries. The City's comment letter to Community Transit would ask them to coordinate with other transit providers (Metro and Sound Transit), and evaluate the possibility of not just going to the 192<sup>nd</sup> Park and Ride, but also going down to Westminster in order to serve the Community College. However, she noted Metro's BRT would function differently than Community Transit's BRT (different types of approaches, platforms, etc.), and this would likely require varying types of infrastructure.

Commissioner Hall expressed his belief that it is unacceptable that the two transit service providers cannot work together. He suggested the City use their political clout and not allow either one to operate on Aurora Avenue unless they can settle their differences. Commissioner McClelland suggested that a coalition be formed of jurisdictions that are in this same position. The remainder of the Commission agreed that would be an appropriate approach, and Commissioner Hall agreed to present the concept at the next Puget Sound Regional Council Meeting he attends.

Ms. Sherman suggested that two major factors would come into play as part of this argument. First, a Community Transit report states there is no demand for cross-county transit service on Highway 99. Secondly, the RTID proposal for Snohomish County provides funding to redesign and construct the SR-104 and SR-99 interchange, and this project would likely include BAT (Business Access/Transit) lanes. This would result in a continuous series of BAT lanes along the corridor. She noted that the BAT lanes are not really necessary when traveling southbound on a Community Transit Bus. But if the transit center was no longer available, the BAT lanes would be a great asset and allow them to save time and provide a more reliable service.

Commissioner Broili questioned what incentives the City could offer to encourage collaboration between the two transit agencies. Regarding the demand for this service, he noted that property values have gone up and redevelopment has surged along Rainier Avenue where light rail has been proposed from the airport to Northgate. Commissioner Hall noted that light rail is proposed to go across the County line to the 164<sup>th</sup> Street and the Ash Way Park and Ride, and significant ridership numbers have been forecast. The Commission disagreed with Community Transit's claim that there is no demand for cross county bus service.

**COMMISSIONER BROILI MOVED THAT COMMISSIONER HALL DRAFT A LETTER TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING THE TRANSIT SERVICE IN SHORELINE. CHAIR PIRO SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Hall agreed to bring the document back for Commission review at their first meeting in September. Mr. Tovar suggested it would be wise to communicate this problem to the State Legislators, as well. The Commission agreed that the letter drafted by Commissioner Hall should include a provision that encourages the City Council to contact the State Legislators.

## **Word Choice for Comprehensive Plans**

Mr. Tovar explained that one of the difficulties of administering the City's current Comprehensive Plan is that it does not really give sufficient care to the use of important words, such as "shall" and "should." In addition, it is difficult to interpret what the Plan says about Master Plans for institutions, and staff plans to propose amendments in the near future to clear up these issues.

Mr. Tovar summarized that the City's current Comprehensive Plan says more than it needs to say, and doesn't state policies as clearly as it should. In addition, the City's current regulations are leaner than they need to be. He emphasized that regulations have a direct influence on the outcome of permits, but comprehensive plans do not speak directly to project permits. During the coming months, staff would keep this in mind when they bring forward draft proposals for subarea plans. Chair Piro summarized that staff intends to incorporate a more streamlined approach when proposing new draft subarea plan language for the Comprehensive Plan.

## **Update on Work Program/Prepare for Joint Meeting with the City Council**

Mr. Cohn reviewed the Commission's upcoming meeting agendas as follows:

- The agenda items originally scheduled for the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting (speakers series debrief and discussion of City Hall) had to be moved to September 6<sup>th</sup>. The Commission could also discuss possible agenda items for the joint meeting with the City Council on September 6<sup>th</sup>.
- A public hearing on a formal subdivision application has been scheduled for the Commission's September 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting. The application has been appealed, so the hearing would take place before the Commission and the Hearing Examiner.
- A joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting has been scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup>. The joint session would be a 1½-hour dinner meeting, followed by a regular City Council Meeting.

Mr. Tovar suggested that at the joint meeting, the City Council may express concern about the general community anxiety relative to growth, development, change, rezones, new projects, etc. The City Council would likely want an opportunity to share these concerns with the Commission.

Commissioner Broili asked staff to share the list of topics generated at their retreat as possible agenda items for the joint meeting. Mr. Cohn said the Commission previously expressed a desire to remind the City Council that they want to move forward on the Briarcrest Subarea Planning Process. The Commission might also want to spend some time talking about the Town Center Subarea Planning Process. Additional ideas might come to light as staff begins their budget discussions, as well.

Commissioner Broili suggested the Commission's retreat priorities might be considered as possible agenda topics, too. Mr. Cohn suggested it would be helpful for the Commission to pinpoint four or five agenda items on September 6<sup>th</sup> and then assign specific Commissioners to present the items to the City Council. Ms. Simulcik Smith referred to the back of the Commission's agenda planner, which provides lists of their retreat prioritization, items to be scheduled for the next year, and the "backburner" items.

Commissioner Pyle suggested they also ask the City Council to commit the necessary resources for staff and the Commission to pursue special study areas in the near future. He noted that the studies would be large tasks to complete and require a significant amount of staff time.

Mr. Tovar announced that the Ridgecrest and North City Neighborhoods are having a joint ice cream social on August 16<sup>th</sup>. He suggested that since the items that were originally scheduled on the August 16<sup>th</sup> agenda have been postponed to September, perhaps it would be appropriate to cancel the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting so that Commissioners could attend the neighborhood social. The Commission agreed to cancel their August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Commissioner Hall recalled that at the joint meeting one year ago, the City Council expressed concern that the Planning Commission was not giving them enough information about how they made decisions. The Commission has tried to respond to this concern, and he suggested it would be appropriate to ask for additional feedback from the City Council about how they could further improve their service. They agreed to finalize their agenda items at their September 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Buildable Lands Five-Year Update Summary**

Mr. Cohn reminded the Commission that the Buildable Lands Analysis is an important part of the Growth Management Act. He explained that cities within each county are required to show they have adequate zoning capacity and infrastructure to accept growth, and the purpose of the Buildable Lands Analysis is to measure a city's capacity to absorb growth and to evaluate the effectiveness of local plans. This is done by reviewing the land as it is currently zoned and comprehensively planned and evaluating the effectiveness of the existing development regulations.

Mr. Cohn advised that King County is required to submit a Buildable Lands Analysis to the State every five years, and the next analysis must be submitted by September 1, 2007. As part of the analysis process, King County required each of the cities within the County to submit their own report. He briefly described the process the City used to complete their analysis.

Mr. Cohn referred to the summary of preliminary findings for King County starting on Page 22 of the Staff Report. He specifically noted the following:

- There has been a tremendous growth spurt in King County, and they have accepted about one-third of the growth target in about one-fourth of the planning period (2001 – 2022). While this is ahead of schedule, they must recognize that growth could slow down substantially if the economy were to change. It is important to be ahead of the target as much as possible.
- Single-family development permits have increased from 19,500 to 26,000 over the past five years, and most of this activity has occurred in south King County. Over 25,000 multi-family development permits have been granted over the past five years, and most of this occurred in Seattle with some in Shoreline, as well. This is a shift from what they saw in the first five years of the decade when most of the multi-family development occurred in east and south King County.



- Single-family densities have increased from 4.6 to over 6 in the most recent five years. This means they are approaching numbers that are typical of an urbanized area.
- King County lost 70,000 jobs during the recession years, but most of this has been made up over the past five years. However, Bellevue has not reached the job level they started with in 2001. Shoreline has had more job growth during the last eight years than Bellevue, which is unusual.
- The County's capacity numbers look good. It appears they have almost twice the residential capacity as needed for this round of targets. While the County does have more commercial capacity, it is not as much as they anticipated.

Next, Mr. Cohn shared the findings from Shorelines Buildable Lands Analysis. As staff reviewed properties that are vacant or developable, they found they have the capacity for just over 1,000 single-family homes. However, it is important to keep in mind that 80% of the capacity is on redevelopable sites. This means that additional development would depend on people short platting their properties. The capacity numbers for multi-family development are much smaller, slightly under 400. However, the capacity of the mixed-use zones would accommodate nearly 3,500 additional multi-family units.

Mr. Cohn explained that using the rules for development capacity as defined by King County, staff found that most redevelopment would replace what already exists and would result in very little employment growth. If the market changes and developers construct taller buildings in the City, the employment capacity could be much greater.

Commissioner Hall asked if the identified capacities were calculated after deducting for critical areas, market reduction factors, etc. Mr. Cohn answered that critical areas were subtracted out, and they had to recognize that only a portion of the properties would develop during the next 20 years. He emphasized that the Shoreline's identified housing and employment capacities are consistent with the current growth targets.

Commissioner Broili asked if staff has identified a date for potential build out. Mr. Cohn said he does not think it is realistic to define a theoretical build out number. As the market changes, properties that were thought to be "built out" could be redeveloped to a greater capacity. A more defining factor is whether or not the City has the necessary infrastructure to support additional density. He said the City anticipates the current infrastructure capacity is sufficient to meet the growth target. However, going beyond the identified growth targets would require serious modeling to identify the possible impacts. Commissioner Broili noted that the City must also have adequate environmental capacity to accommodate the additional growth.

Commissioner Pyle noted that the bulk of the City's mixed-use development is focused on Aurora Avenue. Mr. Cohn clarified that all commercial sites are available for mixed-use development. However, half of the residential capacity and 90 percent of the employment capacity is on Aurora Avenue. Commissioner Pyle inquired if this number references the highest and best use of the property on Aurora Avenue. Mr. Cohn answered that the City's numbers are relatively conservative, and the capacity depends on the Comprehensive Plan designation for each of the properties. Mr. Cohn said that

in addition to Aurora Avenue, staff also anticipates future mixed-use developments in the Echo Lake area as well as other sites in the City.

Commissioner Pyle expressed his concern about forecasting a multi-family residential number that would be primarily absorbed by the mixed-use category. He suggested it would be difficult to forecast an accurate number since it is dependent on the market. Mr. Cohn emphasized that the Buildable Lands Analysis is not a market forecast, but a technical study of what could happen. While there are no guarantees, it is important to note that the Puget Sound area has been growing rapidly over the last 40 years, and they anticipate growth would continue to occur.

Commissioner McClelland asked how Fircrest was treated in the Buildable Lands Analysis. Mr. Cohn answered that institutions such as Fircrest and Shoreline Community College were not identified as redevelopable properties. Commissioner McClelland asked how the Buildable Lands Analysis treated neighborhoods such as Innis Arden, which are governed by covenants that limit redevelopment. Mr. Cohn said the GIS mapping system allows them to exclude these neighborhoods from the redevelopment scenario.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Commission.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **2007 Retreat Follow-Up**

Mr. Cohn referred the Commission to the Retreat Report that was provided in the Staff Report and encouraged the Commissioners to communicate their comments related to the report to Mr. Cohn by August 17<sup>th</sup>. The Commission could have a discussion regarding the list of items to be scheduled in 2007-2008 at their September 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

Ms. Simulcik Smith distributed a memorandum to the Commission that provided information regarding the Council of Neighborhoods. The Commission agreed it would be appropriate for them to provide a representative at the monthly Council of Neighborhoods Meetings, and Commissioner Pyle volunteered to attend in September.

Commissioner McClelland announced that the first North City Jazz Walk is scheduled for the evening of August 14<sup>th</sup>. This is a collaborative effort of the North City Business Association, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Arts Council, City of Shoreline and Small Business Forum.

Commissioner McClelland questioned if some of the development that has occurred recently in the City is a result of not being able to clearly interpret the City's Development Code. Mr. Cohn answered that the City does not have a residential design review requirement, so they have no control over building design in residential areas. His expectation is that the Housing Citizen Advisory Committee would suggest some type of design guidelines for staff to consider when reviewing applications for residential

development. Commissioner McClelland recalled that she worked previously with staff on residential design guidelines, and staff agreed to locate the information that was put together as part of that effort and forward it to the Housing Citizen Advisory Committee.

**NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was scheduled on the agenda.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

The August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting was cancelled. The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 6<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

---

Rocky Piro  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Jessica Simulcik Smith  
Clerk, Planning Commission