

**DRAFT**

## **CITY OF SHORELINE**

### **SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

August 18, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall  
Council Chamber

---

---

#### **Commissioners Present**

Chair Craft  
Vice Chair Montero  
Commissioner Chang  
Commissioner Malek  
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  
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney  
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

#### **Others Present**

John Evans, Sound Transit

#### **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, Malek, Maul, Mork and Moss-Thomas.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of July 21, 2016 were adopted as corrected.

#### **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dia Dreyer, Shoreline**, voiced concern that although the meeting was posted as a public hearing for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, the proposed amendments would also apply to the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subareas. That means that only half of the impacted citizens have been informed that tonight's proposed changes would directly and significantly impact their neighborhoods so they can be part of the

public hearing. She commented that informing and interacting with the two areas separately, and then applying code as though they were both equally clearly informed and have been given the opportunity to be involved, appears to be a “divide and conquer” approach in order to muffle the voice of the citizens as a whole. She asked that the City be careful to inform the public more clearly.

**Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline**, said she recently read on Facebook that the location of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station was shifting north of the Interstate 5 (I-5) on ramp and the on ramp, itself, would remain in its current location. She sent a letter of inquiry to Sound Transit and received the following response from John Evans, Light Rail Planning Manager:

*“At the request of the City of Shoreline, Sound Transit is working with King County Metro, WSDOT, and Shoreline to refine the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station design that would move the station approximately 400 feet north of the location in the project’s preliminary design. This would provide the space needed primarily for expanded bus service facilities at the station now planned by King County Metro, along with the project’s previously planned park-and-ride garage and passenger pick-up/drop-off space. We are still early in the process of developing the refined designs.”*

Ms. Saheki asked what exactly caused the station to move and why expanding bus service would require the station to be moved. She also asked why the citizens have not been informed at previous meetings that the station location was about to change. Lastly, she said it seems that the public’s knowledge about the relocation was pure happenstance, and she questioned when the City planned to notify the public. Chair Craft invited staff to share information regarding the potential relocation of the station as part of their presentation.

**Robert McMurray, Shoreline**, also raised concerns about the proposed relocation of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station. He asked why it was not recognized earlier in the process that the on ramp to I-5 would have to be changed to accommodate the station.

**PUBLIC HEARING: 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN PACKAGE (ORDINANCE NUMBERS 750, 751 AND 752)**

Chair Craft advised that the public hearing is on the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan Package, which includes Ordinance 750 (adopting the Subarea Plan and amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, Ordinance 751 (amending the Development Code and Official Zoning Map), and Ordinance 752 (adopting the Planned Action Ordinance (PAO)). He reviewed the rules and procedures for the hearing and then opened the hearing.

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Redinger briefly reviewed the timeline for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea Plan process, which began in May of 2013 with a community workshop that was open to both the 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subareas. This was followed by a visioning phase that included a series of five workshops where citizens were invited to brainstorm high-level things they would like to see in the neighborhood. Following the visioning phase, there was a break in the schedule for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea Plan

waiting for Sound Transit to make a decision on the location of the 2<sup>nd</sup> station. In November of 2013, Sound Transit decided that the preferred station location would be at 145<sup>th</sup>, and planning for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea resumed in early 2014 with a series of design workshops. Part I of the design workshops provided an opportunity for more high-level, very specific brainstorming, and Part II introduced potential zoning scenarios and a number of illustrations. The next step was to begin the Draft Environmental Impact Analysis (DEIS), which was published in January of 2015. In March of 2015, the process took a break while the City's Transportation Department performed the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study. The preferred concept for the City was adopted in April of 2016, and subarea planning began in earnest again. Prior to April, the Commission had some prerequisite discussions relative to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study, as well as a wetlands assessment and technical memorandums that were produced.

Ms. Redinger further reviewed that the Planning Commission sent a recommendation to the City Council in April relative to a preferred alternative (Compact Community Hybrid) to move forward with the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). On May 2<sup>nd</sup>, the City Council elected to not select a preferred alternative, but to move forward with the FEIS, studying the Compact Community Hybrid as a 4<sup>th</sup> Alternative, as well as the concept of phasing for all action alternatives (Connecting Corridors, Compact Community, and Compact Community Hybrid). More recently, the Commission has held a series of study sessions about the following elements of the Subarea Plan Package:

- Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)
- 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan
- Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan
- Development Regulations
- Zoning Map
- Planned Action Ordinance and Boundaries

Ms. Redinger explained that following the public hearing and the closing of their deliberations, the Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will discuss the Subarea Plan package on September 12<sup>th</sup>, and they could potentially adopt the three ordinances as early as September 26<sup>th</sup>. She emphasized that the map the Commission forwards to the City Council as part of its recommendation could be changed by the City Council.

Ms. Redinger reviewed that public participation occurred early in the process when it was a lot easier to talk about high-level concepts. The public outreach included visioning and design workshops, as well as a presence at Celebrate Shoreline and other neighborhood events. Articles about station subarea planning were published in *THE CURRENTS NEWSLETTER* every month for the past three years. There were also a number of mailings and additional community meetings.

Mr. Redinger reviewed the three ordinances as follows:

- **Ordinance 750, which adopts the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan and amends the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.** Ms. Redinger reviewed that Ordinance 750 was discussed by the Commission on July 21<sup>st</sup> when the Commission reviewed the seven chapters

contained in the draft Subarea Plan. The Subarea Plan includes a Vision Statement, which is based on a livable community model and includes policy language for land use, transportation, economic development, community design, and other elements that are covered in the Comprehensive Plan. It also includes conceptual illustrations that were shared previously, as well as the Future Land Use Map that ties each of the Mixed Use Residential (MUR) Zones to a specific Comprehensive Plan Designation. For example, MUR-70' correlates to Station Area 1 (SA1), MUR-45' to Station Area 2 (SA2), and MUR-35' to Station Area 3 (SA3).

Ms. Redinger explained that while a Comprehensive Plan Designation typically represents a range of potentially appropriate zoning, the designations for the Station Subarea zones was done differently. The intent is to make it more complicated to change the zoning in the future since it would require amending both the Comprehensive Plan Designation and the Zoning Designation.

- **Ordinance 751, which amends the Unified Development Code, Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Title 20, and the Official Zoning Map to implement the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea.** Ms. Redinger reviewed that this ordinance adopts the Development Code Regulations and Zoning Map. As part of its recommendation to the City Council, the Commission could separate the Development Code Regulations for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station into a new Ordinance 756. Potential zoning scenarios were discussed by the Commission in 2015 (February 5<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>) and 2016 (March 17<sup>th</sup>, April 7<sup>th</sup>, and August 4<sup>th</sup>). They were also discussed by the City Council at several meetings that are detailed in the Staff Report.

Ms. Redinger explained that the Compact Community Hybrid Map (Alternative 4) is being used as a placeholder in all of the documents and exhibits since that was the Commission's last recommendation for a preferred alternative zoning scenario. If the map is changed upon recommendation by the Commission or adoption by the City Council, the map and all other related maps, including the Comprehensive Plan Map and PAO Boundary Map, would be changed to reflect the zoning map.

Ms. Redinger referred to Attachment D of the Staff Report, which outlines Commissioner Mork's proposed amendment to the zoning map. The Commission discussed the proposed change briefly at their last meeting. As per the amendment, the Compact Community Hybrid Map (Alternative 4) would be amended so that all parcels that are encumbered by a wetland, stream or buffer would remain Residential 6 (R-6). The other areas around Paramount Park and the properties north of the Paramount Open Space would be zoned MUR-35'.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Commission has discussed the proposed amendments to the Development Code and Zoning Map at a number of meetings, including May 5<sup>th</sup>, June 2<sup>nd</sup>, July 21<sup>st</sup> and August 4<sup>th</sup>. He explained that the MUR zones were originally created during the adoption of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan to shape and guide development to implement the Subarea Plan. The regulations that were adopted through the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan would also apply to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, including standards for MUR zones (height, setbacks, stepbacks), vehicular access from side streets, streetscape improvements and landscaping requirements, greater design standards, affordable housing and green building requirements.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that, as part of the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan process, staff presented a number of Development Code Amendments relative to Critical Areas Reasonable Use Permits (CARUP), station area uses, single-family detached uses in MUR-35' and MUR-45' zones, minimum density in the MUR-35' zone, minimum lot area in the MUR-70' zone, maximum setback on 145<sup>th</sup> and 185<sup>th</sup> Streets, additional height for rooftop amenities, minimum density calculations, townhouse design standards for the MUR-45' zone, site and frontage improvement thresholds for change of land use, and access to development from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Mr. Szafran recalled that, at their last meeting, the Planning Commission voiced concern that establishing a minimum lot size in the MUR-70' zone could be problematic for certain property owners. Although a minimum lot size requirement would provide enough lot area to build to full potential of the zone, it would be inflexible and would not guarantee development to the full potential. It could also result in less choice for property owners and create many remnant parcels that cannot be redeveloped. Staff is proposing a different approach that would establish a higher minimum density requirement of 80 dwelling units per acre in the MUR-70' zone. This would provide flexibility to property owners and ensure that density is clustered around the station. It would also encourage higher buildings with structured parking and a variety of building forms. However, the approach would still not ensure that properties are developed to full building potential. He provided several examples of recent and proposed development in the City that are at or exceed 80 units per acre.

Mr. Szafran reviewed that the Commission also voiced concern about staff's recommendation to establish a minimum density in the MUR-35' zone of 12 units per acre. In addition, there was a lot of discussion about staff's recommendation that minimum density calculations be rounded up rather than down.

- **Ordinance 752, which is the Planned Action Ordinance (PAC) for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).** Ms. Redinger advised that Ordinance 752 includes mitigation measures for Phase 1 of the Compact Community Hybrid Zoning Scenario (Exhibit A), Development Code Regulations (Exhibit B), and the PAO Boundary Map (Exhibit C) that was discussed by the Commission on August 4<sup>th</sup>. She reminded the Commission that the purpose of the PAO is to address cumulative impacts for a 20-year growth scenario, identify mitigations, track actual growth against projected growth, and provide for streamlined environmental review. She displayed the PAO Boundary Map that was discussed on August 4<sup>th</sup>, which includes just the Phase 1 boundary. Another alternative would be to have the PAO Boundary encompass the entire zoning area and then rely on the 20-year mitigations that were identified through the FEIS. She reminded them that the current ordinance has a sunset of 20 years from adoption. That means the ordinance would not apply to the entire build out, but just what is anticipated for the first 20 years. This could be the 20 years that was analyzed in the FEIS for the full build out scenario, or the roughly 17-year time frame that would apply to Phase 1 if phased zoning is used.

Ms. Redinger advised that, at the conclusion of the public hearing and Planning Commission recommendation, the City Council will conduct a study session on the entire Subarea Plan Package on September 12<sup>th</sup>, with potential adoption of the ordinances on September 26<sup>th</sup>. All ordinances and exhibits, as well as the FEIS, have been included on the City's website [www.shorelinewa.gov/145FEIS](http://www.shorelinewa.gov/145FEIS).

Ms. Redinger referred to Ms. Saheki's questions about the footprint of the proposed station, and acknowledged that there has been a lot of community input regarding station location over the last several days. She emphasized that the station location and design is a Sound Transit process rather than a City process. However, Sound Transit is obligated to check in with the City and the entire community at various stages of the design process, and they are trying to schedule a public meeting in November to present initial design plans (roughly 30%). Additional open houses will be held at 60% and 90% design.

Ms. Redinger shared an aerial photograph illustrating the previously-proposed footprint. While it shows the actual location of the elevated station and some of the plaza, it does not show the other components that will be necessary. She explained that the initial plan was to move the on-ramp to I-5 from its current location to north of the station. However, as their work approached 30% design and Sound Transit started incorporating comments and concerns from other agencies and members of the community, the design evolved into a different footprint. She provided an aerial photograph illustrating the location of the proposed new station location. She noted that although the station would be moved north of the on-ramp, the on-ramp's location would not change.

Vice Chair Montero asked if the parking garage would remain in the same location as originally proposed. Ms. Redinger answered that it would also be moved north. She explained that, although the total footprint would only increase slightly, it would impact more single-family properties. The FEIS analyzed multiple station layouts, one of which is very similar to what is currently being proposed. The location change is relatively new information, and the intent was for Sound Transit to communicate with property owners before the change went public.

Chair Craft asked if the new proposed location would incorporate NE 148<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Redinger answered affirmatively and advised that NE 148<sup>th</sup> Street would provide for better pedestrian access and circulation. She explained that the City and many other agencies consider the evolving design to be better because it includes improved traffic flow and traffic safety on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE; utilizes NE 148<sup>th</sup> Street for improved safety and operations; provides for better bus access and circulation and bus layover space; provides an opportunity to access and utilize open space south of the station; provides for expanded drop-off and pick-up facilities; extends pedestrian, bicycle and traffic improvements further north on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE; and lessens construction impacts on City streets because the I-5 ramp would not have to be closed for as long, if at all.

**John Evans, Sound Transit**, said Sound Transit is working with partner agencies to determine the preferred options to best serve the community. He pointed out that the drawings are very rough and do not show the extent of the station. For example, the previous footprint actually extended to the north, which would require additional property acquisition that is now shown on the map. He emphasized that the evolving footprint may require the acquisition of an additional seven or eight properties. He recognized that property acquisition is a significant concern, and Sound Transit has hand delivered letters to all potentially-impacted property owners.

Chair Craft summarized that the evolving design would move the station further north into the MUR-70' zone. It would also incorporate NE 148<sup>th</sup> Street to allow for better bus, bicycle and pedestrian access on the north side of the station rather than on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Mr. Evans explained that it was difficult to

engineer traffic to fit into the triangle south of the on-ramp. Having another access so close to the intersection of NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street was also problematic from a traffic engineering standpoint. They are considering a variety of options, and Sound Transit will continue to work with Metro and the City's Traffic Engineer on how to address circulation to make it function well but still allow improvements on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to occur.

Chair Craft asked if the evolving design is based on a more in-depth traffic/circulation analysis. Mr. Evans said the proposed new location has received support from partner agencies, and the intent is to formalize the concept. The issue is trying to fit everything within a confined space. Since the original selection of the station location, Metro completed its draft long-range plan that incorporated substantial new bus service to the station area. The developing footprint would accommodate their need for increased space.

Commissioner Chang asked how the proposed location change would impact the conclusions contained in the FEIS. Ms. Redinger answered that staff is doing some initial analysis to see how the change would impact the walkshed, etc. However, on the whole, moving the station 400 feet to the north would not change what was analyzed in the FEIS, and it may help alleviate some of the issues. For example, it may create better traffic flow on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. She emphasized that more information about the station location will be forthcoming at the 30% design workshop that Sound Transit will host. At that time, the community will have an opportunity to comment on the designs as they are developed.

Chair Craft commented that, by moving the station as proposed, the amount of MUR-70' zoning available for redevelopment would be reduced. That means the number of potential units would also be reduced.

Commissioner Chang asked how the new location would impact the traffic study results, and Ms. Redinger answered that it would not change the volumes, other than reducing them a bit because fewer parcels would be zoned MUR-70'. On the whole, staff believes the change would provide relief. The more people have an option to reach the station by reliable bus service, the fewer people will choose to drive in single-occupancy vehicles.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas referred to the letter from Sound Transit to Yoshiko Saheki, which indicated that the location change was based on a request from the City of Shoreline. Mr. Evans said the change came about as Sound Transit worked with their partners (Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), City of Shoreline and King County Metro). Moving the station to the north would reduce the impacts to NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, and the City of Seattle would no longer have jurisdiction. He explained that Sound Transit has a directive to address transit integration. Rather than creating individual silos of transit operations, light rail will work with the bus service so that the two opportunities are well integrated. Metro pointed out that their projections indicate that 90% of the train ridership will come from their buses, and the plan must include pleasant, easy-to-use, and efficient circulation. The City has agreed that Sound Transit should work with King County Metro to make sure their needs are accommodated. In addition, the City Traffic Engineer identified concerns about how traffic would work at the intersection of NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. She particularly voiced concern about the closeness of driveways, where stacking would occur.

Commissioner Malek asked about ownership and future disposition of the triangular piece of property at the intersection of NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Mr. Evans said the property is WSDOT right-of-way all the way to the northern boundary of the existing park-and-ride. In normal circumstances, Sound Transit would purchase an air lease or long-term easement use of the property, but WSDOT would still retain ownership. This may still be required if other enhancements or access are included in the developing footprint scenario.

Commissioner Mork emphasized that pedestrian and bicycle access are crucial to the success of the station, and she asked if the location change would alter the work that has been done in this regard. Ms. Redinger answered that staff anticipates that if NE 148<sup>th</sup> Street goes through the station area, pedestrians and bicycles would have better access. Mr. Evans added that the proposed change would also resolve the City's long-time concern about how people who are walking or riding to the station get across the on-ramp. Relocating the station further north would eliminate the need for the Metro off-ramp because people would be able to use light rail instead of catching a bus to travel down I-5. In addition, the pedestrian crossing would be shorter and enhanced. The previous version would require a new on-ramp that would serve as a northern wall to what is going on north of the station. The intent is to work with the City on a variety of multi-modal enhancements on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE that improve connections to and throughout the station for all modes of transportation.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas voiced concern about recommending approval of a land use map before making final decisions relative to zoning. For example, the Compact Community Hybrid Map (Alternative 4) is being used as a placeholder. However, in the context of deliberations about the overall zoning in the subarea, the Commission may want to recommend changes to the land use map. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor explained that the general approach is to address the Comprehensive Plan first and then the zoning should implement the Comprehensive Plan. However, for Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations that can only be implemented with one zoning district, any subsequent zoning changes would require amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Because the Comprehensive Plan designations and the implementing zoning designations are tied together, the Commission could consider the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map simultaneously.

### **Public Testimony**

**Dia Dreyer, Shoreline**, expressed her belief that there should be no minimum density requirement in the MUR-35' zone, and the base density calculation rounding methods should not be modified. In addition, she recommended that the Phase I PAO Boundaries should not include any MUR-35' zoned properties. If the properties to the east are excluded, then properties to the west should be excluded, as well.

Ms. Dreyer reviewed that the Commission and City Council have confirmed multiple times over the past two years that single-family residential should be allowed in the MUR-35' zone and they are not in support of imposing minimum density. She noted that Commission's October 16, 2014 minutes show that staff verified that minimum density in the MUR-35' zone was not supported by the Commission, yet the topic was brought up again by staff at the Commission's June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. After a lengthy discussion, the Commission reaffirmed that they were not in support of minimum density in the MUR-



35' zone. Based on that meeting, each note in the code was adjusted and next to the adjustments it was noted that *"the Commission does not support minimum density in MUR-35'."* However, in the current meeting packet, staff has once again reasserted the amendment to be sent to City Council. She suggested that this dismissal of Commission direction and repeated insertion of the amendment is a mockery of the process and a complete disregard for the role of the Planning Commission. She questioned who is driving the relentless attempt to get the amendment into code. Is the Planning Division acting on the single biased interest of a certain outside party? Is it not the responsibility of the City to fully and clearly disclose to Shoreline citizens any possible ex-parte communications that could influence the City's decision?

Ms. Dreyer concluded that, as discussed by the Commission in June, forcing additional units can have an incredibly large impact. Few homeowners have the means to realistically build three units, as Amendment 8 would be a requirement for all properties regardless of size. Requiring that units be crammed onto a property would leave the current home owners few options but to scrape their lot and demolish their own homes in order to do anything besides simply live there. Developers know this will reduce the pool of buyers, increase the highest and best use of the property, and bully the current homeowners.

**David Lange, Shoreline**, pointed out that the City has run for more than a year with the 185th Street Station Subarea zoning and current permits have had little to do with the concept drawings that were sold to the public as depicting the upzone results. He questioned how a PAO would foster the concepts of higher density and storefronts around an intersection with less density in the middle of the block or a working solution for walking density versus completely dispersed Vision 2029 storefronts. He commented that the new station design would eliminate bus stops on NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street near the station; and all buses, regardless of origin or destination will be using 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He cautioned that the City can build density faster than it can create community, which effectively blocks buses on NE 185<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and creates costs instead of revenues.

Mr. Lange advised that there are serious concerns that the critical areas on private spaces have not been adequately identified or documented, and there is a buffer area west of the freeway that is still labeled as MUR-70'. He said he would like single-family residential to be a conforming use in the MUR-45' zone. Having a residential-only option in every zoning category will result in more cars than businesses. Further, it will push for more road width and garage space while decreasing walkability in the community. He voiced his belief that the residential option is effectively a "bait and switch" from the DEIS pictorial concepts that garnered some citizen approval and is now a surprise implementation of density, mainly residential, at any cost. He recalled that, at their last meeting the Commission heard about interest in redevelopment, but it is likely that every one of the proposals was for residential uses. With MUR-45' coming into the upzone years before MUR-70' development is present, business and office solutions are needed in the MUR-45' code, repeated all along the 1.25-mile corridor for 185<sup>th</sup> and its breadth. It's all about density, and the question is picking business and office or wider streets and congested intersections in areas where there are currently residential streets.

Mr. Lange commented that the examples provided of MUR-45' buildings will not get built in Shoreline until Seattle quits booming. He suggested one of the strongest support letters mentioned residents lacking mobility, and the easy-to-build, 3-story townhomes without elevators are no place for a

significant portion of the City's residents (existing or desired). He noted that every new building either contributes to the walking community or creates dumb density costs. He urged the Commissioners to read the comments and FEIS statements again before they vote.

**Doug Hudson, Shoreline**, said he first heard about the Subarea Plan via a letter from a realtor who wanted to purchase his home, which is located on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, the 5<sup>th</sup> lot above NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street. He particularly voiced his concern that the 4-lot width of MUR-35' zoning north of NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street (between 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave) would be directly adjacent to single-family residential zoning. As proposed, it is possible that a 35-foot high structure could look directly into his back yard. He questioned why the City is proposing to rezone these properties midblock when the remainder of the zoning changes occur by block. He said it appears the intent is to create a mini Aurora Avenue. He asked for examples of where this type of zoning has been done elsewhere.

**Yoshiko Saheki, Shoreline**, referred to Amendment 3 (SMC 20.40.506) of Ordinance 751 and asked that the language be revised so that single-family detached dwellings that do not meet the minimum density are permitted in the MUR-45' zone, as well as the MUR-35' zone, subject to the R-6 development standards. She would support a provision that would sunset the allowance in the MUR-45' zone 10 years after the station opens. She observed that most people who live on blocks designated as MUR-45' did not envision this change when they purchased their homes. By allowing them to have their homes as permitted uses until 2033, the rezoning would be less disruptive on their lives. She asked the Commissioners to not just plan for the future; they should also consider those who live in the neighborhood now and have already invested in the community.

**Steve Schneider, Shoreline**, said he also received an email from Olivia Rother, Committee Outreach Specialist for Sound Transit, regarding the proposed change in station location. He asked the Commission to postpone any decision on the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan until Sound Transit gives the City an exact new location for the station. Since the design will not be ready until late fall, the City should wait until the final design is finished before proceeding with any decisions. The time should be used to continue the discussion of the cons and pros of the rezone. He asked who would pay for all of the mitigations listed in the FEIS for Phase 1 of the Compact Community Hybrid Zoning Scenario. It should not be the people who already live in the neighborhood.

**Wendy DiPeso, Shoreline**, said she was present to represent the Shoreline Preservation Society. She asked that the Commission accept the Society's additional comments as part of the official public record with legal standing on the matter of the proposed 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan (PAO, FEIS and rezone), including Ordinances 750, 751 and 752. The Society has a longstanding interest and involvement in the community, protecting its natural and cultural resources, the character of the neighborhoods, and the Thornton Creek Watershed. The Society asserts Growth Management Act (GMA) and SEPA standing in this matter.

Ms. DiPeso said that, along with the concerns raised in a letter that was submitted earlier in the day, the Society has the following additional concerns:

- At the Commission's last discussion, Commissioner Mork testified of her concern that retaining R-6 around wetlands would create an area where only the very wealthy could live. However, it is

important to keep in mind that they are not talking about lakefront property or ocean views. They are talking about homes that are subject to flooding. If the City increases the density north, west and south of the Paramount Park and Open Space, any properties that are in the buffer zone or adjoining the wetland would be subject to greater flooding.

- The Commission also had a lengthy discussion about minimum lot size, but it did not address the fact that buildings of a certain height require fire service access on all four sides. This will require setbacks.
- In order to keep everything above board and the community informed, it is necessary to at least do an amended or supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) based on the proposed station location change. Sound Transit will not conduct their public meeting until November, yet it is anticipated the City Council will make a final decision on the Subarea Plan by the end of September. That seems to be “putting the cart before the horse.”

Ms. DiPeso said she could fill a book with all of the issues and concerns the Society has relative to the Subarea Plan. It comes down to the fact that they are not just talking about dots on a map. Almost everyone in the room could say that this community is their home. The 2000+ people who attended the ice cream social just prior to the hearing could also say this community is their home. Yet, with the strike of a pen, these human beings are being denied the right to determine what the changes are going to look like in their home area once projects are actually proposed. She questioned who the community belongs to. It appears that it now belongs to those who have the power and money to redevelop.

**Aaron McCullough, Shoreline**, said he lives on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and is a supporter of aggressive planning. He supports the City turning into the modern city that it can be, and he supports a significant upzoning to meet the coming density that is inevitable. He said he did not grow up in Shoreline and has lived in the City less than five years. However, it is his home and he intends to stay. They are trying to find their way in the neighborhood and provide ways for people with disabilities to have a place to live, as well. There is an accessory dwelling unit on his property that is leased out to someone with developmental disabilities. They are interested in taking advantage of a potential upzone to provide an additional accessible unit that he may end up moving into as he ages.

Mr. McCullough said he is dismayed by the Compact Community Hybrid Map, which illustrates a fractional change from earlier ones that seemed to push the MUR-35' all the way up 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to NE 160<sup>th</sup> Street. The current proposal falls short of allowing him to take advantage of an increase in density. He disclosed that he works for Sound Transit as an Accessibility Coordinator, but he was not present to speak on behalf of Sound Transit. He was previously an attorney who focused on the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). His desire is to address the City's need for more accessible housing options and provide opportunities for citizens to age in place. Rather than knocking down existing structures, his goal is to take advantage of the potential upzone. He commended the Commission for the good planning they have done and for the well-deserved award the City recently won for the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. He urged the Commission to take an aggressive approach to the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan.

**Jeffrey Eisenbrey, Shoreline**, presented a petition with 97 signatures from citizens asking for an extension of two weeks for the public comment period to account for the late-breaking news about the station relocation, as well as people's general sense of dismay and powerlessness regarding the upzone. He commented that the proposed change in station location strikes him as the latest and inescapable evidence that the process is outpacing the gathering and consideration of facts. He noted that the City of Bothell's pursuit of redevelopment on Bothell Way was an 8-year process, yet the City of Shoreline is trying to complete the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan in two to three years. In spite of the extended public comment period outlined by staff, the community feedback has mostly been thrown out and people have expressed grave concern and surprise when they see how the proposal is rendered in the maps.

Mr. Eisenbrey referred to Section 3.3.3 of the Department of Ecology's (DOE) SEPA on-line handbook, which discusses the effected environment, significant impacts and mitigation measures. He noted that the City uses the lowest threshold of mitigation (monitoring) almost exclusively. As he demonstrated in documents he prepared for the last Commission meeting, the impact to schools of a full buildout can be conservatively estimated at \$250 million strictly for construction. The City's FEIS does not address where this money will come from, nor does it propose any mitigation besides monitoring. This is irresponsible at best, and at worst, it is either incompetent or an effort to whitewash the costs that will be passed on to residents. All of these services will be costly and have not been accounted for in the FEIS. When comparing the work of the City's Planning Division to the work that has been done by other municipalities (as cited in a letter of rebuttal to comments the Commission has received), the City's work is shoddy at best.

**Ann Bates, Shoreline**, voiced concern that the costs associated with additional infrastructure have not been addressed in the plan or in the FEIS. There is some very lovely language in the July 2016 draft report that says the City would prioritize capital projects, update its systems plan and procure funding for and implement improvement to its facilities. However, it does not say whether the City actually has the staffing capacity to get all the changes done. It also does not identify who would be responsible to pay for the improvements to water, sewer, traffic, parks, etc. She noted that there is a chance that Paramount Park may be turned into a school again. While it has been suggested that the City would insist that the school provide playground equipment for the community, it is not guaranteed and the park may be lost. Although another park would be recommended based on population and size, there has been no discussion about who would pay for the park and where it would be located. She asked if developers would have to pay for any of the improvements and if the City has sufficient staff to see that the improvements are made.

**Deborah DeMoss, Shoreline**, said she has been significantly impacted by the decision that was made relative to the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan, and she is present to support the citizens and neighbors who are concerned about the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan. Based on the horrifying effects of the Planning Commission not doing a traffic study for her street (12<sup>th</sup> Avenue), she and her neighbors are still in a nightmare state. She said she hopes that the Commission will listen loud and clear to the neighbors and base its decision on what they are saying. They know better than anyone. No one bothered to listen to her and her neighbors. Instead, they followed the staff's recommendation, but it is important to keep in mind that staff does not have to live with the nightmares that their plans create. She reported that, in May, a small dog was killed on her street, which is located in a commercial/business

area. The traffic has been horrendous, and the little dog will never come back to its family. She noted that there are children living along the street, and she implored the Commission to listen to the community and understand their concerns and thoughts. When all is said and done, you cannot go back. The 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan was rushed through. Although the City won the lawsuit that was filed against it, she finds it ironic that they won an award for their efforts.

**Pam Mieth, Shoreline**, said she is in favor of the light rail station and some increased development. However, she continues to object to the height, density and scope of the proposed Subarea Plan. She said she does not understand why neither the Planning Commission nor City Council has paid any attention to the objections of the majority of residents who have attended their meetings. It seems that the Subarea Plan is a foregone conclusion. She said she understands the concept of grouping redevelopment in proximity to the stations, but it puts the full impact on these neighborhoods. Perhaps spreading it out a little bit and having some better transportation links should have been considered further. She is also concerned that there would be no maximum density in the proposed zones, and she is worried the plan would result in a lot of micro-units along NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 155<sup>th</sup> Streets, with no setbacks in some cases. This would crowd out the streets and create a very urban environment that would completely change the character of the City. While she understands the need for progress, the proposed plan seems excessive. She asked if the change in the station location would require the borders of the increased density to shift north a few blocks. She noted that the plan talks about extending the turn lanes on NE 155<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Meridian Avenue NE all the way from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. If so, would that be done in the existing roadway, or would the on-street parking be eliminated. She said she would love the proposal to be downscaled, and she urged the Commission to continue the public hearing.

**Robin Lombard, Shoreline**, commented that many of the residents in attendance at the public hearing have spent countless hours over the past three years in meetings, design workshops, open houses and discussions. They've invested the time because they care about the neighborhood and how the plan surrounding the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea will impact them. They want to make sure the Commission has the information it needs. She said she was surprised and concerned when she heard that the station might be moving to the north. Although she thinks it is Sound Transit's right to change its mind based on more information, citizens will want to give feedback. She requested that the Commission hold back its recommendation on the Subarea Plan until they are sure about the location and Sound Transit has communicated with the residents and allowed them an opportunity to provide feedback.

Commissioner Malek asked if staff has discussed how reducing the size of the MUR-70' zone based on the proposed new station location would impact the FEIS that was prepared for the Subarea Plan. Ms. Redinger answered that the FEIS is intended to analyze the maximum potential impact, and the proposed station relocation could potentially decrease the impact. Therefore, staff believes the location change is adequately addressed in the FEIS.

**Janet Way, Shoreline**, commented that the proposed change in station location is a significant concern, and she supports previous requests that the hearing be rescheduled to a future date to allow more people to testify and for the Commission to consider the impacts properly. She pointed out that about 3,000 households would be impacted by the proposed Subarea Plan. If the area were threatened by a flood, fire, or earthquake, the Commission would feel obligated to do something to help the neighbors.

Instead, it appears they are trying to figure out a way to “kick them all out.” She understands that change will happen and development will occur, but ultimately, that’s the way the residents feel. Again, she asked for more time. The citizens have a right to be heard and to be given proper notice of the changes coming up.

**Charles Cooper, Shoreline**, said the reality is the Central Puget Sound (the metropolitan region) is going to see an increase in population in the magnitude of 1.5 million in the next 20 years. That means that every city in the region must take some responsibility for accommodating the increase in population. That necessarily means that cities must look at how they are organized, and it will mean more density. He recognized that change is never pleasant, but they must “take the bull by the horn.” The City Council and Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility of looking at the best interest of the community in the long run; not just for existing residents, but for new residents. It is his hope that the Commission will do its best job in figuring out what needs to be done, recognizing that the City must densify and create walkable, vibrant communities and transit-oriented development adjacent to the Sound Transit investments that are coming.

Ms. Redinger clarified that single-family uses would be permitted in the MUR-35’ zone. The R-6 development standards would apply to future single-family residential development and there would be no minimum density requirement. However, if minimum density is applied to the MUR-35’ zone, it would not be possible to develop more than one single-family home to maximize the density allowed under the MUR-35’ development standards.

Regarding Ms. Saheki’s recommendation, Ms. Redinger explained that the regulations, as currently written, would allow single-family homes as permitted uses in the MUR-45’ zone, and the remaining non-conformance would pertain to the minimum density requirement. Even with the non-conformance, a single-family homeowner in an MUR-45’ zone would be allowed to expand, remodel and rebuild up to 50% square footage or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less, of their existing footprint.

Ms. Redinger referred to Mr. Hudson’s concern about having a 35-foot high structure looking down on his backyard. She clarified that the existing height limit in R-6 zones is 35 feet, and the 35-foot height limit in the MUR-35’ zone was intended to be compatible.

Ms. Redinger recalled that there were also a number of questions about who would pay for upgrades to infrastructure. She answered that some of the upgrades would be provided by Sound Transit in conjunction with the station development and some will occur as capital projects. However, a lot of projects will occur as part of redevelopment. She reminded the Commission that developers are required to pay for improvements to traffic, utilities, etc.

Ms. Redinger emphasized that the City has made a clear commitment to acquire and develop new park space, programs and facilities. She advised that the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan is currently being updated. In addition to looking very specifically at opportunities within both of the station areas to acquire land, the plan would look at an impact fee that developers would pay into a fund that the City could use to acquire available property for park or open space.

Although it has been suggested that the public hearing be continued to September 1<sup>st</sup>, Ms. Redinger pointed out that date is the Thursday before the Labor Day Weekend. When staff originally considered dates for the public hearing, they knew it would be challenging to hold a public hearing and have good participation in August. They also realized that moving the hearing to a non-traditional Commission meeting night would also cause problems, and the Thursday before Labor Day was also not ideal. However, it is important for the City Council to start deliberating in September and make a recommendation soon after, as they are also obligated to adopt a City budget and take care of other year-end items.

Ms. Redinger clarified that the Polaris Development was not part of the 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea. The zoning was adopted 10 years ago as part of North City. The policies surrounding the development are not based on staff recommendation. The development approval was based on policies and plans from City, County and regional entities.

Regarding the maximum density provision, Ms. Redinger reminded the Commission that the City has changed the way it regulates residential development from a maximum density to a height limit. There are also other controls relative to the number of units that can be developed, such as parking standards.

There was no one else in the audience who wished to participate, and the public portion of the hearing was closed.

### **Commission Discussion and Action**

**CHAIR CRAFT MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT ORDINANCE 750 (ADOPTING THE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN AND RELATED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP) AND ORDINANCE 751 (ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE SHORELINE MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 20 UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE AND AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S OFFICIAL ZONING MAP TO IMPLEMENT THE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET STATION SUBAREA PLAN) BE ADOPTED AS PROPOSED BY PLANNING STAFF IN ATTACHMENTS A AND B OF THE AUGUST 18, 2016 STAFF REPORT. COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO REMOVE AMENDMENTS TO THE SHORELINE MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 20 PROPOSED BY STAFF IN ATTACHMENT B, EXHIBIT A AND DIRECT PLANNING STAFF TO PREPARE A NEW STAND-ALONE ORDINANCE FOR THOSE AMENDMENTS AND TO MODIFY ORDINANCE 751 TO REFLECT THE CHANGE. THE RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL WOULD BE FOR THE APPROVAL OF BOTH ORDINANCE 751 (ZONING MAP AS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT B, EXHIBIT B) AND APPROVAL OF A NEW ORDINANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS SHOWN IN ATTACHMENT B, EXHIBIT A. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor explained that the intent of the sub-motion is to separate the development code provisions from the zoning map so that the development codes for the 145<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan and 185<sup>th</sup> Street Station Subarea Plan stand alone.

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

**COMMISSIONER MORK MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO RETAIN R-6 ZONING ONLY ON THOSE TAX PARCELS THAT ARE ENCUMBERED BY CRITICAL AREAS AND THEIR BUFFERS AS SHOWN ON ATTACHMENT D TO THE AUGUST 18<sup>TH</sup> STAFF REPORT. THE OTHER TAX PARCELS SHOULD BE ZONED TO MUR-35'. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Mork reminded the Commission of the specific goals called out by the City Council to increase density and recommended that the properties that do not have critical areas should be reverted to MUR-35' zoning so the density requirements can be met. She explained that when identifying critical areas, it is not just based on whether or not they can be seen. When property is developed, a developer must also notify the City if any critical areas are found. She feels there is already a safety net built in, and MUR-35' would be a reasonable method to increase density in the area.

Commissioner Malek asked if the entire area was originally identified as MUR-35' but later changed to R-6. Chair Craft answered that the original Compact Communities Map identified the properties around the Paramount Open Space and Paramount Park as MUR-35'. In the Commission's recommendation to the City Council, the MUR-35' zoning was removed for the properties around the park. Commissioner Mork clarified that her sub-motion would revert those properties that are not encumbered by critical areas or critical area buffers back to MUR-35'. This would also include some properties by Twin Ponds Park.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she took the opportunity to walk through the entire area earlier in the week and noticed there are a lot of single-family residential homes, and many are relatively new. She does not anticipate these uses will change in the next 50 years, but there are also opportunities for redevelopment. Although the R-6 and MUR-35' zones have the same height limit, they also contain different development standards for setbacks, etc. She supports the proposed motion to change the properties back to MUR-35' zoning. She also suggested that the sub-motion should include the properties south of the Paramount Open Space that border NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street. This change would present an opportunity to increase density for walkability. Although there is a small amount of critical area on the properties, the mitigations that would be required to develop these properties would resolve a huge number of issues that plague the Paramount Open Space. These improvements will not be made if the R-6 zoning is retained. Given the location of these properties, she felt there would be greater safeguards and a better opportunity to develop infrastructure on these properties if they were zoned MUR-35'.

At the request of Commissioner Chang, Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that although the MUR-35' zone would allow a greater lot coverage, development would still have to conform with all the critical area requirements. In addition, new development would have to meet the more stringent stormwater requirements. Commissioner Chang clarified that both the R-6 and MUR-35' zones would require new development to meet the new stormwater requirements. Commissioner Moss-Thomas



reminded the Commission that NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street is a highway of statewide significance, and MUR-35' zoning would offer additional options for redevelopment. While she does not believe that all the existing homes will go away, the goal is to create a livable community with a variety of housing types.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE SUB-MOTION BE AMENDED TO ZONE THE PROPERTIES ON THE SOUTH END OF THE PARAMOUNT OPEN SPACE THAT HAVE A PROPERTY LINE ABUTTING NE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO MUR-35'. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Moss-Thomas summarized that her sub-motion is partly an equity issue, as well as a density issue. It is also a quality of life issue. For example, denser development can actually block sound from the corridor from carrying through to the neighborhoods. Identifying the properties as MUR-35' would not eliminate a property owner's ability to develop a property as single-family residential based on the R-6 zoning standards.

Commissioner Mork said she supports the exception proposed by Commissioner Moss-Thomas because the properties abut NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, and the Commission has a tendency to think of major arterials, such as NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street or 15 Avenue NE, as being places where they want more density.

Chair Craft said he supports the Compact Community Hybrid Map, as previously recommended given the geography and topography of the area. Although he recognized that the intent is to focus denser development on the arterials where there are transit opportunities, he is not sure how necessary it is to change the zoning given that there has been recent development of single-family housing in the area. He reminded the Commission that the zoning could be changed at some point in the future if necessary, and the previously recommended map hones the focus in on the areas that are most important for transit-oriented development (15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, and NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street, and Light Rail Station). He said he would be inclined not to support either of the sub-motions.

Vice Chair Montero said he also supports retaining R-6 zoning on the properties that surround the park. He said he could support the motion to convert the properties back to MUR-35' if the minimum density requirement were eliminated.

**THE MOTION TO AMEND THE SUB-MOTION (*CHANGING THE ZONING ON THE PROPERTIES SOUTH OF THE PARAMOUNT OPEN SPACE THAT ABUT NE 145<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO MUR-35'*) WAS APPROVED BY A VOTE OF 4-3, WITH COMMISSIONERS MOSS-THOMAS, MORK, CHANG AND MAUL VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR CRAFT, VICE CHAIR MONTERO AND COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

Again, Chair Craft expressed his belief that the original map the Commission created is effective given current circumstances. Changes can be made in the future if necessary. The more intense development should be focused on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, NE 155 Street and the light rail station area.

Commissioner Mork commented that her sub-motion is intended to provide an equity option so that people will have a choice on whether they retain, replace, or expand their single-family or redevelop consistent with the MUR-35' zoning standards. Zoning the properties to MUR-35' would give

additional options to homeowners and developers. For example, MUR-35' development would provide opportunities for people who want to live near a park but cannot afford a single-family home.

Vice Chair Montero said he still feels the area should remain R-6, recognizing that it is part of Phase 2 of the Subarea Plan and can be reevaluated and changed at a later date. He believes the properties will remain the same for the foreseeable future regardless of whether they are zoned R-6 or MUR-35'. Commissioner Moss-Thomas disagreed, pointing out that the proposal would change both the Land Use Map and Zoning Map for all properties within the subarea. Although the properties in question are not included as part of the PAO (area formerly identified as Phase I), she believes changes will occur. For example, the gateway area at NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is ripe for redevelopment, and she sees a higher potential for shorter term development going from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE heading west before the station opens. It is important to address zoning and land use now so that property owners have a clear understanding of their choices.

Ms. Redinger pointed out that the map the Commission is currently considering would adopt all zones as of 2016 without phasing. If the Commission wants to put forward a phased-approach to the City Council, they would need to clarify their intent relative to the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative and the PAO boundaries. The Comprehensive Plan Map should also be changed accordingly to represent the future vision for zoning, even if it does not happen right now.

Commissioner Malek said he also walked through the Paramount Open Space and Paramount Park. With the density proposed in the MUR-70' and MUR-45' zones, there will be a need for more open space and areas that are less dense. The current map already lends itself to this concept. As he has watched Ballard redevelop, one of his least favorite things is the townhome density projects that are hobnailed in and encroach on sensitive areas. Of all the spaces to impose high density, critical areas and their buffers are the most objectionable. He would rather consider expanding the MUR-70' zoning further north beyond NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street and leaving the properties surrounding the parks as R-6. There is no reason to propose higher density and/or business traffic against a wetland area.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas reminded the Commission that commercial uses are not allowed in the MUR-35' zone unless facing a collector arterial. Therefore, most of the properties surrounding the parks would be restricted to residential development only. MUR-35' also has a height limit and limits on lot coverage. She voiced concern about leaving a lot of R-6 zoning in the middle of an area that is already fairly transit rich. She also voiced concern that the current map would place R-6 zoning across the street from MUR-70' zoning. She summarized that the proposed change would give more equity and lend itself to more development so that people can start using public transit before the station is open. She also anticipates that many of the properties would be redeveloped as residential rather than commercial. She understands that the change will impact the people who live in the neighborhood, but the area has been designated on long-range plans for well over 20 years as being a more transit-dense area.

**THE SUB-MOTION (RETAINING R-6 ZONING ONLY ON THOSE TAX PARCELS THAT ARE ENCUMBERED BY CRITICAL AREAS AND THEIR BUFFERS AS SHOWN ON ATTACHMENT D TO THE AUGUST 18<sup>TH</sup> STAFF REPORT. THE OTHER TAX PARCELS SHOULD BE ZONED TO MUR-35') WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED BY A VOTE OF 4-3, WITH**

**COMMISSIONERS MOSS-THOMAS, MORK, CHANG AND MAUL VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR CRAFT, VICE CHAIR MONTERO AND COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO ADVANCE THE MUR-70' ZONE TO THE AREA BETWEEN NE 155<sup>TH</sup> STREET, 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE AND THE FREEWAY. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Malek said the intent of the sub-motion is to reclaim more high density, with the understanding that some would potentially be lost with the station relocation. He also felt that MUR-70' would better serve the area.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if MUR-70' zoning would need to have been analyzed as part of the EIS. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor explained that not every lot needs to be analyzed in the FEIS at the exact zoning that is put in. The FEIS analyzed the no action alternative, the maximum growth alternative and various other scenarios and identified the amount of impacts associated with each one. The EIS studied a large percentage of the area in question as potentially MUR-85' zoning, so the analysis captures the impacts associated with MUR-70' zoning, as well. She concluded that the proposed change would fall within the parameters of the FEIS.

Chair Craft said he does not support extending the MUR-70' zone further north. The MUR-70' zoning should be located as close to the light rail station as possible. Bringing it to NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street would extend it beyond where it would be most effective, resulting in dense zoning further from the station area than desirable. On the other hand, he supports the MUR-70' zoning at the intersection of NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE given the existing commercial corridor and transit access along NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street.

Commissioner Mork asked staff to display the map that illustrates the ½-mile radius and walkshed boundaries, as well as the 1½-mile bike shed around the Compact Community Hybrid Alternative. Although the subject properties along NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street are within the ½-mile radius but not the walkshed, it was noted that the walkshed would move slightly north if the station is relocated as currently proposed. Commissioner Moss-Thomas noted that the station would be shifted north about the same distance as Commissioner Malek's recommendation to extend the MUR-70' zone. Given the potential for additional non-motorized improvements if the station moves further north, the properties in question would likely be within the walkshed area. She cautioned against basing their decision on today's streets and property boundaries, which are likely to change as parcels are redeveloped.

Commissioner Chang voiced concern that the proposed amendment represents too much change, and she likes the way the current zoning steps down and provides a transition from MUR-70' down to MUR-45', MUR-35' and then R-6 zoning. Commissioner Malek noted that, even with the change, the MUR-70' zoning would be surrounded by MUR-45' zoning to buffer most of the area.

Chair Craft commented that limiting the MUR-45' zone reduces the opportunity for people to purchase property, and people who purchase property tend to stay a little longer. Eliminating a portion of the

MUR-45' zone would remove some of the opportunity for different types of families and individuals to move into the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Montero pointed out that the property on the northern portion of NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street is developed with a church on the east corner and a fire station abutting the freeway. The map is missing 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, which curves down between 5<sup>th</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenues NE. The opportunity to redevelop to MUR-70' is limited. He agreed that the area does not lend itself to MUR-70' and it should remain as MUR-45'. However, he would support extending the MUR-70' zone further on the property east of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

**THE SUB-MOTION TO THE MAIN MOTION FAILED BY A VOTE OF 3-4, WITH COMMISSIONERS MALEK, MAUL AND MOSS-THOMAS VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR CRAFT, VICE CHAIR MONTERO, AND COMMISSIONERS CHANG AND MORK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

**COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE PROPERTIES SOUTH OF NE 155<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND NORTH OF NE 152<sup>ND</sup> STREET BETWEEN 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE AND 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NE BE ZONED MUR-70' RATHER THAN MUR-45'. VICE CHAIR MONTERO SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Once again, Commissioner Malek said the intent is to reclaim a little more MUR-70' to account for the MUR-70' that would be lost as a result of the station relocation. Density is needed in the area, and MUR-70' is the best way to do it. There would still be MUR-45' zoning to transition between Paramount Park and the residential neighborhoods.

Chair Craft voiced his same objection that the proposed change would limit the amount of MUR-45', which is inappropriate given the location. While moving the station north would limit some opportunity for MUR-70' development, it would be minimal and not have a major impact. He supports keeping the MUR-70' zone closer to NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and the station. Given the topography and the properties' proximity to Paramount Park, as well as the single-family residential development to the north, he supports the retention of MUR-45'.

Vice Chair Montero pointed out that 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street is a multi-modal corridor, and changing the zoning as proposed would allow the properties to be developed consistently along the entire corridor, creating an attractive boulevard. On the other hand, Commissioner Chang said she supports MUR-45' zoning to keep the taller buildings away from the park.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she supports the proposed amendment from a multi-modal standpoint, as well as an opportunity to create more cohesiveness between the Ridgecrest Neighborhood to the north and the volume of people going by on NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street. NE 155<sup>th</sup> Street is already busy, and it will get even busier as multi-modal improvements are made. The proposed change would provide more opportunities for all modes of transportation. There would still be a good buffer for the park, the proposed change would be consistent with the goal of creating density closer to the station.

**THE SUB-MOTION WAS APPROVED BY A VOTE OF 5-2, WITH VICE CHAIR MONTERO AND COMMISSIONERS MOSS-THOMAS, MORK, MAUL, AND MALEK VOTING IN FAVOR AND CHAIR CRAFT AND COMMISSIONER CHANG VOTING IN OPPOSITION.**

Commissioner Moss-Thomas noted that Section 1 of Ordinance 751 was pulled out to be its own separate ordinance. Therefore, they are only considering amendments to the zoning map in Ordinance 751. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor said the Commission should also provide clear direction to staff that the Comprehensive Plan Map should be changed accordingly based on the zoning amendments that were done by the Commission.

**COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO UPDATE THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP (EXHIBIT B TO ATTACHED A OF ORDINANCE 751) TO ALIGN WITH ALL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES IN ORDINANCE 752. COMMISSIONER MORK SECONDED THE MOTION**

Commissioner Chang asked if her fellow Commissioners were comfortable with the proposal to change the station location. Chair Craft reviewed that the intent of moving the station further north is to expand opportunities for transportation access, and he feels comfortable that the area to the north will be a more effective location for the station. Commissioner Chang concurred but voiced concern about how the relocation would impact the analysis that was done as part of the FEIS. Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that the traffic studies played a part in Sound Transit's decision to relocate the station. Even though they are working with partners, Sound Transit will be the governing body responsible for all amendments or addendums to their FEIS. The City's FEIS has to do with zoning and land use, neither of which will be impacted by the proposed relocation.

Commissioner Chang voiced concern that the proposed relocation could impact traffic flow through the area. Commissioner Maul pointed out that the traffic numbers would not change. The station would simply be moved 400 feet north to better accommodate the buses. He does not believe the relocation would alter the FEIS in any way.

Vice Chair Montero reminded the Commission that, along with the proposed changes in zoning, transit would become an authorized use within the MUR-70' zone. Therefore, it is immaterial where the station is located within the MUR-70' zone since it is already authorized as an allowed use.

Commissioner Mork said she shares Commissioner Chang's concern on trying to assimilate such a large change in such a short order of time. She asked if it would be possible to request staff to spend some time pondering and identifying concerns that might not be addressed in the FEIS. Director Markle reminded the Commission that the City's Traffic Engineer has been integrally involved in the process, and part of the reason for exploring movement of the station is to alleviate some of the traffic concerns that have been raised and impacts that have already been identified, mainly through Sound Transit's FEIS. Staff's conclusion is that movement of the station would actually reduce traffic impacts. While there will likely be a mode split, the split will go towards bus and less vehicular traffic.

**THE SUB-MOTION (UPDATING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO ALIGN WITH ALL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES) WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**THE MAIN MOTION (ADOPTING ORDINANCES 750 AND 751) WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED BY SUBSEQUENT SUB-MOTIONS.**

**VICE CHAIR MONTERO MOVED THAT THE HEARING BE CONTINUED TO AUGUST 22, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.**

The Commission clarified that the public comment period had been closed previously, and no additional public testimony would be accepted at the continued hearing.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Markle announced that the City has enacted a moratorium effective August 8<sup>th</sup> on the acceptance of applications for self-service storage facilities. The matter will come before the Commission within the next few months.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no reports or announcements.

### **AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Chair Craft reviewed that the Commission's September 1<sup>st</sup> meeting was cancelled.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

---

Easton Craft  
Chair, Planning Commission

---

Lisa Basher  
Clerk, Planning Commission