

**From:** [webmaster@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:webmaster@shorelinewa.gov)  
**To:** [agenda comments](#)  
**Subject:** City of Shoreline: Agenda Comments  
**Date:** Friday, September 23, 2016 10:19:26 AM

---

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

**Form Name:** Comment on Agenda Items  
**Date & Time:** 09/23/2016 10:19 AM  
**Response #:** 149  
**Submitter ID:** 10655  
**IP address:** 24.19.12.89  
**Time to complete:** 5 min. , 32 sec.

---

### Survey Details: Answers Only

---

#### Page 1

---

1. Pamela Mieth
2. Shoreline
3. (O) Ridgecrest
4. pammieth@gmail.com
5. 09/26/2016
6. 8A
7. Dear Mayor and members of the City Council -

I am writing to include my questions and comments on the record as you continue to discuss the rezoning and planned action ordinance of the 145th Street area.

I do believe Shoreline needs to add some increased density for a number of reasons, including to help support the new light rail station, to hopefully provide some more affordable housing in the city, perhaps to even create some jobs, and to help the environment by easing the creep of sprawl. I just think the way you are proposing to go about it is wrong - that the scope is too much, the safeguards too few, and that you will not achieve what you hope through your methods of implementation.

In no particular order at this time:

1) I am wondering if you/the city has a response to Wendy DiPeso's questions/comments regarding the RCW and limits it places on the use of planned action absent prior or subsequent project level public input/review? I would like to know why the city disagrees with her reading of it because otherwise it seems you are willfully ignoring the law and leaving Shoreline residents without any recourse or input.

2) City Councillor Salomon is suggesting phasing to delay higher-density development along 15th

Ave. as it is farther from the light rail station. Isn't this part of 15th, which is already commercial/higher density, the exact type of place increased density/bigger development should go? Particularly as it already has/is close to good public transit? Wouldn't having an existing transit user base in the area be easily transferred to the light rail via connecting buses (or a slightly longer walk) and/or be a good argument for keep existing bus service in Shoreline that connects other areas of the city? Aren't there some open unused lots there currently that could use some higher/better uses?

Phasing of rezoning to start with smaller areas closest to the light rail stations and in areas where higher density, such as 15th Ave., might make some sense. Isn't it easier to upzone additional areas when the actual impact of upzoning is apparent than to try to downzone after-the-fact?

3) Given the current research into the negative health effects of living near highways/high-traffic roadways, is building a lot of housing right next to the highway a great idea?

From the introduction to a 2010 CDC report, "Taking into consideration the entire body of evidence on primary traffic emissions, a recent review determined that there is sufficient evidence of a causal association between exposure to traffic-related air pollution and asthma exacerbation and suggestive evidence of a causal association for onset of childhood asthma, nonasthma respiratory symptoms, impaired lung function, all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality, and cardiovascular morbidity."

And, "In the United States, it is widely accepted that economically disadvantaged and minority populations share a disproportionate burden of air pollution exposure and risk (26,27). A growing body of evidence demonstrates that minority populations and persons of lower socioeconomic status experience higher residential exposure to traffic and traffic-related air pollution than nonminorities and persons of higher socioeconomic status (5,28–31). Two recent studies have confirmed that these racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities also exist on a national scale."

Is this something we wish to perpetuate?

4) The proposed rezoning would allow in both MUR-70', which seems to be the way the council is leaning, and in MUR-85', which is apparently still on the table, additional heights for certain considerations, bringing the total allowable height for development to 140 feet or approximately 14 stories. Does anyone else find that a shocking change to what is currently single-family zoning? Can anyone tell me what is the closest 14-story building? What is the tallest building currently in Shoreline?

5) On one hand I hear comments on the need to preserve/develop more open space, and at the same time one of the voluminous documents online talks about the possibility of redeveloping some of what open space is left into mixed use residential - the Jackson Park golf course, for example. I don't play golf so it wouldn't upset me greatly, but that is a large chunk of open space - which I think would be needed as open space more than ever. I realize that is in Seattle and out of the city's control, but it seems that discussion on increased open space is put forth as a nice idea, with most of the focus is on identifying what un- or under-developed parcels there are that can be included in the rezone for development.

From the FEIS, "The projected population under Alternative 4 would create a baseline demand for approximately six to seven total neighborhood parks in the subarea. (This would be approximately two to four new neighborhood parks given existing parks in the subarea.) It is assumed school

facilities would continue to serve part of the demand, and given the lack of available land and space for new neighborhood parks, some of the demand potentially could be served by smaller-sized neighborhood parks and dispersed mini-parks, recreation facilities, and urban plazas/public gathering spaces created as part of redevelopment sites."

The latter really don't seem to be adequate. Particularly if, as it has been stated, the School Department retains jurisdiction over Paramount Park and there is the potential it could be returned to use as a school.

Further, also, from the FEIS, "Alternative 4 retains land area around parks in R-6 single family use ... Retaining existing single family homes around the parks provides a transition in land use between the parks and the more intensive mixed use."

Perhaps I am misreading the most recent map recommended by the Planning Commission or perhaps because there is a roadway between the park and the properties it is not considered "around [the] parks," but it would appear that the areas around Paramount Park are clearly MUR-35'.

6) In some other communities they balance the need for increased density, affordable housing and open space by allowing developers to build greatly increased density (and requiring a substantial number of affordable units) in exchange for a large percentage of the parcel required to remain open space. In Shoreline, it seems we are allowing them to build on every square inch, eliminating a lot of setback requirements and not imposing any maximum number of units per development. I understand the need to increase density in already more urban environments to help preserve the more rural areas, but we need to maintain some green and open space, some variability in the streetfront and not resort to 6-lane roadways, as some have called for, to accommodate all the increased traffic from the development we are planning to reduce traffic somewhere else. Size of roadways affect livability/walkability.

7) The council mentioned transportation impact and park development fees developers could be assessed, but won't that be more than offset by the tax breaks the city is giving and cost of utility and traffic mitigation measures the city would be paying for?

8) Am I correct that one of the council's argument against R6 zoning at the last meeting was that it doesn't save tree canopy, "permeability" or affordable housing? It would seem that could be changed if the council willed it without having to upzone, at least at this time, such a large portion of our city.

9) Councillor Hall's argument that upzoning is needed to prevent incidents where individual large homes have been built and cover more of the lot than they should seems to me fallacious. It would seem to indicate more that whoever is in charge of making sure that doesn't happen is asleep on the watch. What guarantee do we have that it won't happen similarly on these much larger mega-projects we are facing?

10) I found the public comments from Lance Young of the Interurban Trail Tree Preservation Society both at the council's 9/12 meeting and in writing for the 9/26 meeting regarding wetland infiltration zone preservation extremely important, as well as Janet Way's regarding the critical areas.

As well, from the FEIS, "It should be noted that this reconnaissance and assessment level of

analysis was not a full delineation of wetland and stream boundaries and characteristics, but rather a high level analysis supported by field observations," and only of public properties.

"This level of analysis was sufficient to inform the FEIS study, with the understanding that future redevelopment applications would be required to fully delineate streams and wetlands as part of their proposals, and those future delineations would provide the most up-to-date, accurate level of detail at that time."

It would seem this is information critical to informing the city of what it needs to protect and that having a full and comprehensive picture at this stage would be necessary, with confirmation from the individual projects at that later date.

Further, from the FEIS, "The timing of the assessment in late August/early September is typically a drier time of year. However, assessments and delineations of streams and wetlands are conducted year-round, and delineations are required to define boundaries and characteristics accurately across all seasons of the year. Delineations are often completed during the growing season, when vegetation is at its peak and can be readily identified."

Timing is everything.

11) How much affordable housing and how affordable housing is really expected from the rezoning? The FEIS outlines developers shall make 20 percent of the units affordable to those earning less than 70 percent of the King County median income (70% of the current \$78,657 is \$55,059) adjusted for household size. That is not "affordable" to an awful lot of people or professions the report lists for Shoreline residents. Further, that drops to 10 percent of the units if the amount is affordable to people earning 60 percent of the median, which would currently be \$47,194. And, finally, there is the option of payments in lieu of units, which we've seen how well that's worked in Seattle.

I also wonder about the notation that the the city may, at its sole discretion, "agree to subordinate any affordable housing regulatory agreement for the purpose of enabling the owner to obtain financing for development of the property."

12) What letter did the city send out to selected residents? I don't see a copy online? What were the parameters of who received it? What did it say? Why is the city only now getting around to sending out letters to residents? Or did it do so previously but only if your property is within the affected area? Although I reside just outside both of the proposed rezone areas, my quality of life will be greatly affected by both the light rail project in particular (how many homes on my street will be taken and thus how close to it will I actually be?) and the general effects of the rezone - tall buildings, greatly increased traffic and intersection wait times, infrastructure needs and thus increased taxation to mention only a few. Not all of us work in downtown Seattle or areas easily connected to by public transportation. Some of us will still have to drive in the 145th St. sub-area and if the existing bus routes are diminished to track people to the light rail, we will have even fewer public transportation options.

Please reconsider what seems to be your leaning toward such a massive rezone and the methods by which you are doing it. There are ways to increase density in Shoreline to achieve all the goals you've outlined, without eliminating what made so many people want to live here.

Sincerely,

Pamela Mieth  
163rd Street  
Shoreline

**8.** (o) Oppose

Thank you,  
**City of Shoreline**

---

**This is an automated message generated by the Vision Content Management System™. Please do not reply directly to this email.**